OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

THIRD SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

1-2 GEORGE V., 1910-11

VOL. C

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-FIRST DAY OF FEBRUARY TO THE TWENTY-SECOND DAY OF MARCH, INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY C. H. PARMELEE, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1911

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 21, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—LAND DAMAGES.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the government what is the reason for the delay in granting fiats to a number of petitions of right, I believe over thirty in all, which were asked for in the month of September and October, 1907, in regard to claims for compensation for lands taken by the commissioners for the Transcontinental railway in the county of Madawaska in the province of New Brunswick. It would appear that although these petitions of right were filed, and fiats were asked for more than three years ago, no fiat has been granted up to the present time. The right of expropriation involves a certain sacrifice of private interest for the public good. When it is exercised, it seems to me that the subject, whether his claim be against a corporation or against the Crown, ought to have the right to make that claim good in the courts. These claims have been standing for three years, and I would like an explanation as to the cause of the delay in issuing fiats.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. The cases of lands taken in the county of Madawaska along the line of the Transcontinental railway have been a matter of consideration, and of discussion with the hon. gentleman who represents that county in this House by the Department of Justice for a good many months, and there has been considerable difficulty and delay in regard to them caused by the view which has been taken of the applicability of the provisions of the Expropriation Act to lands taken for the line of the Transcontinental railway. I gave to the question the best consideration that I was able, upon the language of the Transcontinental Railway Act, and the provisions enacted by this parliament with reference to the manner in which the construction of that line was to be carried out, and I was of opinion, from such examination of its provisions. that notwithstanding the constitution of the Board of Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, land taken for the construction of the line was land expropriated by the Crown, and therefore that the provisions of the Expropriation Act would have application, and that an information filed in the name of the Attorney General for the condemnation of any land which was requisite for that purpose would properly bring the question for consideration before the Exchequer Court. Such proceedings were taken, not with reference to lands in Madawaska, although I think that in some instances of lands taken in that section of the province of New Brunswick, fiats were given or expropriation proceedings initiated upon information. Some cases, however, from other parts of the province of New Brunswick came not long ago before the learned judge in the Exchequer Court for disposition, and he reached the conclusion after consideration that the lands so taken could not be considered as expropriated by the Crown, but that they were taken by the Board of Transcontinental Railway Commissioners for the purposes of their work, and, in that view, that the method of proceeding under the Expropriation Act would not have application. Not considering that that disposition of the matter was a satisfactory one, instructions were given to appeal from that decision to the Supreme Court of Canada. Such an appeal has been taken, but has not been heard by the Supreme Court. It will be heard, I have no doubt, at the sittings which begin to-day, and as soon as we have had an authoritative pronouncement on the subject from the Supreme Court, it will be either unnecessary to make any amendment of our present expropriation statute or it will be a matter for consideration whether that course should be taken. With regard to the granting of a petition of right in such circumstances to the land owner, let me say just one word. I have had no reason to change my view that it is more in the interest of the land owner himself that the proceedings for ascertaining the amount of compensation should be initiated by the government upon information of the Attorney General than upon a petition of right. There is perhaps no great practical difference, but there

is this important difference in the matter of expense to the land owner that if instead of allowing him to proceed by petition of right, the Crown takes the initiative and lodges the information, exactly the same result is obtained, but the Crown is in the position of the actor or plaintiff, and the burden of the preliminary expense is taken off the shoulders of the land owner and assumed by the Crown. For that reason I have encouraged that course of procedure rather than by giving the land owners fiats for petitions of right and in almost every instance—I know of no exception—that course has met with the approval of the land owners.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If I might be pardoned, I would like to say that I do not think these men should be subjected to the delay and inconvenience of having fine points of construction of statutes decided by the Supreme Court or any other court. Their lands have been taken, in this case they seem to have been taken three or four years ago, and a cheap and inexpensive method of ascertaining the amount of compensation to be given ought to have been provided in the first instance. If there is any doubt about their right to pursue such a course, that doubt should have been removed by statute long ago. I do not think that these men should be obliged to endure this long delay caused by the proposed appeal to the Supreme Court. They have been waiting three or four years now, and I do not think they should be saddled with one day's delay more than is absolutely necessary.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the government willing to lay on the table from day to day the very large number of protests sent in with respect to the proposed reciprocity agreement. These are documents which should be in the possession of the House, and we had the promise of the right hon. the Prime Minister that they would be laid on the table from day to day. I have a copy of one with a very large number of signatures from operatives in the Hamilton cotton mills, and another from the pork packing industry, and I think there is also one from business men in Toronto.

Mr. FIELDING. These protests are not brought down from day to day, but at several times we have brought down papers called for. Every day something comes in, and not all on the one side. We have not only protests against the agreement but also the other side, but my hon. friend evidently does not desire to have these.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not draw any particular distinction. I was assuming that the bulk of the protests were against the proposition, but I would be very glad if the Finance Minister would lay all the documents on the table, as they would be all equally valuable. We ought to have a definite answer in this matter, and I would like to know whether or not the government propose to have these on the table from day to day.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not heard the proposition before, and, therefore, am not at liberty to answer it definitely.

Mr. BLAIN. A few days ago a similar request was made, and the right hon. the Prime Minister promised that he would bring these down from day to day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon.

Mr. BLAIN. On February 14, following a request from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) with respect to a delegation from the Vegetable and Fruit Growers' Association I asked would there be any objection to have the views of the pork packing industry delegation which interviewed the government submitted to the House so that we might have full knowledge of their statements, and the Prime Minister replied 'no objection, whatever.' Everything will be brought down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That does not mean from day to day. I have brought in the proceedings of the pork packers delegation, and am laying it on the table, and intend following this by a report of the delegation of the fruit and vegetable growers. I shall do more, I shall have these printed.

Mr. BLAIN. Any on the other side

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That the report of proceedings between the delegation of Fruit and Vegetable Growers and the Prime Minister and members of the government held in the House of Commons on the 10th February inst., be printed for the use of members, and that rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto. Also that memoranda presented by the Meat Pakers of Ontario and Quebec be printed.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER delivered a message from the Governor General, which was read by Mr. Speaker, as follows :

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons the Fourth Joint Report of the Commissioners for the demarcation of the meridian of the 141st degree of west longi-

tude (Alaska boundary) appointed in virtue of the first article of the convention between Great Britain and the United States, signed at Washington on the 21st of April, 1906.

Government House,
20th February, 1911.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.—Mr. LORTIE.

Mr. J. A LORTIE (Soulanges) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I rise to a question of privilege, in connection with an article which appeared in 'Le Canada,' on February 17th. It reads as follows :

LATEST NEWS.

Nationalists are divided on the question of reciprocity.

(From Le Canada's special correspondent).

Ottawa, 16.—I learn on reliable 'castor' authority that Mr. Monk will vote against the reciprocity proposal and that Mr. Nantel will follow suit.

Dr. Paquet, on the other hand, and Mr. Gilbert, who have been brought into line by numerous protests forwarded by their constituents, will give their support to the reciprocity proposals.

However, the former has come to that conclusion on the ground that he considers the proposal of benefit to Canada. As to the idea whether the proposals are of any advantage to his constituents, he does not concern himself with it in even the slightest measure. He went so far as to acknowledge that even should his electors frown on reciprocity, he would support the proposals. The member for L'Islet is certainly entitled to the country's gratitude under the circumstances; however, it remains to be seen whether his constituents will approve of the principle he propounded or on the contrary will show their distrust at the coming elections by throwing him overboard.

As for Messrs Lortie and Blondin, they have not as yet taken a stand, it is said, and for this good reason that they have not been in the House for over two weeks.

The counties of Champlain and Soulanges are in the same plight as the county of St. Hyacinthe in reference to its representation in the local house they have as their representatives in the Dominion parliament men who take no interest whatever in the concerns of their electors. Mr. Héroux, while in a mood of tendering good advice, should call the attention of these gentlemen to the primary importance of their duties as representatives of the people in parliament.

Mr. Speaker, every statement in reference to me in the above extract is shamefully false. Ever since the opening of this session, I have been discharging faithfully my duty as a member of parliament. I followed assiduously the various debates which have been going on, and I appeal to all my fellow members that I am telling the truth while I flatly contradict the statement which appeared in that paper 'Le Canada,' in the very presence of the man who wrote those lines.

If 'Le Canada,' or the writer of that piece of news, is in a position to show that I have been two weeks away from the House, I shall at once resign as a member of parliament.

Of all the newspapers in the country, I do not think there is another as rotten as 'Le Canada' when it comes to misrepresenting and knowingly showing things in a false light.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. MONK. I desire to ask the government if they will table any correspondence had with the American government since the last batch of correspondence was laid upon the table. I understand there has been an exchange of letters, and that notably since what is known as the Champ Clark utterance, there has been some correspondence, letters addressed, I believe, to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), or, it may be, to the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). I think that all this correspondence up to the present moment should be tabled.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr Monk) refers to some correspondence which the Minister of Finance has had in relation to the Champ Clark utterance?

Mr. MONK. I said that amongst other things it was said that there had been an exchange of letters in regard to that question between the Secretary of State of the United States and my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding).

Mr. FIELDING. There is not a shadow of foundation for that statement.

Mr. MONK. Has there been any correspondence?

Mr. FIELDING. If there is any correspondence in relation to this matter with the United States authorities, properly the subject of consideration by this House, it will always be brought down.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I desire to make inquiry concerning two returns moved for on the 14th of December last, relating to the travelling expenses of ministers and civil servants and the cab hire of ministers and civil servants.

Mr. MURPHY. I will make inquiry and see that the returns are brought down with all dispatch.

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to call the attention of the government—I presume, of the Minister of Public Works—to the fact that an order made on December 5 last and re-

corded in revised 'Hansard' page 786, for a return showing all public buildings occupied by post offices in whole or in part, and the revenues derived from them, has not yet been complied with.

Mr. MURPHY. I will make inquiry about that also.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). I desire to ask the Minister of the Interior when I may look for the return asked for on December 7?

Mr. OLIVER. What is the nature of the return?

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). It relates to lands, timber and mineral rights.

Mr. OLIVER. If my memory is right, the return involves a great deal of labour for its preparation. I can assure my hon. friend that it is in course of preparation, but I cannot promise it at an early day.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). It was ordered a long while ago.

Mr. OLIVER. The return is very comprehensive, perhaps more so than my hon. friend realized when he moved for it.

Mr. BRADBURY. When may we expect the return ordered on January 23 last referring to licenses, leases or concessions given to individuals or corporations of water powers and privileges on the Winnipeg river?

Mr. OLIVER. I am sorry that my hon. friend is delayed in that, it should have been down long ago, I assure him that it will be down without any delay.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair I wish to call the attention of the House for a few moments to a matter of great importance. Let me first read a telegram recently received:

Mission Junction, Feb. 18.

J. D. Taylor,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Resolution passed here to-day as follows: 'That whereas the Dominion government has seen fit, in the reciprocity agreement, to abolish the duty on fruit, farm products; and whereas, this will be a detriment to the farmers of British Columbia, we wish to go on record as being strongly opposed to the agreement as it now stands.'

Mission City Agricultural Association,
per A. M. VERCHERS, Secretary.

Mr. LENNOX.

Also I have this communication:

The Hammond Fruit Association, Limited.
Hammond, B.C., Feb. 4, 1911.

Dear Sir,—At the annual meeting of the Hammond Fruit Association, Limited, the following resolution was passed, and I was requested to send same to you: 'That the Hammond Fruit Association, Limited, views with alarm the movement recently advanced by the grain growers of the Northwest for reciprocity in natural products with the United States. Such an adjustment of the tariff would be of material disadvantage to the fruit industry of this province, and this association is strongly of opinion that not only should no reduction of duty on fruit be permitted by the Dominion government, but that immediate steps should be taken to place our duty on a parity with that of the United States.

Yours truly,
D. W. BAKER, Secretary.

J. D. Taylor, Esq., M.P.

I have another communication, which I will not read in full, from the Western Canada Bag, Envelope and Box Board Company, Limited, which states that this corporation has addressed to the Prime Minister a communication setting forth their position with respect to the proposals now under consideration, the effect of which is given in this:

—regarding the proposed reciprocity agreement between Canada and the United States so far as it pertains to the removal of duty on building, roofing and sheathing paper, deadening felt, box board, &c. Such a policy would absolutely destroy all hopes of success for the plant which we are now erecting at New Westminster, B.C., for the manufacture of these products and which we hope to have in operation within six months.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. GEORGE W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.) The importance of the question now before the chair has been so frequently reiterated by hon. gentlemen who have already taken part in the discussion that I will make no apology for the time I shall occupy this afternoon. Since the debate was commenced, a couple of weeks ago by the leader of the opposition, (Mr. Borden, Halifax) whose views were further emphasized by the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto, I think I may fairly say that, so far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned who have taken part in the debate, no new ground has been broken. The imperialist drum has been pounded and the stalking horse of annexation has been paraded before us; the dire calamities that will come to the industries of Canada in respect of all her present industrial activities have been emphasized in language which for pessimism and lachrymose sentiment cannot be paralleled, I verily believe, anywhere outside the tomes of the ancient

prophets. For my part, I have always endeavoured to view questions of trade as purely business questions. I think it is very rarely that any question can come before this House, or this committee, in which sentiment is to be irrevocably intermingled. The question before the chair at the present moment is neither more nor less than to give effect to a tentative agreement arrived at between certain commissioners representing the government of Canada and certain commissioners representing the government of the United States by which it is proposed to have certain reciprocity of trade between the two countries. Since this question was first mooted in the House and before this committee, the fact that it was an old question has been frequently stated by hon. gentlemen who have taken part in the discussion. My recollection carries me back as far as 1879, when the Conservative party was returned to power upon the question of the National Policy. The very first session of parliament after the new government was called to power they proposed what was known as a standing offer to the United States whereby the government led by Sir John Macdonald offered to the United States reciprocity in animals, fruit, hay, vegetables, wheat, barley, rye, oats and other grains, fish, meats and lumber. Now, I am sure there is no hon. gentleman sitting opposite to me who will say that Sir John Macdonald was actuated by any sentiments of disloyalty towards this country or towards the imperial connection when he placed in the platform of his party that standing offer of reciprocal relations between Canada and the United States in respect of natural products. Again, in 1891, the issue before the people was the trade issue which we have at the present time. The Conservative party of the day went to the country on the issue of reciprocity. And the subject was dealt with in certain state papers which are on record and available to hon. members of this House. I have here a letter written by Lord Stanley of Preston, Governor General of Canada, to Lord Knutsford,

Government House,
Ottawa, December 13, 1890.

My Lord,—I have the honour to send to Your Lordship to-day a telegraphic message in cipher, of which the following is the substance:

With reference to my telegram of the 10th instant this government is desirous to propose a joint commission such as that of 1871, with authority to deal without limitation and to prepare a treaty respecting the following subjects:

1. Renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, with the modifications required by altered circumstances of both countries, and with the extensions deemed by the commission to be in the interests of Canada and the United States.

2. Reconsideration treaty of 1888, with respect to the Atlantic fisheries with the aim of securing the free admission into United States markets of Canadian fishery products in return for facilities to be granted to United States fishermen, to buy bait and supplies and to tranship cargoes in Canada. All such privileges to be mutual.

3. Protection of mackerel and other fisheries on the Atlantic ocean and in inland waters also.

Taking the agreement now before the chair in connection with the agreement which was arrived at by Sir Allen Aylesworth, Minister of Justice, and the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) at Washington some weeks ago, we have a settlement of those very questions which it was proposed by the late Conservative government should be dealt with by this joint high commission. It is a circumstance to be noted that the Conservative government of that day was so anxious to disclose to the people of Canada the fact that they were about to bring about such a boon to the people that they violated certain confidences which existed between them and the commissioners at Washington, for which I venture to say they were severely reprimanded later. I have here a letter written by J. G. Blaine, to Senator Baker. It reads:

Dear Mr. Baker,—I authorize you to contradict the rumours you refer to. There are no negotiations whatever on foot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be assured no such scheme for reciprocity with the Dominion confined to natural products will be entertained by this government.

Yours very truly,
JAMES G. BLAINE.

It would appear from this that the effort of Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues to negotiate a treaty with the United States confined to natural products was not likely to be acceptable to the government of the United States. It was insisted upon by the government of the United States and their representatives of that day that any treaty of trade to be entered into between the two countries must not be confined to natural products, but must also include manufactured articles. That was an addition to the treaty which was not acceptable to the manufacturing interests of Canada in 1891 any more than it is acceptable to the manufacturing interests of Canada at the present time. But, Sir, I have further evidence of the fact that the late government was not dealing frankly with either the people of Canada or the people of the United States with respect to these negotiations. I have here a letter addressed by Mr. Blaine to Sir Julian Pauncefote, then British ambassador at Washington:

Department of State,
Washington, April 1, 1891.

While no notes were exchanged between us I carefully minuted my modification of the

paper you left with me containing Lord Salisbury's proposition, and did so immediately after you left the department. You will observe the private character which I wished to impart to the conference is recognized by you a month later in your note of January 27, when you called the correspondence 'confidential.'

In view of the fact that you had come to the state department with the proposals, and that the subject was then for the first time mentioned between us, and in view of the further fact that I agreed to a private conference as explained in my minute. I confess that it was a surprise to me when several weeks later during the Canadian canvass, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper, both stated before public assemblages that an informal discussion of a reciprocity treaty would take place at Washington after the 4th of March, by the initiation of the Secretary of State.

I detail these facts because I deem it important, since the matter has been for some weeks open to public remark, to have it settled that the conference was not 'initiated' by me, but on the contrary that the private arrangement of which I spoke was but a modification of your proposal and in no sense an original suggestion from the government of the United States.

I read that, in order to point out to the House the value which the late Conservative government seemed to have set upon the successful termination of a reciprocity treaty between the two countries. So anxious were the late government to get that fact before the country during the election campaign of 1891, that they did not hesitate to violate the confidences that were established between them and the commissioners at Washington for which they were subsequently reprimanded in the letter which I have just read to the committee.

For my part, I have been endeavouring since this debate opened to discover what are the changed circumstances which appear to justify hon. gentlemen opposite in coming to the conclusion that a trade arrangement which was admittedly so advantageous to Canada in 1891 could be so disastrous to Canada in 1911. I am reminded that a year ago the time of this House was occupied in discussing questions in relation to another one of the great nations of the world, Germany. A year ago, it will be remembered, a considerable time of this parliament was taken up in the discussion of what was then supposed to be a war scare existing between Germany and England. Our hon. friends opposite had no kind words to express with respect to the conduct of Germany and her apparent determination to strengthen her armaments for the avowed purpose, as was alleged by them, of making an attack on Great Britain. In fact, Sir, during several weeks, whenever hon. gentlemen moved about the chamber one might always hear the clanking of military accoutrements. The other evening the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) made a complaint that this government had not devoted more attention to improving the trade relations of Canada with Germany. I was rather surprised to hear the loyal member that he is, expressing so much consideration for trade with the Germans, when a year ago he and his colleagues on the other side of the House were prepared to condemn them with every anathema they could command. A complaint was made against the Minister of Finance that he had not abolished the German surtax to enable the products of that unfriendly nation, because it was unfriendly a year ago if we are to take the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite, to enter Canada and make Canada a market for the manufactures of Germany. On the other hand, we have a proposal here to establish trade relations with the United States, a country whose peaceful and happy association with Canada for 100 years is about to be celebrated. The hon. member for East Lambton went into somewhat specific details with respect to the industries that would be inevitably injured if not absolutely ruined if this reciprocity arrangement was carried out. He undertook to speak for the dairymen of Canada and more particularly of Ontario. He did assert, and his observations I am sure are still impressed on the minds of hon. gentlemen who were present and heard him, that if this reciprocal arrangement were to be carried out the dairying industry of Canada and more particularly the dairying industry of the province of Ontario, would be ruined. I have before me copies of two resolutions passed, one by the Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario and one by the Dairymen's Association of Eastern Ontario. The first reads:

Moved by J. W. Hyatt, West Lake, Ont., seconded by James R. Anderson of Mountain View, that the Dominion government be respectfully but most strongly urged in the negotiations now pending between Canada and the States to provide for complete reciprocal trade in dairy products.

I have also the resolution passed by the Western Dairyman's Association, which is as follows:

Moved by J. A. Biehn, of Bright, seconded by Geo. Rice, of Tillsonburg, that the Dominion government be respectfully but most strongly urged in the negotiations now pending between Canada and the States to provide for complete reciprocal trade in dairy products.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that having read these resolutions, which were passed by the men who are most interested in that industry, it is scarcely necessary for me to remind this committee that the hon. member for East Lambton, when he made those observations with respect to the effect

of the reciprocal arrangement upon the dairying industry, was not speaking by the book.

With regard to the fruit and canning industry, he also devoted some considerable time to that subject, and he came to the same conclusion, that the confirmation of this reciprocity agreement with the United States would inevitably destroy the canning industry of this country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to place words in my mouth that I never uttered, or to misrepresent me in any way. I do not think you can turn up 'Hansard' and show that I have made the statement that the canning industry would be ruined.

Mr. KYTE. Then that it would be seriously injured and hampered.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Oh, well, be fair.

Mr. KYTE. I accept the hon. gentleman's explanation with respect to that, but I wish to point out to my hon. friend that there is not much evidence of the canning industry being injured, or in any way hampered by this agreement in face of the fact that the common stock of the Dominion Canners, within the last ten days, went up from 48 to 58. There are many sources in this country from which we can obtain evidence with respect to the effect a question of public policy may have upon certain industries without taking all our authority from hon. gentlemen opposite. I think the records of the stock exchanges afford a pretty good index as to what the people generally are thinking with respect to the operation of this reciprocity arrangement upon the industries of the Dominion. With regard to the railways of Canada, it has also been asserted that this agreement will result inevitably in diverting traffic from our transcontinental railways, and that the American roads will get the benefit of the carrying trade, or a great portion of the carrying trade, of our country. I observe that the Canadian Pacific railway stock, within the last ten days, went up from 209½ to 213¾. If we accept that as an index of the view which the Canadian Pacific railway take of this matter, I can scarcely imagine that the argument advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite in that respect can be harmonized with the stock operations in the city of Montreal, and in the other stock exchanges throughout this country. I have here, also, from the Montreal 'Daily Witness,' selected from the column called 'Stock Exchange Talks,' a paragraph which says:

Our big railways are preparing for a great year's activity from one end of the Dominion to the other, and in this connection, among the many interests to be served by this expansion will be the different Canadian steel corporations which are to receive liberal orders for rails and other construction requirements from the railway concerns.

I might also point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that in the last week the determination has been arrived at by the directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build an additional line from Victoria harbour, on the Georgian bay, to the city of Montreal, in order to carry the additional freight which will be offered as a result of this trade agreement.

Mr. SPROULE. They have been working at that for nearly two years back.

Mr. KYTE. At all events, they are not discouraged by the prospect, or, perhaps, they would hesitate before they would carry on the scheme. I also saw, a few days ago, that it was the intention of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build an additional competing line between Toronto and Montreal. Taking all the leading stocks of Canada, I think you, Mr. Chairman, will be very much impressed with the fact that, taking one with the other, nearly every industrial stock in Canada has gone up during the last two weeks. I might say further, that this morning's paper contained a despatch from Montreal, which reads as follows:

Montreal, Feb. 20.—G. F. Johnston and H. J. Allison, of the firm of Johnston, McConnell and Allison, left Montreal this evening for New York en route for England in connection with the completion of a $20,000,000 British Columbia lumber deal, the capital for which is already largely subscribed. The name of this concern will be the British Canadian Lumber Corporation, the head office of which will be in this city.

I read this for the purpose of pointing out that the lumber interests is not calculated to receive very much injury from this reciprocal trade arrangement should it pass through parliament.

But there is one other feature of this question that I desire to present to the committee, because this is an agreement which involves a larger question than that of any local industry or enterprise. I refer to the large amount of British capital which has heretofore been invested in Canada for the purpose of developing the great industrial and commercial enterprises of the country. The statement was made without reserve by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and repeated by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) that the result of this arrangement would be to withdraw British capital from Canada and make it extremely difficult to get any further advances of British capital for the industrial and agricultural development of the country. I have before me an interview given by a

distinguished financier of the city of London, whose name we will all recognize, Mr. Grenfell, son-in-law of the distinguished Governor General of Canada at the present moment. Mr. Grenfell is a member of the banking firm of Chaplin, Milne, Grenfell & Co., and chairman of the Canadian agency of one of the leading Canadian bond issuing houses in London. In a cable message which reached here yesterday, Mr. Grenfell is quoted as giving the following interview with regard to reciprocity:

From my recent trip to Canada, I am convinced that Canadians fully realize the progress and prosperity that have accrued to Canadian manufacturing and agricultural industries from cheap money sent out at a rate of over £30,000,000 per annum by English investors. I am confident that the first thing taken into consideration by the Canadian ministers would be whether the reciprocity arrangement with the United States might affect securities against which these large investments have been made.

I believe it will prove of inestimable advantage to Canada. Great material benefits will be derived by the whole Dominion in both agricultural and manufacturing industries from the opening of American markets. The future prosperity of Canada must be largely based on the soundness of agriculture and the enhanced value of western farm lands that will result from reciprocity will mean greater security of English investors. The free and larger markets which reciprocity will open to the farmers of the west, will cause great demands for the products of the factories of the east. Canadian statesmen have taken advantage of the situation.

It appears to me they have secured splendid terms for Canada in exchange for giving Americans what Americans could have taken for themselves at any time by simply lowering their own tariff wall without asking permission from Canada. Investors in England will speedily realize many trade advantages derived by Canada through the reciprocity agreement and will be more anxious to participate in opportunities offered by sound Canadian enterprises by investing their money at high rates of interest, while assisting in the development of the British Empire.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that these statements, coming, as they do, from gentlemen who are experts on the subject, gentlemen who have authority to speak, are far more convincing arguments to lead one to a correct conclusion as to the real effect of this reciprocity arrangement upon the industries of Canada than all the somnolent reveries of the hon. member for East Lambton. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) also stated that the Hudson Bay railway should be abandoned, because it would be practically a waste of money to construct it, as under this arrangement the trade would be diverted from that railway to the railways of the United States.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte), is wide of the mark again. I made no such statement as he now attributes to me.

Mr. KYTE. The hon. gentleman stated that one of the results of reciprocity would be that the Hudson Bay railway would be useless to Canada, and though I may have paraphrased his statement and not given his exact words, I believe 'Hansard' will bear me out that such is in effect what he said.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I ask you, Mr. Chairman to have the hon. gentleman read the 'Hansard' and there he will find that what I said was, that if the statement of the men of the west be true, that they are going to trade with Chicago and New York, then there was no need for the Hudson Bay railway, and that statement was made by me interrogatively.

Mr. KYTE. I accept the correction, and it still leaves the point just where I put it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.

Mr. KYTE. Now, the hon. the leader of the opposition, speaking on this very Hudson Bay railway some short time ago, said:

The west is very much concerned at the present time about the building of the Hudson Bay railway. There is not absolute unanimity of opinion in this country as to the relief that will be brought to the people of the west by the construction of that road. I hope it may bring to them all the relief they expect, and then beyond question, in justice to this road it ought to be proceeded with without any delay.

That is the statement of the leader of the opposition in respect to the building of the Hudson Bay railway, and we may conclude from it, that he does not regard that this trade arrangement will militate against that great enterprise as my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) would have us imagine.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. gentleman not find that the leader of the opposition also said in effect: Why proceed with the building of the Transcontinental railway, the Hudson Bay railway, and the canals, if we are going to divert our trade to the south and alter our policy which has been established for so many years.

Mr. KYTE. I did not feel I was called upon to read all the speeches made by the leader of the opposition, in which he has made reference to this railway; my point was to show that when he was discussing this particular resolution, he was still urging the government to proceed without delay with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, instead of making this bargain with the United States.

Mr. KYTE. There is no such reference as that in the speech I have read.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is what it was; it was an alternative.

Mr. KYTE. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong), also spoke of the annexation sentiment that existed in the United States, and he referred to Senator Cummings as an annexationist. True, Senator Cummings is an annexationist, but like his friend, Speaker Cannon, he is opposed to the reciprocity arrangement, and therefore, it may be assumed that if there was any trend towards annexation in this reciprocity arrangement, Senator Cummings, annexationist as he is, instead of opposing it, would have been anxious to have facilitated its passage through the Senate. Let me remind hon. gentlemen opposite that Mr. Bennett, who moved the annexation resolution in Congress, is also opposed to the reciprocal arrangement, and Senator Fordray, of Michigan, speaking on the question a few days ago, in the American Senate said:

> We have been buncoed by the Canadian representatives into a free trade treaty from which we receive no benefit. I do criticise our representatives for having surrendered body, soul and breeches to Canada.

Evidently, the people of the United States, like the people of Canada, are not unanimous as to the real meaning or consequences of this trade arrangement. We have in this House hon. gentlemen opposite censuring this government and its representatives, for yielding everything to the United States, and we have a member of the United States Senate censuring the representatives of that country, because they negotiated an arrangement, which gave everything to Canada. Amidst these conflicting opinions, it is difficult for one to come to a conclusion, as to how much sincerity or earnestness there exists in one party or the other, but, taking the extremists in the United States, who say Canada gets everything, and taking the extremists in Canada, who say the United States gets everything, and drawing an average between them, we may possibly come to the correct conclusion that this treaty is a fair treaty, and one that ought to receive the approval of the people of both countries. I do not know whether our hon. friends opposite are serious, when they say that the interchange of business promoted by reason of this agreement, will lead to annexation. I can scarcely believe that these hon. gentlemen one after another would reiterate so solemn a statement, unless they had some real conviction upon the matter. But, I would call attention to the fact that a reciprocity treaty existed between Canada and the United States from 1855 to 1866, and before that treaty actually terminated, the people of Canada, for the first time in 100 years, were called upon to show their loyalty to the mother land and their disposition towards the people of the United States. In 1866 there was a raid by United States subjects across the Canadian border. True, it did not amount to much, but whether the invasion was great or small the people of Canada did not hesitate to take up arms to repel the invaders from Canadian soil. Had that reciprocal arrangement between the two countries, had the effect which hon. gentlemen opposite say a reciprocal trade arrangement will now have, then the people of Canada might have betrayed their annexation sentiment and rested on their arms, while their country was overrun by invaders. Happily but few opportunities have been given to the people of Canada to defend their country, and I trust it may be many a long year before another opportunity will arise, but I venture to say, tracing the whole history of this country from its earliest beginning to the present there is to be found no time when the people of Canada expressed annexation sentiments, except it be on a historic occasion when certain men of the political stripe of gentlemen opposite, desired for the time being, to make political capital out of a great question in this country.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman does not include the Hon. Edward Blake, does he ?

Mr. KYTE. I do not include the Hon. Edward Blake, but I do include the Hon. J. J. C. Abbott and other distinguished Tories.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why does the hon. gentleman exclude the Hon. Edward Blake, when he did the same thing as the Hon. Mr. Abbott?

Some hon. MEMBERS. He never did.

Mr. KYTE. Another statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite is, that this reciprocal trade arrangement will have the effect of diverting all the grain carrying trade from Canadian ports to United States ports. I have before me a statement of the amount of foreign exports from Canada in 1910, and I find that from the port of Montreal there were shipped in that year, $15,037,958 worth of United States goods. I find also, that at the present time, when no reciprocal trade arrangement is in effect, 27 per cent of the foreign exports of Canada, (other than to the United States), was shipped from United States ports during the same year, 1910.

When I point out that millions of dollars worth of American goods for export are shipped from the ports of Montreal and St. John and that millions of dollars worth

of Canadian goods for export are shipped from New York, and other ports of the United States, that is all I need say to show that trade will find its own channels where they are of the greatest advantage. It is inconceivable that there is any hon. gentlemen in this House who would look forward to a consummation when no exports from Canada would go by way of the United States, and no exports from the United States would go by way of Canada. We are living too closely together and our interests are too much interwoven for us ever to expect to see the day when all Canadian goods will be exported from Canadian ports, and all American goods will be exported from American ports.

I have one or two observations to make with respect to the effect of this agreement, as I view it, upon those sections of Canada with which I am most familiar ; and I am going to quote some figures, even at the risk of falling under the solemn and weighty abjurgations of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), who found fault with the figures given by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) a few days ago.

Mr. LENNOX. Can the hon. gentleman say that they were correct?

Mr. KYTE. I am not saying anything about them ; but the figures I give are as likely to be challenged as were the figures of the hon. member for South Wellington. Looking over the trade returns, I find that the value of agricultural products shipped to the United States from Canada in 1910, including horses, cattle, swine, lambs, sheep, poultry, wheat, rye, oats, barley, buckwheat, beans, peas, Indian corn, hay, straw, potatoes, green apples, berries, butter, cheese, and eggs amounted to $6,277,295, upon which duties were paid of $1,274,337. The value of fish products sent from Canada to the United States was $3,223,398, upon which there were duties paid of $512,514. Gypsum to the value of $396,493 was shipped, upon which duties were paid of $101,493.

When discussing this question, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) pointed out that we had at present two markets in Canada, and that it was needless for us to seek a third market by entering into negotiations with the United States. Speaking more particularly for the maritime provinces, and with reference to the chief item of export from those provinces, namely, fish, I would like to remind hon. gentlemen that at present we have scarcely any free market for our exports of fish. The hon. member for North Toronto said that reciprocity between the various provinces of Canada was the ideal for the people of Canada to strive for. I quite admit that in the last 40 years there has been considerable reciprocity between the provinces of Quebec and Ontario on the one hand, and the maritime provinces on the other, but that reciprocity consisted in the people of the maritime provinces buying manufactured goods from the people of Quebec and Ontario, and the people of Quebec and Ontario taking current cash of the realm from the people of the maritime provinces in payment for those goods.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I think the hon. gentleman should be fair enough to say that the people of Quebec and Ontario have bought large quantities of coal and steel from the maritime provinces.

Mr. KYTE. My hon. friend did not permit me to refer to that fact, as I intended. It is quite true that Nova Scotia coal is sold in large quantities as far west, I understand, as Montreal, but not very much farther, and that considerable steel and iron have been shipped during the last two years from the steel works of Sydney and Sydney Mines into Quebec and Ontario ; but apart from these two items there is no reciprocity of trade in natural products between the maritime provinces and the province of Ontario.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Are there not a great many potatoes shipped from New Brunswick to the western provinces?

Mr. KYTE. There are some, but not many. The great market for the potatoes of the maritime provinces is in the United States. More potatoes from the maritime provinces are bought in the United States, notwithstanding the duty of 25 cents a bushel against them, than are bought in Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. BLAIN. May I be permitted to say that three years ago there were 600 carloads of potatoes sent to the city of Toronto alone from the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. KYTE. That is quite true. There are seasons when potatoes are sent from the maritime provinces to the city of Toronto ; but these are exceptional seasons. I am speaking of a market which the people of the maritime provinces may at all times and seasons depend upon.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman has given the exports from Canada into the United States of different kinds of farm products. Would he give the exports of the same from the United States into Canada? He would find that several times the quantity of potatoes come from the United States to Canada as go from Canada to the United States.

Mr. KYTE. I would say to my hon. friend that I prefer to make my own speech; and having listened to one from him of two hours the other evening, I do not think I

am under any special obligation to listen to another one now. During the last 40 years I have never seen or heard of a man from Ontario or Quebec coming to Nova Scotia to buy fish.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is it not a fact that in the maritime provinces potatoes are manufactured very extensively into starch, which is shipped to the western provinces?

Mr. KYTE. I will relieve my hon. friend by saying that there is no great percentage of the potatoes of the maritime provinces made into starch.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Is it not a fact that this government has established a special cold storage rate for carrying fish from the maritime provinces to Ontario, and Quebec? Has no fish been carried?

Mr. KYTE. It is quite true, the people of the maritime provinces have been endeavouring to coax the people of Ontario to buy their fish, but they have not succeeded to any great extent. It is absolutely impossible for reciprocity to any large extent to arise between the maritime provinces and the western provinces of Canada in regard to our fish products. The great market for the fresh fish of the maritime provinces is the United States owing to the easy access which we have to that market and owing to the facilities of transportation. The fresh fish of the maritime provinces is, however, but a very small item. Their salt fish needs a market, and we can get no market for it in Ontario or Quebec. I know a gentleman down in Halifax who has a son living in Alberta Last year he sent his son half a barrel of herring, knowing that his son was fond of the real product such as we get in Nova Scotia. He paid $3 for the half barrel but the freight to Alberta cost him $8. Is it not preposterous then to talk of the maritime provinces shipping salt fish to the prairies of the west? I have here the figures showing the exports of fish from Canada in 1910 :

EXPORTS FROM CANADA, 1910.

	United Kingdom.	United States.	Other Countries.
Codfish, haddock, ling and pollock..	$116,468	$432,211	
Herring, pickled..	1,560	112,334	
Herring, smoked.	2,241	20,134	
Mackerel, fresh..	....	119,919	
Mackerel, pickled	500	176,383	$128,830
Salmon, fresh ..	45,218	144,113	1,327
All other fresh fish	298	1,936,161	
Oils, cod, seal, whale, &c... ..	331,360	53,064	
Fresh lobsters ..	....	528,341	
Canned lobsters..	748,775	1,137,929	
Gypsum	....	396,493	2
Sheep and lambs.	11,441	569,679	

It is not, then, a correct statement to say that we have two markets for the products of the maritime provinces, particularly with reference to our fish. There is only one solid, substantial market which can always be depended on, and that is the United States, and in respect of this market the fishermen of the maritime provinces have been labouring for the last forty years under the handicap of an adverse duty. Let me remind the House that the people of the maritime provinces did not complain of this handicap so long as it was the policy of this government to maintain exclusiveness in our dealings with the United States and prevent, by a high tariff, as much as possible, intercourse between the two countries. But when the opportunity has come to throw down the barriers and enable our people to sell their fish in the best markets free of duty, it is not surprising that they should be strongly in favour of this reciprocal arrangement.

My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) endeavoured to convince us that there is a large market for fish in Canada. Well, I should like to quote an article from the Montreal 'Herald,' dated 15th February, and entitled 'Fish Eating.' It is as follows:

FISH EATING.

Few countries are more generously endowed in the matter of its marine riches than Canada, and it is surprising and surely regrettable to learn from the annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries that Canadians are not fish eaters. This is attributed to the lack of proper transport and delivery or of careful attention in the treatment of fish while in transit. Then it is said the condition in which the fish is offered the public, for a sale is not what it ought to be. Professor Cowie, of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, cites Ottawa as a frightful example of the manner in which fresh fish is generally exhibited. 'A dealer,' he says, 'usually a butcher, on a Friday morning, places a large tin tray in his shop window on which are laid out generally in an inch or more of their own blood a few sickly looking fresh haddock, trout, &c., by means of which he expects to entice the custom of those, and there are many, who would eat real sea fish.

I am one of those, who, when they come to Ottawa, would like to eat real fish, but I must confess that up to the present my taste has not been gratified. I was really astonished to find that it was almost impossible to get good fish in this city, and that the only opportunity any man from the maritime provinces can have to taste the real article is when he enjoys the hospitality of some of the private citizens of this city, who have lived in the maritime provinces, and have had an opportunity to appreciate the simon pure article.

There is another important feature in this arrangement, and that is that it opens

to us the market of Porto Rico. The United States markets take our fresh mackerel, canned lobster, salt mackerel and certain kinds of salted fish, but the market of Porto Rico is the great market to which we have been exporting dried fish from time immemorial. But ever since Porto Rico came under the control of the United States our Canadian fish have been subject to the American tariff. Under this arrangement, however, not only are the markets of the United States thrown open to our fish, but the market of Porto Rico as well, so that we shall have at all times and in all seasons a steady demand for our products in this line. That is one of the things we are seeking. It is very little avail to tell us that during lent, in Montreal and Ottawa, there is some demand for our fish, because once Lent is over that demand ceases. What we want is a place to which we can always send our fish and have a ready, steady market.

There is another feature which commends itself to my judgment, and that is that in the United States there is a growing demand for salted cod fish other than the dry. Heretofore our fishermen have been obliged to dry their fish, which is a long, tedious and laborious process, and the additional price obtained does not pay for the additional labour and trouble. But a market has sprung up in the United States for salted cod fish not dried, and that is bound to become one of our most profitable industries.

In this connection I should like to quote the opinion of Mr. Howard Smith, of the firm of M. and N. Smith, of Halifax, the largest exporters of fish in the world. That statement may, perhaps, surprise some hon. gentlemen, but it is none the less correct, and I might add that Mr. Howard Smith is a strong supporter of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), and his colleague from Halifax (Mr. Crosby). He is prominent and active in the public life of the city of Halifax, and his word is accepted throughout the whole of the maritime provinces. This is what he says:

I cannot see why nine-tenths of the people of this country should not be overwhelmingly in favour of reciprocity. Under reciprocity and with up-to-date methods there is no reason why the fish catch of Nova Scotia should not run up to one million quintals yearly, says Mr. Howard.

Will revolutionize industry.

Now with free fish into the United States, what will happen? We can build and fit out vessels here at about forty per cent less than the Gloucester owner can do. With the fishermen demanding their rights, they will man their home vessels, and the owners can pay them cash as soon as the trip is over, owing to the fact that middlemen will come into the business who will handle fish in a green or half-made state and supply the family trade in the United States. There is no excuse now for standing off the fisherman, for the bulk of the present catch will be sold in a green state to people who will cater to the package fish trade in the states.

Fleet of 500 Bankers.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Nova Scotia banking fleet of from two hundred to two hundred and twenty-five sail will increase to five hundred within five years. There is also no reason why Nova Scotia should not catch and market as many fish as Norway. At present our catch equals only about one-third of theirs, and this with the fishing grounds at our doors, and the consuming market for salt fish thousands of miles nearer to us than to them.

Salt Fish Export.

For a year or two the fresh and package fish people will be the only ones who will benefit under the new regime, so far as the export trade is concerned, but as soon as the catch is large enough, to supply the excess demand of the United States, and the price of hard dried will be on a parity with what can be got for half made fish, then salt fish exporters will take a hand in the business. They will then be able to get what they have been trying to get for years, that is, a slack salted fish, hard cured suitable for any of the world's markets. At present the old-fashioned way of curing still obtains and our fish are suitable only for Cuba, Porto Rico, Hayti and other West Indian islands. A more immediate result will be looked for by exporters, and that is the possibility of getting business in Porto Rico on an up-to-date basis. The preference in favour of Gloucester on that market of 86 cents a quintal will be done away with, and Gloucester will not be able to supply any fish, to speak of for that market.

The chances are that the old fish consigning business, from Lunenburg will be a thing of the past in a year or two, and the large distributors in Porto Rico, will look to this country to purchase supplies to be delivered to them regularly by steamer each month. It is well known that the consignment business has not been profitable ever since return cargoes of molasses ceased to be available.

I read that to show what Mr. Howard Smith thinks of this reciprocal arrangement with respect to its effect on the fishing industry of the maritime provinces. And I think hon. gentlemen opposite may well pardon me if I have shown a little enthusiasm in favour of this trade arrangement. There is another item which——

Mr. AMES. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) preparing to leave the subject of fish?

Mr. KYTE. I was, unless it is desirable to continue it.

Mr. AMES. We have all been listening with interest, I am sure, to what the hon. gentleman has been saying. There is one portion of the subject we have been expecting to hear the hon. gentleman deal with but which he has not touched. What will be the effect of Newfoundland's fish coming

into the Canadian market, and what will be the effect of throwing the preferential West Indian market open to the fish of Newfoundland and the United States?

Mr. KYTE. That is a question that was propounded twenty years ago: What effect will Newfoundland have upon our markets? For years and years fish came into Halifax and were distributed to the ports of the West Indies and the United States, and it did not appreciably affect the price so far as the maritime provinces are concerned. Newfoundland fish largely go to Spain and Portugal. Halifax and the American markets have not been considered a very considerable object for the fish producers of Newfoundland. They have their trade connections with Liverpool and the Mediterranean, and they ship direct to Spain and Portugal, and some times to Brazil. Therefore, the people of the maritime provinces will suffer little from the competition of Newfoundland.

Now, I desire to refer to another item in which Nova Scotia is interested, the item of gypsum. I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite proclaiming that the natural resources of this country ought to be kept for the people of this country. That is a proposition with which I entirely agree, provided that those natural resources are to be made a source of revenue to the people of this country who are now in life and their immediate successors. If they say that the natural resources of this country should be locked up for the benefit of some enterprising speculator in the next century, I decline to accept that proposition. I say that the natural resources of Canada are for the people of Canada to-day as well as for the people of generations to come. We have large deposits of gypsum in Nova Scotia, and have been endeavouring to find a market for our gypsum. But, the encouraging encomiums made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) with respect to the home market and the market of Great Britain, have not brought any consolation to the owners of gypsum deposits in Nova Scotia. A few years ago a trade of modest dimensions grew up in the shipping of gypsum, inaugurated by an American company that had vessels engaged in carrying gypsum from Windsor to different parts of the United States. But that business has been limited owing to the duty on gypsum. As this is an article which is not of very great value in its raw state, shippers could not compete successfully under that duty, no matter how small it might be. But let me read a telegram from Washington which appeared last week in the New York 'Post,' which will show the effect that this arrangement will have on the gypsum trade of Nova Scotia:

The ship-building industry of the country is vitally interested in the agreement, as is shown by a telegram received by the President to-day from the Staten Island Ship-building Company of New York. The telegram states that free gypsum provided by the reciprocal arrangement means an order for that firm to build a large fleet of American steel ocean-going vessels of 7,500 tons capacity each, to transport the gypsum from Nova Scotia to the manufacturers of the Atlantic sea-board.

That indicates that there will be great activity in the shipping of gypsum from Nova Scotia within the next few years. In the Island of Cape Breton, the whole coast line of the Bras d'Or lakes is filled with gypsum deposits of enormous-value to those who make use of it for the usual purposes of trade. But, with the exception of the Keystone Plaster Company, which has been doing business in a rather small way in the constituency of my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) during the last five or six years, not a pound of gypsum has been sent from Cape Breton to other parts of Canada, to the United States or elsewhere. I am aware that a strong financial concern in the United States has had their representatives in the Island of Cape Breton during the last few years going over gypsum properties, having them bonded, and making arrangements to have gypsum shipped into the United States notwithstanding that the duty was adverse and that the profits would not be what they desired. Under the present arrangement, a tremendous boom will take place with respect to the shipping of gypsum to the United States, and the natural resources of Nova Scotia in that commodity will be made to pay tribute to the people of this generation as well as to the people of generations to come.

There is another large item, the shipping of sheep and lambs from Nova Scotia and the maritime provinces. I do not desire to occupy time by referring particularly to all the subjects which are vitally affected in this arrangement. Other hon. gentlemen who are to follow me, will, no doubt, take up the discussion of these items. But I desire to say that the opposition which this measure is receiving from hon. gentlemen on the Conservative side is quite in keeping with their attitude on every other question of public policy propounded by this government, no matter how beneficially it ultimately resulted to the people of Canada. I have particular reference at the present moment to the Fielding tariff and the British preference which was submitted to this House in the session of 1897. I have here the speech of Sir Charles Tupper, who was then the leader of the opposition in this House, a distinguished imperialist so far as his utterances at all events during a long life are concerned, and a gentleman who, would not be considered by hon. members opposite as for a moment assuming a position of disloyalty to the empire.

When the British preference and the Fielding tariff were under discussion, he delivered himself in this way:

The result is that this tariff goes into operation, and the hon. gentleman knows that the industries of this country are already paralyzed in consequence.

There is a familiar ring to that utterance in view of the speeches of hon. members who have been prophesying that this arrangement will affect disastrously the industries of this country.

While hon. members gloat, vindictively gloat, over the destruction of Canadian industries, I was reading the wail, the sorrowful wail, of those industries in the Montreal 'Gazette' where one manufacturer after another declared that their industries were ruined, that their mills must close, and that they saw staring them in the face a return to the deplorable state of things that existed when the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House was in charge of the fiscal policy of this country.

And again:

I feel that far from rejoicing at it from a party standpoint, I deplore from the bottom of my heart the ruin that is going to be inflicted upon the best interests of Canada, and upon its great industries.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), might have saved himself a good deal of energy and this House a good deal of time if, instead of the speech he delivered a few days ago on this question, he had taken the speech of Sir Charles Tupper, put it in your hands and asked that it be taken as read.

That is the reception which this proposal of the Finance Minister is receiving from the opposition to-day, but that is to be expected, as that is the treatment accorded by hon. gentlemen opposite to every proposal made by this government, no matter how beneficial it is calculated to be to the people of Canada. Last year, when the budget speech was being discussed, the hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), said:

The point is what are you taking out of the individual taxpayer of this country? What are you taking out to-day? $11 to $12 per head, whereas in 1896 we took out a little less than $5.50 per head. This money you took out is money that comes from the man's earnings, it is so much abstracted from his capital. There ought to be no reason in the world for taking it except that it is absolutely necessary that the aggregate of the people of this country should be governed and that they should pay for it.

The whole criticism of the speech of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), on the Budget last year, was that the Minister of Finance was taking too much money out of the taxpayers of Canada, and that cry was taken up and reverberated along the back benches until its last echoes died on the lips of the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Thornton). Here is a proposal of the Minister of Finance to lessen the amount of money taken out of the taxpayers to the extent of $2,500,000. Does it receive the approval of the hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) or any hon. gentleman opposite? If the Finance Minister was taking too much money from the taxpayers last year, when he took $100,000,000 out of their pockets, if the hon. gentlemen really meant their criticism to be taken seriously, they ought to hail this agreement with pleasure, because it will relieve the taxpayers of Canada to the extent of $2,500,000.

I desire to quote an article from the 'Shareholder' a newspaper of recent date. The article is as follows:

If we are to believe the hysterical outbursts which are appearing in many of our papers at the present time, Canada is on the verge of a great calamity. We have no interest in the political aspect of the present tariff negotiations and are indifferent whether Liberals or Conservatives are in power at Ottawa. We do feel, however, that a great deal of nonsense has been written in regard to the reciprocity negotiations, and that those writings will do more harm to Canada than any reciprocity treaty we might negotiate. It is little less than absurd for writers to say that the pending treaty between Canada and the United States means the breaking up of the empire and the absorption of Canada into the United States. This is so puerile that it is unworthy of refutation. The absurdity of such a contention is self confident. Almost on a par with these contentions are the statements that the completion of the treaty will mean the break-up of our transportation systems. In other words, these 'calamity howlers' state that the Canadian Pacific railway, Grand Trunk railway, and the Canadian Northern railway will become mere branch lines and act as feeders to the United States railroad. The history of Canadian railway enterprise disapproves of any such theory. It is acknowledged to-day that the Canadian Pacific railway is one of the greatest—if not the greatest—railway in the world. At the present time its stock is selling higher than that of any railroad on the continent. It pays a dividend of 10 per cent, and its earnings and general development have been little short of phenominal. It is unbelievable to think that our Canadian railroads will quietly submit to the traffic being taken south instead of east. Even those who oppose the treaty acknowledge that one result of it will be the opening up of large areas of our western lands and a greater influx of emigrants. This will undoubtedly mean that more grain is to be shipped out and more manufactured articles carried in to supply the needs of the new settlers. This will mean more traffic instead of less for the Canadian railroads.

At the same instant that our Canadian 'calamity howlers' are predicting the break-up of the empire and the absorption of Canada into the United States, the business men

of New York are proclaiming to their government and to the world that Montreal has captured the export grain business from New York. They point out that 74 per cent of the shipments of the west are now going through Montreal. In 1903 New York exported 14,000,000 bushels of wheat, while Montreal exported 8,000,000. In 1908 New York exported 16,000,000 while Montreal exported 30,000,000. In 1910 New York figures showed 6,000,000 and those from Montreal 20,000,000. They claim that Montreal is bound in time to capture practically all of the export grain trade, not only from the Canadian west, but a large amount of grain from the northwestern states.

All students of economics, or even the man who knows absolutely nothing of economics, knows that business will naturally follow along the cheapest lines. If grain can be carried cheaper to Montreal than to New York it will naturally go by the former port. As a matter of fact, such is the case, and with the developments going on in connection with our canals, our terminal facilities, and the deepened St. Lawrence route, Montreal will continue to receive more and more of the export grain trade. The bogie which the protectionists' interest have raised is not even a real one. Canada is developing at such a rate that no treaty or combination of treaties could retard her development.

I, for one, should be very sorry to see any policy adopted by this parliament that would result injuriously to the manufacturing industries of this country. I recognize the part that the manufacturers and the capitalists of this country have taken in building up this great Canadian nationality. I recognize that by their enterprise and capital, they have made it possible for men to receive remunerative employment, and they have added enormously to the population in our industrial centres; but having regard to the record of the government and to the patriotism of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), it is idle folly to assume for a moment that anything will be done by this government or this Finance Minister that will jeopardize the manufacturing interests of Canada.

This question of loyalty is so beside the question under discussion, that one almost loses patience in discussing it, but it comes up so frequently and with such insistence, that it seems necessary for every one taking part in this debate, to put himself on record as respects his loyalty, ambitions and inspirations, as regards our connection with the mother country. The question of loyalty was not permitted by hon. gentlemen opposite, when in power, to in any way interfere with the carrying out of any question of public policy. It is well known that on one occasion, when Sir John Macdonald proposed a policy which was criticised as being likely to be injurious to British connection, he answered: 'So much the worse for British connection.' That sentiment has never been stated or repeated by any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, or so far as I know, by any member of the Liberal party in Canada since 1896, when this government was called on to take office. But their loyalty is of such an ephemeral character that it is difficult to say what hon. gentlemen opposite, regard as loyalty to-day, and what they will call loyalty to-morrow. It was loyalty last year to proclaim that Germany was a nightmare disturbing the dreams of the people of Canada; that the people of Canada should put up money to help to build a navy in England, to assist in repeling a threatened German invasion. We hear nothing now about a German invasion or a German peril, that has passed away into the oblivion of forgotten things. A year ago an election was progressing in Great Britain, in which gentlemen, who were trying hard to get into office, were endeavouring to secure some support by conjuring up to the minds of the people of England, that the responsible ministers did not show a sufficiently anxious disposition to keep up the armaments of Great Britain. But that election passed away. The Liberal party were returned to power. Since then, but a few weeks ago, another election took place, and the same party has been returned again to power. We have had strident and hysterical demands for imperial preferential trade between Canada and the empire. It would be a very good thing, and I can assure you, that if Great Britain declared for imperial preferential trade within the empire, I should hold up both hands for it. But, is it not idle for the hon. member for North Toronto, to tell the people of the maritime provinces, 'you had better keep your fish, keep your lambs, keep your apples and keep everything else you have to sell until we obtain preferential trade with Great Britain, and then we will send our goods over there.' There is not much prospect of our getting imperial preferential trade within the empire while the dominant partner, the people of Great Britain, repudiate it, as they have on three several occasions within the last five years. It is loyalty to-day as far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, to proclaim imperial preferential trade within the empire, but who knows what will be their policy next year? I am reminded of lines written by a poet whose name we all venerate and revere, referring to a distinctly similar situation which existed in England at a time when a party out of power was endeavouring to get back to power. He wrote:

> Loyalty, sooth, we're on dangerous ground;
> Who knows how the fashions may alter,
> The doctrine to-day that is loyally sound,
> To-morrow may bring us the halter.

I have one more observation to make, and I am through. During the course of

the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto, he made some references to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in connection with his administration of public affairs in the province of Nova Scotia, and in connection with the issue which was raised there in the election of 1886. That charge was reiterated, in a somewhat subdued and rarified form, I will admit, by the hon. member for East Lambton. The hon. member for North Toronto referred to the fact that in 1886 the Minister of Finance, then premier of Nova Scotia, went to the country upon an issue which was calculated to disrupt the confederation of Canada. I wish to remind you, Mr. Chairman, that the people of Nova Scotia have, as long as I can remember, taken an active and intelligent interest in public matters. I need scarcely do more than remind you, Sir, that the province of Nova Scotia, within twenty years, has given two prime ministers to the Dominion of Canada, and if the hopes and aspirations of hon. gentlemen opposite had been realized in the last election and they had been returned to power the province of Nova Scotia would have contributed a third prime minister to the Dominion of Canada, to show the deep and intelligent interest Nova Scotians must necessarily take in political matters. Having said so much, I desire to add that the issue that was framed by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and that received the approval of the people of Nova Scotia, was an issue that he was absolutely justified in submitting to the people. From the years 1878 to 1896 the province of Nova Scotia was in opposition to the Conservative government at Ottawa, of which the hon. member for North Toronto was a prominent member. Certain questions of right and justice which had arisen between the two governments, and which should have been settled and decided by the Conservative government at Ottawa in favour of the Liberal government in Nova Scotia, were not so settled. The rights of the province were ignored, and the people of Nova Scotia, driven to desperation, as they were on one other occasion, when a great question came up for their judgment, said: If we cannot get justice from the government at Ottawa we ought to get justice from some other source. In 1886 there was an election run in the province of Nova Scotia on the question of whether Nova Scotia ought to accept conditions as they existed and bear the hardships which were being imposed upon her by the government at Ottawa, or endeavour to secede from the union. I need not remind the committee that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was amply sustained, handsomely vindicated, by the people of Nova Scotia upon that issue, and that he came back to the government of the province with a larger majority than he had before. In two subsequent elections my hon. friend the Minister of Finance led the Liberal party in Nova Scotia and led them successfully, as he has been successful upon every issue on which he appealed to the people during the twenty-nine years of his public life in Canada. We down in the province of Nova Scotia learned years ago to appreciate the eminent ability, unselfish character, loyalty and devotion with which the hon. Minister of Finance has always administered public affairs in Nova Scotia, and since he left the province of Nova Scotia to become Minister of Finance the people of that province have turned their eyes lovingly towards Ottawa to learn from day to day of the new things and the good things that my hon. friend was bringing to the people of Canada. He has brought many good things to the people of Canada, and that he may long live to bring many other good things to them is the devout wish of every man in Nova Scotia irrespective of politics, whether he be Conservative or Liberal. I referred a moment ago to the eminent talents of the Minister of Finance. I shall not discant upon his personal qualities, that must be manifest to every hon. member who knows him, but I will say that as respects his character, his ability, the great good which he has conferred upon the province of Nova Scotia and the Dominion of Canada, and as respects his loyalty to his colleagues and his country future generations of Nova Scotians will say of him:

He was a man, take him for all in all,
We ne'er shall look upon his like again.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Kyte) happens to come from a section of the country where the people have been for many years inclined to indulge in their own peculiar amusement of aërial navigation, each one vieing with all his predecessors to make for himself a world's record as a kite flyer. But, unfortunately for their own reputation, they usually move around in the air promiscuously for a time and then finally land down in some deserted swamp or obscure lake. I do not think that the hon. member who has just taken his seat has established a record for himself any more important to hand down to posterity in that respect than many of his predecessors. He started out by saying that what was suitable for Canada in 1891 ought to be suitable for it in 1911. That may be true, or it may be false, because a great many changes have taken place in Canada in the last twenty years. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said something about the same. He said that Canada, from 1854 to 1866, during the time we had the recipro-

city treaty, enjoyed such advantages that she has desired to get such a treaty ever since, and that if Canada required a reciprocity treaty then she requires one equally as much in 1911. Does it necessarily follow that that is correct? Is it likely to be correct? Are the conditions of Canada the same to-day as they were twenty years ago, or the same as they were in 1866? Not at all. Most of the hon. gentlemen who spoke on this question have given expression to the same principle, and have employed practically the same argument. The hon. member for South Wellington says that what was suitable for Canada in 1866 is just as suitable to-day. I would like to ask him to apply that to himself.

The 'Parliamentary Companion' tells us that he was then a mere babbling infant, and that about all he needed was a bath tub, a little human milk moderately hot and a good deal of spanking to make a boy of him. But he grew up and he developed, and he came to manhood. Does he require nothing more to-day than he did in his infancy? What has happened in the meantime? He has increased in stature, in vigour, in mentality and to-day he is a full grown man. To ask him to be content now with what suited him in his swaddling days is as absurd as to ask Canada in the year 1911 to be content with what she required in the year 1866. Twenty years have brought great changes to Canada: We have grown to nationhood; we have developed strength; our people require different conditions and pursuits now from what they did then. What was suited to Canadians 20 years ago does not suit them to-day. True, as the hon. gentleman told us, the eastern and western dairymen have passed resolutions in favour of this arrangement and no doubt they spoke honestly and with the best intentions, but after all they may not be the best judges, and we will have to leave it to the future to determine. The hon. gentleman told us that the foreign trade of the port of Montreal was $15,000,000 and I can tell him that our fear is that if this arrangement goes into effect, that trade instead of developing as it ought to develop in proportion to the increased wealth and population of the country, will be retarded if not destroyed. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) told us what was going to happen to Nova Scotia fish if they did not get reciprocity with the United States. Might I ask him what has happened to the maritime fish trade up to the present hour? He told us that none of their fish was sold in Ontario and the west, but I would refer him to his political friend from Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) to know if it is not true that that gentleman for years has been doing a very large and remunerative trade in fish with Montreal and Toronto and other cities in these provinces. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) told us that the English market was of little value to the maritime provinces for fish products; he told us that the interprovincial trade in Canada was of no consequence and that if they got a free market in the United States for their fish they would have all they could desire. But, the value of the product of our fisheries last year was $15,000,000, and I find from the statistics that of that the United States took $4,627,000 worth while the English market which the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) has such a contempt for took $5,899,000 worth. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) announced an economic fallacy when he said that the natural resources of our country are for the people of to-day, and not for the people of the future. Is there any wisdom in such a policy. Are we living only for ourselves and for the present; are we to pay no heed to posterity; are we to recklessly waste what nature has given us and leave to future generations a depleted country. Sir, such a policy would be the height of folly. I say that a wise and intelligent people in this or any generation will say: It is ours to use economically the gifts of nature, not to waste or destroy, but to save what we do not really need for those who come after us. That, Sir, is our real duty to ourselves and to our country. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) told us that this reciprocal arrangement would give to the maritime provinces a market for their potatoes. He was asked what quantity of potatoes had been sent from the maritime provinces to the United States last year, and he could not tell, although he ventured the opinion that the interprovincial trade in potatoes was of little or no value. Well, the facts are that large quantities of maritime province potatoes are used in Ontairo and Quebec, and three years ago when in Winnipeg I was told that most of the potatoes they were then using were brought from the province of Prince Edward Island. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that last year the United States sent into Canada $52,597 worth of poultry, while Canada only sent to this great market of 95,000,000 people $3,576 worth. In view of these figures the poultry raisers in Canada will not have much to hope for from this trade arrangement, and with regard to potatoes, as to which the hon. gentleman thought the American market would be so valuable, this 95,000,000 people took last year from all Canada $36,710 worth. What a wonderful benefit it will be to the Nova Scotians to get that market for their potatoes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a wonder they took that much, with the duty of 25 cents a bushel.

Mr. SPROULE. I wonder that they took any at all. They never take any more than

they can do without, and they are not likely to take any more in the future out of generosity than they have done in the past. They only take what suits them. From the United States returns I find that they sent into Canada last year $213,554 worth of potatoes, whereas they took from us only $36,000 worth. Where would the poor Nova Scotians be if the duty were taken off potatoes and the Americans had the freedom of our market? I am inclined to think they would be worse off rather than better. Then, the Canadian farmer has eggs to sell, and where is he going to sell them? The ninety-five million of people of the United States took from us last year only $12,500 worth of eggs, whereas we took from them $117,517 worth. What a wonderful benefit it will be to the Canadian farmers and farmers' wives who have eggs to sell, when they find that they will have to compete in their home market with the importation of double or treble the quantity of American eggs when the duty is taken off. The same is true with regard to horses and the same with regard to cheese.

The Minister of Finance stated, as a justification for making this treaty, that both political parties in Canada were committed to such a proposal ever since 1866, when the old reciprocity treaty was abolished. Well, in my judgment he was a little out in his history and was not quite accurate in his facts. Canada, he said, enjoyed good times during the continuance of that treaty from 1854 to 1866, and presumably those good times were due to that treaty. I want to ask those who know anything about the history of that time, is that a fact? I say emphatically that it is not. What gave us the good times that we enjoyed from 1854 to 1856 or 1857? It was the Russian war, which ran up the price of everything we had to sell. We sold wheat in the barn for $2 a bushel, and everything else at correspondingly high prices. After that, for some years, notwithstanding the reciprocity treaty, we had rather bad times. Prices went down lower and lower until 1861, when the American war started, and we had good times again. Why had we those good times? The Minister of Finance says because of the treaty of 1866. Not at all. It was because 5,000,000 people in the United States were withdrawn from peaceful pursuits of agriculture, to fight for their rights, and that country had to depend on other countries for its supplies, and everything went up enormously in price. I happened to be living in the United States in 1866, and I remember the high prices we had to pay for everything—25 cents per pound for pork, from 20 to 24 cents per pound for beef, and correspondingly high prices for butter, cheese and all other articles of food. An ordinary suit of clothes cost $125. Our horses and cattle went to the United States in thousands and were sold at very high figures. We had good times, not because of the reciprocity treaty, but because so many of their people were taken from the peaceful pursuits of agriculture and the country had to get its requirements from other countries, and Canada, being so close to the United States, enjoyed the advantage of that condition of things. In 1865 the war closed. I was in the United States in 1866 and 1867, when they abolished the reciprocity treaty, and what was one of the reasons they gave for doing it? I remember one of the generals speaking in Detroit at the time, and saying : Over five millions of our people were taken from the peaceful pursuits of life for many years, and we stopped production, and were obliged to get our supplies from other countries ; but the war is now over, these people have gone back to their regular pursuits, and they will be able to supply us with all the foodstuffs we require, and we are bound as a nation, in the interests of our own people, to abolish this treaty and to put up the duties on these articles, so that we can keep the market of our own country for our own people. And the Americans abolished the treaty for that purpose, and put very high duties on everything that went into that country. I remember that the duty on a box of matches was 10 cents, and everything else was in proportion ; and from that time on we were shut out of the United States market. Then the Finance Minister said, and the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) as well, that both parties in Canada have been committed to such a proposal since 1866 up to the present. That history, I submit, is not correct, and I propose to show that it is not. Since 1897 the Conservative party have never submitted to the people a policy of reciprocity. It is also incorrect as regards the Reform party. In 1891 that party went before the electorate with the policy of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union and not limited reciprocity, and they ran their election on that platform and were sadly defeated.

What has been the history of both political parties in this country with regard to their efforts to secure reciprocity from 1866 to the present? In 1866, after the abolition of the treaty, Sir Alexander Galt and Sir William Howland went to Washington to secure reciprocity, but failed. In 1868, after confederation, there was a clause inserted in our first tariff Act declaring our readiness to enter into a similar limited treaty with the United States if they were prepared to reciprocate. That clause, however, remained ineffective. In 1869 Sir John Rose was despatched to Washington by the government of Sir John

Macdonald to secure reciprocity in natural products on the lines of the treaty of 1866, but he also returned without being able to accomplish anything. In 1871 another effort was made by Sir John Macdonald, when the treaty of Washington was negotiated. An effort was then made to have that treaty extended to natural products, but the Americans again refused. In 1874 Sir Alexander Mackenzie sent a deputation to Washington, headed by the Hon. George Brown, to get reciprocity, but they also failed. In 1879, when the National Policy tariff resolutions and the Customs Act were passed, there was a statutory offer made for reciprocal tariff legislation, or reciprocity, in natural products, and that remained a standing offer to the United States for several years, but was never accepted. In 1891, for the last time, Sir John Macdonald appealed to the country and asked the people whether they were desirous of having reciprocity with the United States. If so, he said, we are prepared to make another effort as opposed to the policy of the Reform party in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, or commercial union. On that issue both parties went to the country, and the Reform party was ignominiously defeated. Sir John was returned, and, true to his promise, he sent another deputation to Washington, but that met with a similar fate as its predecessors, and from that time to the present day the Conservatives have never made any effort to get a reciprocity treaty with the United States. From that day to the present they have never put any such plank in their platform, and I appeal to the Minister of Finance whether he was not absolutely incorrect when he said that from 1866 down to 1911 both parties were committed to such a policy. In 1891 the Reform party ran their election on unrestricted reciprocity, or commercial union, and were defeated. In 1893 they put a plank in their platform in favour of reciprocity with the United States and appealed to the people. They carried the country, and in 1899 the right hon. the Prime Minister and Mr. John Charlton went to Washington to try and get reciprocity, but utterly failed, and the right hon. gentlemen then declared that they had made their last pilgrimage to Washington to secure a treaty, and would in future endeavour to develop this country on national lines. In view of these facts, is it right, therefore, to say that both parties were committed to that policy during all those years? I submit that from that time to the present neither party was committed to it.

My hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has said, however, that if there was good reason for the demand in 1866 there is equally good reason for it in 1911. Well, I say there is not. Times and conditions have both changed. To-day we have good markets, whereas then we had unprofitable markets. Since then the country has been developing in every line. Its people are amply employed at renumerative wages, its interprovincial trade has been growing and has grown immensely, and owing to this development and the increase in immigration we have a home market adequate for all our necessities. There could, therefore, be no comparison between 1866 and the present in that respect. We are to-day a full grown nation. We have reached that development which comes with maturity. We are now full grown, and can face the world in arms; we have the brain, brawn and muscle necessary to hold our own. We have good markets in Canada and ample employment for our own people. Can it, therefore, be said that we are in the same position as in 1866? I say no. Do we then require a reciprocity treaty to-day, as we did in 1866? Not at all. All we require to do is to continue working out our own national development, as we have been during the last 15 years. It seems to me that the epitaph on a certain tombstone would apply well to Canada if we should get this proposed treaty. The epitaph reads as follows:—

> I was well, wished to be better;
> Took medicine and here I am.

Mr. FIELDING. Rather hard on the doctors.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, on political doctors just as well as on medical men. The Canadian people will say: We were well, our political doctors thought we should do better; they administered medicine, and now here we lie. What has been the ruin brought to Canada by the, I was going to say quack political physician and his empirical prescribing for the country's needs at this time!

I was much amused at the wonderful cheer that went up from the supporters of the Minister of Finance on the other side of the House, and from the colony on the back benches of this side when the Minister of Finance sat down. It was as though some oracle from Heaven had spoken—as though the clouds had opened and the shower came down from Heaven to revive the drooping spirits of the world. The hon. gentlemen acted as though they felt very much better. They reminded me of the sick Irishman, who was called upon by the doctor. Doctors have a habit, when they call upon a patient, of not only looking at the tongue and feeling the pulse, but of using a little instrument, such as I have here, a thermometer. First the thermometer must be shaken down to make sure that it is below 98⅘, the normal human temperature, and then it is placed under the

patients tongue. The physician placed the thermometer under the Irishman's tongue and walked up and own, while he waited for the expiry of the three minutes, during which the instrument was to remain in the patient's mouth. The poor Irishman held his mouth shut, and when at last, the doctor removed the thermometer, the patient said: 'Thank you, sorr; I feel a great deal better for that thratement.' The Finance Minister had taken the temperature of his following, and they felt they would soon be well. But I am afraid the improvement was like that of the Irishman, more in imagination, than in reality. Now, what did we do when we found we could not get any treaty with the United States? The matter was taken up seriously by the Conservative party in 1876, 1877 and 1878, when Sir John Macdonald, finding every effort to negotiate a treaty unavailing, laid down a policy designed to protect the home market of Canada and prevent the United States exploiters from dumping their surplus goods in our country. Being shut out of the American markets by high tariffs and the refusal to negotiate a reciprocity treaty from 1866 to 1890, we had periods of hard times in Canada, there is no doubt, and felt the urgent need of better markets for our own people. But, as the United States did not admit us to their markets, the wise statesmen of that day said: We will prepare for ourselves a National Policy, and will develop Canada on lines that will assure to our own people the employment that is denied to them by the Americans making a slaughter market of Canada. This National Policy was introduced in 1879, and had the effect of directing the pursuits of the people of Canada, and educating them so that they might better employ their time and labour by turning out the finished products suitable for Canada, instead of selling our raw products, as we had been doing up to that time. That policy continued to be carried out by the statesmen controlling the destinies of Canada. We sent experts to Great Britain to study the markets and ascertain what was suitable for the consumption of the people there, and how we could produce it and lay it down in their markets in prime condition, and in the most attractive and saleable form. We established experimental farms for the same purpose; we appointed a dairy commissioner, and dairy instructors; we prepared cold storage by land and by ocean, and improved the transportation of the country by land and by ocean as well. We did this for the purpose of transporting to the markets in which we must sell the goods we had to dispose of the only one of value we had left to the Canadian people, so that they might receive the benefit they were entitled to expect from the markets of the mother country. We sent Prof. James W. Robertson to England to study the markets of that country and of other European countries as well; and on his return to Canada, he outlined the policy which, in his judgment, we should follow, to make our products sell in those markets. He said that the education of our farmers was one of the desirable things, so that we might produce an article of superior quality in dairy products, cured meats and other foodstuffs, suitable for the British market. For that purpose we established experimental farms, we commenced experimental work by means of the experimental farms, and by the officers appointed to deal with the dairy associations to carry on the other portions of this business. And so we went on up to 1890. But we found that the Americans were still taking advantage of our markets. The meat products which our Canadian farmers were supplying in unlimited quantities, were driven out of the Canadian markets by the inroads of the United States meats. We had got the government in 1879 to put a duty on meats, but it was not sufficient. Deputation after deputation came to the government, until, in 1890, we laid this problem before them. We said that the Canadian farmers were raising meat enough to supply the demand of Canada, but the big Chicago houses brought into Canada 22,000,000 pounds of fresh meat to feed the Canadian people, depriving the Canadian farmer of his home market. And we urged that, in the interest of the farmer, the duty must be increased. We succeeded in convincing the government that this was the right thing to do. We showed them that every day the refrigerator cars could be seen coming from Armour & Co., from Swift, and other meat packers, of Chicago, dumping out the fresh meat in London, Hamilton, Toronto, Kingston, Montreal and even down to the maritime provinces. And there were stalls retailing this meat alongside the Canadian butcher stalls. These Chicago houses, in fact were feeding the Canadian artisans and labourers in the cities with beef and pork raised in Kansas and Illinois to the detriment of our farmers. Was that wise? Was it proper? We got the government to put the duty, not as high as we asked, but up to 2 cents and 3 cents a pound on fresh meat.

What was the result? In two years we shut up every one of these American butcher stalls in Canada, we stopped these refrigerator cars from dumping the fresh meat in Canada and reduced the consumption of American fresh meat to less than 8,000,000 pounds. Will any man tell me that that did not do the Canadian farmer

any good? I think the Canadian farmer is too intelligent to doubt it. What would be the result to-day if you took the duty off? By this arrangement we reduce it to one and a quarter cents a pound. It was 2½ cents a pound when we imported 22,500,000 pounds, and they kept stalls open. Would not the same thing happen again? It would, and to the detriment of the Canadian farmer who is raising meat enough to feed the Canadian people and is entitled to demand from the Canadian government a protection of the home market for the Canadian farmer. But although we are feeding the Canadian people our exports of cured meats, packing house produce, increased from $5,000,000 in 1889 when that duty was put on to $17,196,000 in 1903, and in addition we fed the Canadians as well. Was that no benefit to the Canadian farmer? Would we not do him serious injustice if we took that duty off? In my judgment we would. By these means we secured a profitable market in Great Britain for all we had to sell over home consumption and we had there a splendid market also for our dairy products? What did we do with regard to dairy products? We sent our dairy instructors and instructed the people how to make better butter and better cheese. We prohibited the importation, manufacture or sale of spurious products, process butter and filled cheese which were largely produced in the United States. We compelled the Canadian people to label all Canadian produce going to Great Britain so that it would not be confused with American produce there. Then the Americans commenced shipping butter and cheese across at Brockville, sending it to England by Montreal and calling it Canadian. We stopped that by compelling them when they brought it across to label it United States produce. By these means we developed that industry until in a few years our cheese products increased, the price and quality went up all along the line until three years ago we enjoyed the advantage of being able to supply the British market with 65 per cent of all the cheese imported from all parts of the world. The United States was our greatest competitor in 1879 and shipped double the quantity of cheese to Britain that we did. The exports have been going down from that time until to-day, and last year they sent there only a few million pounds, a negligible quantity, and there is practically no American cheese in the English market to-day. We supplied England last year with 65 per cent of her imports of cheese. Will any one tell me in the face of these facts that the Canadian dairymen would not suffer and lose his reputation for butter and cheese abroad if he allowed the same thing to happen now that happened years ago? History would repeat itself and the Canadian dairyman would live to learn that he made the mistake of his life when he passed that resolution saying that all he desired was to get into the American market with his cheese and butter.

The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said that he represented an agricultural constituency, that there were farmers there who are raising the best cattle found on the continent, and raising splendid horses for which they desired access to the Buffalo and New York market.

He said :

> The arrangement presented before us will give Canada tremendous advantages over the position which she now occupies.

He added:

> Will any one tell me that the people of my riding do not desire to get their cattle and their sheep and their hogs into the Buffalo market?

I would like to ask would they be equally desirous that the man from Kansas, Illinois, Ohio and New York should come into the Canadian market and share the markets of Guelph, or Toronto, or Montreal with the Canadian farmers to the extent they were doing before? Will the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) be willing to see an American butcher stall opened in Guelph, to sell beef and pork from Chicago in competition with the farmers of South Wellington? I think not. He says the Canadian farmers are anxious to get into the American market to sell horses. Where do they sell them to-day? They have a splendid market in the Canadian west, the best we ever had, a Canadian market, a home market, a market that never fails us so long as we protect it against the American people. Last year over 6,000 horses were imported from the United States and paid over $100,000 duty to get into our market.

Mr. MILLER. Was not a large number of these horses the property of immigrants coming to Canada which as settlers' effects would pay no duty?

Mr. SPROULE. No, these are horses on which duty was paid, the settlers' effects are not included in this list. Remove that duty and will there not be much greater competition with the Canadian farmers? Our Canadians are buying horses all over our country, and are paying enormous prices. I saw $200 paid for one horse the day I was home, $255 is sometimes paid, and I saw $450 paid for a team. Where were they going? Away to the western provinces to supply our people. The hon. member for South Wellington said that we want to get into New York with these horses. These heavy horses never go to New York ; the only market we have there is for fancy hunters or for driving horses

of which we get perhaps one out of 500. The great and important market we have is the home market, and we have shut out from that the cayuses and bronchos that were destroying the horses of our western country. Are we to bring back the conditions we had when they were coming in with impunity? It would be a bad day for the western horse and for the western farmer, a bad day for Ontario and Quebec whose farmers have such a splendid market there. We are told that the Canadian market is of little value to our people, but the Minister of Agriculture told us the other day that the home market is increasing at the rate of $2,000,000 a year and it is already by far the most important we have in point of volume as it is in point of value ; four times as much as there is a surplus to export.

Are they willing to let that market be destroyed? I say keep the home market for the Canadian people and unless we do that we will not be doing what is right. Will this agreement help us? In my judgment it will do us very serious injury. It will break up and injure our present lines of transportation and foreign trade which are interprovincial, which are from east to west. To-day the trade is carried by our own lines of railway and steamer through our own ports and through our own great cities. It will break up that trade and will carry it to the south, to the American market. It will seriously injure the earning power of our railway and transportation companies and of those men who own vessels and who are making a good living out of the carrying trade. They will be seriously struck by this treaty. It will injure as well the Canadian ports and cities through which these goods are carried. It will injure Port Arthur, Fort William, Winnipeg and the ports on the Georgian bay, but it will build up St. Paul, Minneapolis, Duluth and Chicago. Is that the national policy that we should desire, is that the national policy that is good for the Canadian people? It is no more suitable for them to-day than it was in 1879 when we introduced the national policy as being suitable for Canada. We have now an interprovincial trade of vast importance, of great value to the people of Canada, from west to east and from east to west. This will be broken up and our trade will be drawn off by the various lines and branches that tap our country every few miles of a length extending from 2,000 to 4,000 miles. The trade which goes through Ontario, which filters through Quebec and the maritime provinces and passes Halifax and St. John on its way to England, will go through the United States by way of Chicago, Boston, Portland, New York, and Canada must inevitably suffer on account of being deprived of the interprovincial trade and the transportation which she now enjoys and which will be taken away from her if this agreement is carried out. It will divert trade from the great cities and towns of Canada to the great cities and towns of the United States. Winnipeg is one of the largest cities in Canada to-day in her population, wealth and enterprise. What will she be in future years? It is true that she will go on developing but not at the same rapid rate as she has been developing of late years. It will be a serious blow to her if that law goes into force, because the wheat that is shipped through Winnipeg and inspected there will be turned from that route, and sent down across the boundary line, not touching Winnipeg at all. It will not reach the terminal elevators and the complaint of the western farmers that the terminal elevators do them an injustice by mixing their grain will be very largely removed because their grain will go to the western states and find a market at Duluth, Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Superior, instead of Toronto, Montreal and the maritime provinces. That will be the result, and therefore it will do them a great deal of harm. It will Americanize our trade and commerce. Two thousand commercial travellers go out every week from Winnipeg away through the western country with their samples to take orders for the products of our country and England that are distributed through the wholesale houses of Winnipeg to that western country. One hundred million dollars worth of goods are distributed every year through the wholesale houses of Winnipeg to the wholesale and retail stores of the west extending from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean. Those goods are distributed on account of the orders taken by the 2,000 commercial travellers. What will happen to them? They will be supplemented by from 2,000 to 4,000 American travellers from Chicago, St. Paul and Minneapolis, selling American meat, American cured beef, fresh beef from Chicago and Kansas City, and other goods from the United States. They will become serious competitors of these commercial men.

But, this agreement will do more than that. I say it will Americanize the commerce of our country. We have many Americans in the west who are accustomed to the products of their own country and they will buy them in preference to ours because they know them better. They will establish a demand for them, and these commercial men will get their orders. These orders will not be sent to the Winnipeg whosale houses but to the wholesale houses of Chicago, Duluth and Minneapolis, to the detriment of our great Canadian cities, especially to the detriment of Winnipeg and to the benefit of the Ameri-

can cities. It will Americanize our trade, it will Americanize our people in social, commercial and industrial life, to the disadvantage of our people, and it will result in injuring the great towns and cities of Canada and building up the great towns and cities of the United States. I said that it would Americanize our commerce, and the social life of our people. The dominating influence of 95,000,000 of people over 8,000,000 of people will soon do more; it will assimilate, absorb, take up and cause us to lose our imperial and British identity, and we will be practically assimilated by the United States. If you have in one school 95 children belonging to one nation and 9 to 12 of another nation, in a few years you will see the greater dominating the lesser and the greater absorbing the lesser. Will not the ideas of the greater overcome the ideas of the lesser? And will that not produce a change in the social, intellectual and commercial habits of the lesser number? Would that not happen in this case? Most assuredly it would, the same as it would in the case of the school children. We will have 95 millions of people overshadowing, overtowering and dominating the seven or eight million people that we have. It will Americanize them, it will wean them away from their British allegiance, it will wean them away from their loyalty to the mother country, and it will pave the way for unrestricted reciprocity and annexation. That is the goal that many of those who are advocating this treaty are aiming at to-day. That is the goal they desire, that is the goal that many of them would have us reach. I fear very much, Mr. Speaker, that is what will come to pass, if in our fatuity, the parliament of Canada should sanction this reciprocal trade arrangement.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE AND REPORTED.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—Mr. Ecrément.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Pacific and Peace Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill (No. 115) to incorporate the Guardian Accident and Guarantee Company.—Mr. Doherty.

Bill (No. 77) respecting the National Indemnity Company, and to change its name to National Guarantee and Accident Company.—Mr. Wilson (Laval). (Title changed to 'The Merchants and Employer's Guarantee and Accident Company).

THE HUDSON BAY MORTGAGE CORPORATION.

House in committee on Bill (No. 56) to incorporate the Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation.—Mr. Knowles.

On section 31,

Mr. PUGSLEY. It strikes me that this section is rather extraordinary. It seems to make a special provision for removing doubts that might arise as to certain questions between the company and its shareholders, and it provides that if the doubts which the company had were not unreasonable, even though the decision might be in favour of the shareholders, the cost of the proceedings should be a lien on the stock. I have never seen such a provision in a special charter before. I think that might very well be left to the ordinary provisions of the law with regard to trust matters. I would invite the attention of the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill to this section.

Mr. McCRANEY. The section to which the hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) refers was discussed in the Banking and Commerce Committee, but not with respect to the particular point that he mentions. The Bill, I understand, is modelled upon that of the Northern Mortgage Company which was passed last session. I understand that a similar section is in the Great West Permanent Company's Act also.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course, if there is precedent for it, one must have due respect to that fact. But let me read the section:

34. Whenever the directors shall entertain reasonable doubts as to the legality of any claim to or upon such shares, bonds, debentures, obligations, dividends or coupons, or the proceeds thereof, then and in such case the directors may file in any court of competent jurisdiction in the province in which the head office of the company is situated, a petition stating such doubts, and praying for an order or judgment adjudicating and awarding the said shares, bonds, debentures, obligations, dividends, coupons, or proceeds to the parties legally entitled thereto, and such court shall have authority to restrain any action, suit or proceedings against the company, and the directors and officers thereof for the same subject matter, pending the determination of the petition; and the company and the directors and officers thereof shall be fully protected and indemnified by obedience to such order or judgment against all actions, suits, claims, and demands in respect of the matters which have been in question in such petition, and the proceedings thereupon, provided that if the court adjudges that such doubts were reasonable, the costs,

charges and expenses of the company, in and about such petition and proceedings, shall form a lien upon such shares, bonds, debentures, obligations, dividends, coupons or proceeds, and shall be paid to the company before the directors shall be obliged to transfer, or assent to the transfer of, or to pay such shares, bonds, debentures, obligations, dividends, coupons or proceeds to the parties found entitled thereto.

It strikes me that that is a most unusual enactment. It means that if the directors have any doubts as to whether a shareholder is entitled to shares or a depositor to certain moneys, those directors may file a petition, and, if the court holds that their doubts were reasonable, even though the party wins the suit and is awarded the property in question, he may still be made liable for the costs. As I say, it is a very unusual proceeding, but there is precedent for it, and when this Bill passes there will be still another precedent.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House again in Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose at six o'clock I had pointed out to the House the probability that if we established closer relations with the United States in commerce, in social, professional and official life, the tendency would be for the larger nation to dominate the smaller, for the 95,000,000 of the United States to influence the 8,000,000 people of Canada, so that we would become more like them and lose our own identity. I had also dwelt on the injury likely to be inflicted on the farmers of Canada by giving access to the Canadian market to the stockraisers of the United States. I had pointed out that it will injure the meat-raising industries of the country as it did in 1885 to 1890. It will also injure them in another way.

By the importation from the western country into Ontario and Quebec of the grain necessary to keep our millers going we have more food supply for our cattle and hogs down here. We have 300 flour mills going in Ontario and the upper portion of Quebec that are supplied with a large portion of the grain they grind from the west every year, and the stock feeders of Ontario and Quebec will use up all the offal, the bran, shorts and coarse flour. They bring thousands of cars of this feed from these western provinces in addition to that produced down here. Will we have the same system that we have now when that grain goes across to the American market? We are not likely to have it. If the grain of the west is ground in the mills of Minneapolis and St. Paul the offal will not be brought to Canada, and the Canadian farmer and feeder who requires it so much for the growing and fattening of his stock will be deprived of it. It is another source of supply that will be taken from him; it is another handicap that will be placed upon him in carrying on this operation out of which he makes money. It will very seriously injure him, as well as injure the millers of the country. These 300 mills are obliged to get grain from the west to keep their mills running for about six months in the year. I know something of the business, because I was in it for a short time some years ago, and I found that we were obliged to import from the west sufficient grain to keep our mills running for nine months in the year. Of late years we have been growing more grain in Ontario, and perhaps it is only necessary to bring down grain enough to keep them running for six months in the year. But the flour that seems the most saleable, the strong bakers' flour, is made from the hard wheat of the west and the soft wheat of Ontario mixed in equal quantities. Therefore, the Ontario and Quebec miller requires that western wheat to make the quality of flour that the Ontario people desire to have, and they require to get it to keep their mills running as well. They have a large amount of wealth invested in these plants, and unless their mills are running fairly up to their capacity they stand to be seriously injured. The harder you make it for them to get that grain from the west and the more grain that goes to Chicago, St. Paul and Minneapolis the more difficult it will be for them to meet the supply down here, and the less there will be of offal from the grinding of that grain to supply the farmers of this country. In that way it will seriously injure our country. I am speaking especially of Ontario, the conditions of which I know something about. If this arrangement is carried out it will strike a very serious blow at the interests of the millers, as well as the stock breeders and farmers.

Then, it will injure the stock raisers generally by a serious reduction in the amount of feed that they will be able to get. But it will injure them in another way. If you make it possible for cattle, sheep and horses to be transported across the line free of duty, what will be the result? With a plentiful supply of corn in the west there is a great demand for our young cattle for the purpose of feeding them there. Why? Because if they have a large supply of feed and they are short in their supply of cattle, our young cattle will be purchased in the northwest and in other

provinces at the very time when the farmers should begin to feed them, and when they should become most profitable to them, they will be sold on the farm, because of the higher price which will be offered for them, and it will be as it was a few years ago, when we had the freedom of that market for our young cattle. Our young cattle were bought up by thousands, taken over to the United States and fattened by these western people, because they had a plentiful corn crop with which to feed them. In a few years, I believe we will have a great shortage, and I am afraid that instead of the Canadian farmer finishing his product upon his own farm and returning the required nourishment to the soil the young cattle will be taken away, the farms will be impoverished and our farmers will be going around during a portion of the year doing very little on account of it.

We are told that this is going to be a most valuable thing for the farmers of the northwest. The hon. Minister of Finance said: Look at the large deputation we had down from that country, and what were their wants? One of the great wants was the freedom of the American market in order to enable them to sell their cattle and grain. It may be a very attractive prospect to the western farmer to-day to get a few cents more a bushel for his grain for a short time, or a few dollars a head more for his cattle, but I say that in doing that he is sowing the wind and is bound to reap the whirlwind. The system of farming —if I may say so, and I think I know something about farming—that they carry on in the country to-day is not the best kind of farming for the progress of the country, or for the future. What is their system of farming to-day? Having broken up some virgin soil on the prairie, rich, strong and fruitful, they go upon the land in the spring of the year, put in their crop, allow it to remain for a few months, harvest it, thresh it, put their grain into the elevator, and get their elevator receipts. It is all done in a few months in the year, commencing about March or April and ending about the following September or October. What does the farmer do after that? He does a little ploughing in the fall, but he has got the full return of a year's labour by working only a few months and that suits him very well, because human nature is always ready, in a few months, to take the wage of a year's work if circumstances will permit. You have the full return of a year's work in a few months when you get your warehouse receipts. Having obtained their warehouse receipts, what do they do? Three or four farmers will employ one man to stay on the homesteads and look after the stock of all of them while these farmers come down to Ontario and the east and go around visiting in the country until next spring. This is inculcating, not industrious habits, but indolent and unthrifty habits, because these men are away from their farms. When a farmer leaves the farm generally everything is going to the bad. He should be on his farm in winter as well as in summer. He should be carrying on mixed farming, he should have enough stock to keep the boys employed in the winter time feeding the coarse grains from his own farm that he has in such plentiful supply and return to the soil by that system the nourishment which it needs instead of the system of farming which is carried on now. He is impoverishing that rich virgin soil, with the result that it will yield him less every year. It will bring him to the same condition as that which is found in the States, where they have carried on the same kind of farming until to-day they are receiving a return of only eight or ten bushels to the acre, whereas it ought to be 25, 30, 35, or 40, as we find it in Ontario to-day. Is that healthy farming? It may please the western farmer to get the returns from what ought to be a year's labour in a few months. But that is not the kind of farming that will pay in the future. It reminds me of what an old Scotch woman said to her boys who were rather given to running around all winter and doing nothing. She said in my presence: It is all right for you to have a good time now, and it will be very well if there is no hereafter, but if there is you will have a fearful reckoning.

A day of fearful reckoning will come, but I fear it will be when the land is impoverished and the soil no longer able to continue giving the large crops it yielded when first brought under cultivation. The system of farming now pursued will not ensure to their benefit and it will do incalculable damage to the land. They should remain on the farms during winter, feed and grow the animals on the soil just as the Ontario farmer does, instead of denuding the land of its fertility. The Ontario farmer has learned by experience that it requires a different system of farming from that to bring him a suitable return, and no doubt the time will come when the western farmers will see the errors of their present system. This reciprocity agreement will tend to build up the cities of the United States and to impoverish Canadian cities. Our lake port towns on Lake Superior, at the Sault, on the Georgian bay, instead of being on the great highway of commerce as they are to-day, will be side-tracked, and the trade of the country will go by them instead of through them. This reciprocity arrangement will decrease the business of the railways which is looked to to pay the dividends to the stockholders. Winnipeg, Port

Arthur, Fort William, Collingwood, Owen Sound, Meaford, Midland, Sarnia, will, if this reciprocity arrangement is passed be seriously injured—and when you injure these towns you injure the surrounding country—and the United States cities like Detroit, Chicago, Superior, Minneapolis, St. Paul, will improve just in proportion as our Canadian towns deteriorate. This arrangement will give the fruit raisers and garden vegetable producers a bad blow, and in this industry to-day in Canada an immense amount of money is invested and a great number of people employed in its pursuit. The fruit growers of British Columbia and Ontario have with no uncertain voice told the Prime Minister the injury that will be done to their industry if this arrangement is sanctioned, but the government turned a deaf ear to them, and the Prime Minister told them they had come too late. Surely it is never too late to mend ; surely until the die is finally cast it is not too late to retrieve this step which is calculated to do so much injury to our country. Then, the lumbermen have said that it will injure their business and they ought to be the best judges of that. The fine lumber for which the Americans receive a good price will be consumed in the American market and the coarse lumber will be thrown into Canada, to the detriment of the Canadian lumbermen in Ontario, British Columbia, Quebec, and the maritime provinces. This reciprocal trade arrangement will give the American manufacturer access to the natural resources of Canada, and a greater supply of raw material to keep their factories running and employ labour on the American side. The other day we were told by the Finance Minister that the Americans would have no more advantages under this arrangement, in the future than they have had in the past, but listen to what President Taft said in his message to Congress :

We have on the north of us a country contiguous to us for 3,000 miles with its natural resources of the same character as ours which have not been drawn upon as ours have been, and in the development of which the conditions as to wages and character of wage earners and transportation to market, differ but little from those prevailing with us. The difference is not greater than between different states of our own country or between different provinces of the Dominion of Canada. Ought we not then to arrange a commercial agreement with Canada if we can by which we shall have direct access to our great supply of natural products without an obstructing or prohibitory tariff.

And yet in the face of such language from President Taft the Minister of Finance tells us that this reciprocity agreement will give the Americans no better advantages than heretofore in the rich inheritance of our forests and other natural resources. President Taft continues :

Ought we not now, therefore, before their policy has become too crystallized and fixed for a change, meet them in a spirit of real concession, facilitate commerce between the two countries and thus greatly increase the natural resources available to our people?

That is what Taft says, and that is what he hopes to gain, and now will the Minister of Finance pretend that the arrangement will not give the Americans access to our forest wealth? President Taft further says :

The currents of business and the transportation facilities that will be established forward and back across the border cannot but enure to the benefit of the boundary states.

Mark that language well. And just in proportion as this inures to the benefit of the boundary states, to a like extent it will injure Canadian cities, towns and provinces. President Taft goes on:

Some readjustments may be needed, but in a very short period the advantage of the free commercial exchange between communities separated only by short distances will strikingly manifest itself. That the broadening of the sources of food supplies, that the opening of the timber resources of the Dominion to our needs, that the addition to the supply of raw materials, will be limited to no particular section does not require demonstration.

If it does not require any demonstration on his part, it ought to suggest to us the danger that we encounter if we adopt this proposed treaty. What will it do ? It will give the raw materials of our country to keep labour employed in the United States. What will it do more than that ? We are told by one of their most eminent men, that because of the obstructions at the boundary line, $350,000,000 of United States capital have been invested in Canada during the last few years, to establish in this country branches of American factories, because they could not otherwise get access to the markets of Canada. That meant the employment of our mechanics and artisans and an immense increase in the wealth of our country. The same man said: We need to do something to stop that great influx of capital from our country into Canada. Do we, in Canada, want to stop that ? I say we do not. This measure will make ultimately for commercial union with the United States. It will weaken the tie that binds us to the mother country. Some say that it will not affect us one iota. On that point let me quote one or two American writers and speakers. President Taft's speech in Columbus, Ohio, elaborated as follows:

The greatest reason for adopting this agreement is the fact that it is going to unite two countries with kindred people and lying together across a wide continent in a commer-

cial and social union, to the great advantage of both.

How long afterwards will they be kept apart politically? I say that commercial and social union inevitably ripens into something more—ultimately into political union. Then, I take Mr. Wilson, the United States Secretary of Agriculture. He is equally frank as in his addressed letters to the farmers of the republic, he assures them that:

> The removal of the duties on Canadian products will do them no harm, and that the great feature of the compact is that under it our relations with Canada will be more intimate and we will become more and more one people.

One people commercially, one people socially, one people politically, if that is not leading us away from our ties of loyalty to the mother country, I do not know what English language means. The Detroit 'Free Press' says:

> That the principal merit of the agreement is political and social. It will, it is hoped, and confidently expected, be the beginning of the end of the stupid separation of two halves of a continent which is inhabited by substantially one people.

If I know what the English language means, I say that there is but one interpretation to be placed on this, and it is that it means ultimate political union. Then, the 'Free Press' of Milwaukee, says:

> The terms of the agreement will be viewed by some people from the standpoint of the pocket book, but the man of larger vision will regard it not only in the light of its present effect but in the light of its future fruitage. Thus viewed, a reciprocity agreement with Canada assumes a significance far transcending even its great promise of benefaction to the living people of these neighbouring nations.

It means a union of the two countries in the future. I said that it will tend inevitably to weaken the tie that binds us to the mother country. I have here a speech made by Mr. Austen Chamberlain, at Birmingham, a short time ago, and I wish to quote from it briefly, to show how the subject is viewed over there. To my mind, he has voiced the situation very correctly. He says:

> What is going to be the effect upon the trade of our city of such an arrangement as this? I cannot doubt that it will be serious. I cannot doubt that, whilst depriving us of advantages which Canadian imperial patriotism has hitherto afforded us, whilst depriving us of those, it will expose us to a new and an additional and a more eager competition from the United States of America. In the first place, the purchase from Canada of its grain and raw material, creating a new trade route, will bring back the trade route a stream of manufactured articles; and I cannot help saying that, as I think of this agreement, I come more and more to the conclusion that the American policy of conservation of its natural resources is turning into a policy for the exploitation by American capitalists and American manufacturers of the national resources of Canada. It must increase enormously the competitive power of America in the world's trade, and its export power as well as its domestic production. And as its new ties become more firmly established, as new interests grow up under them, I feel that the independent national growth of Canada, within the British Empire, will be seriously menaced by the overwhelming strength and the overwhelming wealth of its great neighbour. As the years roll by, as the north and south trade develops, as the transport interests become greater and ever greater, the hold of the American upon the Canadian market will become closer; his grip upon Canada will be firmer, and the national development in which we all rejoice, the material development to which we have looked forward, will be hampered, if it be not jeopardized, by the growing competition of continental ties.

I take up the speech of Mr. Asquith when answering in the English House of Commons the speech of Mr. Balfour, and in that speech we find illustrated the callous indifference of our government to the great policy of inter-imperial preferential trade to which we ought to look forward knowing what it would do for us. What does Mr. Asquith say:

> I come to the main point in the debate. The charge against the government is that during all these years the Dominion has been knocking at our door, that we have turned a deaf ear to her appeal, and that the first-fruits of our indifference and neglect are to be found in this agreement between Canada and the United States of America, which the leader of the opposition tells us, if ratified, will be a disaster to the empire. Well, but have they been knocking at our door? What do they themselves say? Sir W. Laurier, speaking at Nelson on August 30 last, said: 'It is not the policy of the Canadian government to ask Great Britain to change her fiscal policy one iota. (Ministerial cheers.) We make our arrangements to suit our own interests, and so it is with Great Britain.'

Mr. Asquith gave that statement of our Prime Minister as an answer to the contention of the leader of the opposition in the British House of Commons that Canada had been knocking at its door for imperial preferential trade, that she had been knocking in vain and was now about to make a tie which would alienate her affections from the mother country and seriously cripple every chance of bringing about that inter-imperial trade. Am I not justified therefore, in saying that this proposed reciprocal arrangement with the United States will operate to our disadvantage? It will give American manufacturers command of the timber resources of Canada, it

will give them a greater supply of raw material to keep their own establishments going, it will give employment to labour in the United States and deprive Canadians of that labour in their own country, and will make undoubtedly for commercial union. In every way it will operate to our disadvantage. It will weaken the ties that bind us to the mother country. In the face of all these facts, why should this scheme be forced on the Canadian people against their will and desire? What is impelling the government to take this course? They say they do not desire to make this a political issue. Neither do the opposition. We have endeavoured to keep this question as much as possible out of the arena of party politics, and have it discussed solely on its merits. On every side we have protests against it. The boards of trade in Toronto and Montreal, Halifax, Vancouver, Winnipeg and a dozen other towns and cities have pronounced against it in the strongest possible language. The most eminent and influential men in the public life of this country have declared against it in the most unmistakable terms. The great financial magnates of this country, our professional men, our great manufacturers, our railway and transportation interests, our agricultural interests—all these have come out most emphatically in opposition to this policy yet it is being forced on the country all the same. Why force it through this parliament? Why not submit the question to the people before the die is cast, and it is too late to retreat? I challenge the government to do that, and will be willing to abide by the decision of the people and offer no more objection.

Canada values her own interests very highly and desires to have that commercial freedom in the future which she enjoys at present. Canada is now enjoying a prosperity she has not had for years. Her products are abundant, her granaries are overflowing, she has profitable markets for all she has to sell at home as well as outside. Canada produces nothing which she cannot now dispose of readily at remunerative prices, her people are happily employed, and are being paid good wages and what more can she want? Our railways and other transportation companies are taxed to the utmost to carry on the commerce of our country and are earning large dividends from year to year; our banks are overflowing; our factories are unable to cope with the orders they receive and are obliged to enlarge their premises from year to year, and we have others being established in order to supply the great demand which exists at remunerative prices in our own market. Why then should the government carry on this flirtation with Miss Jonathan? We are making money in every line, we are rapidly becoming rich, and our people are strong and vigorous in their physical manhood and national life. Why then continue that flirtation with Miss Jonathan? Our Finance Minister seems to have become infatuated with her appearance. Her attractiveness has captured his fancy and he seems disposed to carry on that flirtation and lead us into an alliance from which there will be no escape. He is today in the garden of Eden enjoying all the luxuries which the finances of this Dominion can procure, he is now revelling in the milk and honey of political life, but if he persists in carrying on this flirtation, until it results in the fruition he desires, he will find himself in the position of that Irishman who was advised to go and get married. This man was employed as a gardener by a lady who owned a beautiful place and was much pleased with the manner in which he cared for her garden. Why, said she, you are a fine gardener, and I have kept you many years at good wages, but although you earn good wages and at the entrance to those grounds there is a commodious house to occupy if you only get married, I think it is your duty, under the circumstances, to get married, and I have told you often that my desire is that you should do so. You are here very much as Adam was in the garden of Eden. When the Almighty put Adam in that garden to till the soil, he saw that it was not well for man to live alone and he got him a helpmate. Do you not think that you should also get a helpmate? Did you not go to school when a boy and did you not hear the story of Adam? The Irishman replied: Faix, ma'am I did hear that well. Don't you think Adam was no better gardener than you, and had no better place? Don't you think that you should go and do likewise? Faix, ma'am, I remember it very well, and I remember he didn't hould his job long after he got her, but the Lord turned him out to wander up and down upon the earth. So it will be with the Finance Minister, if this comely face and attractive form and immense wealth win him away from the trust given him by the people of Canada. He may make this matrimonial engagement, but it will be with him as the Irishman said of Adam in the garden—not long after he will lose his job and will be turned out to wander up and down upon the earth.

What does Canada want to-day? Canada enjoys freedom and desires to have that freedom continued. Canada desires to be left alone; she does not wish to be a slave to either man or nation. She desires to have the full benefit of her own country and the bountiful resources with which nature has provided here from the sustenance of man and beast. She desires to be left alone to work out her own problems and her own destiny and to develop her national, commercial and financial life as she has been doing. This is the desire of

Canada and her sons of whom Robert Reid, the poet of Canada has said:

Sing me a song of the great Dominion;
Soul felt words for a patriot's ear;
Ring out boldly the well turned measure
Voicing your notes that the world may hear;
Here is no stravelling—Heaven forsaken—
Shrinking aside where the nations throng;
Proud as the proudest she moves among them—
Worthy is she of a noble song.
Sing me the worth of each Canadian—
Roamer in wilderness, toiler in town—
Search earth over you will find none stauncher,
Whether his hands be white or brown;
Come of a right good stock to start with,
Best of the world's blood in each vein;
Lords of ourselves, and slaves to no one,
For us or from us, you'll find we're—men.

And Canada desires, with her men, to be left alone to work out that destiny that she has been working out so bravely for the years of the past. And if the present government do not allow her to go on in her own way with her own development, there will come a fearful day of reckoning for them as soon as the Canadian people have an opportunity to speak their mind upon this question.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). Mr. Chairman, I shall crave the indulgence of the committee for a short time to express to the House and the country the arguments that offer themselves to me in favour of the policy wisely pursued by this government and cheerfully held by the best elements of this country of ours. I hope that in the few remarks I intend to make I shall approach this subject dispassionately. It is one of those issues of national importance which naturally should bar out any party spirit and any dissonant accents; because, Mr. Chairman, speaking of reciprocity of trade between Canada and the United States of America can only mean discussing the development, the progress, the ultimate grandeur of both countries.

I have listened, as I listen always, with great interest and great attention to my old and genial friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I paid careful attention to his tale of woe. When I refer to my hon. friend as an old friend, I only mean that he is one of the old members of the House of Commons. It is one of the privileges of old age to become at times sentimental, reminiscent and even witty. My hon. friend in his tale of woe, has interspersed that tale with reminiscences of the past, with a little sentiment expressed at times in poetical quotation, and with a few witticisms, from the south of Ireland I suppose. In the closing sentences, and even at the beginning of his speech, he stated in a very manly way—forgetting the immediate past—that this Canada of ours had good markets, had good times, and that we should let this country work out its own destiny. Without discussing all the points raised by my hon. friend in his very interesting, very witty and very sentimental speech, let me tell him that I take issue with him on this point. Granted that we have good times, but our policy is to have better times; granted that we have good markets, which we of the Liberal party have created during the past 14 years; but we want better markets. And so, while accepting what my hon. friend said, I will put it this way: Let Canada, with better times and better markets, work out its own destiny under the aegis of the British Crown. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is full of fears as to the future of this young country, I am full of hope as to the future of this country of ours. And as he has quoted a little poetry let me remind him of the beautiful words of Tennyson, the great poet laureate, in speaking of the grandeur of England, and of the still greater hopes of that country:

We sailed wherever ships can sail,
We founded many a mighty state;
Pray God our greatness may not fail
Thro' craven fear of being great!

And I must say at once, that this can be addressed as much to myself as to my hon. friend. Sentiment, however, is a sorry substitute for sound argument. I am reminded of this old English truism by the fact that my hon. friend in his many reminiscences, in his sentimental moods, whilst unbiassed by party politics, as he stated from the beginning, paid his compliments to the old National Policy. I do not blame my hon. friend, he was a faithful supporter of the old chieftain, Sir John A. Macdonald. But has he forgotten that when Sir John A. Macdonald introduced in 1879 the National Policy before this parliament, he inserted a clause in the statute, whereby a reciprocal offer was made to the United States of America? The reciprocity offer did not work, and we remained with the high protective wall raised by the Conservative party in 1879 until 1896. What is the tale of woe of that policy adopted in 1879? I say that sentiment is a sorry substitute for sound facts and sound arguments. It is rather remarkable that I should lecture, if he will allow me, my old friend from East Grey, and tell him, I, a Frenchman, that I have more faith in facts and figures than in poetry, when discussing a financial question. What did the National Policy do during the 18 years of office of the Conservative party? Under the National Policy, from 1879 until 1884, the rate of increase of exports of Canadian produce was 17 per cent; from 1884 to 1889, 7 per cent; from 1889 to 1896, 29 per cent: and from 1896 to 1901 during our tenure

of office, 78 per cent. The aggregate foreign trade of Canada increased under the National Policy, from 1878 to 1884, at the rate of 20 per cent, a good start; but from 1884 to 1890, it increased 5 per cent, a decrease of 15 per cent; from 1890 to 1896, 9 per cent, a slight increase; but under the Liberal policy from 1896 to 1902, it increased 77 per cent. You have there the record of both parties in each their fiscal policy.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. minister give the figures from 1902 to 1910?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have not these figures at hand, but they can be given to my hon. friend, I am sure, during the course of this debate. My hon. friend will understand from the position he occupies in the ranks of his party, that we, on this side of the House, I, at all events, do not object to his criticism of the measure, which is now engaging the attention of the House. The opposition is a necessary part of the machinery of constitutional government. The opposition is bound to watch the affairs of the country, the conduct of the government, the conduct of public business. The opposition, under our constitutional government, is bound to criticise, and it is in the interests of the country that it should criticise. It must find fault with the government. That is the chief occupation of my hon. friend, and I do not blame him for that. I was myself born in opposition. I wished, when I was elected for the first time to the House of Commons, that I had sat a few years where my hon. friend now graces the seat he occupies. But let me remind my hon. friends that our fiscal policy, as this reciprocity agreement with the United States, has always been unjustly criticised by the hon. gentlemen opposite. If they had been satisfied with criticism, I would not object, but they fall into that very bad habit of making predictions. There is no worse thing in public life, than adding a prediction to a criticism. Might I remind my hon. friend of the speech, the very remarkable speech, he made in this House some 10 or 12 years ago, when I was still a young man, when the Yukon railway project was brought before parliament? I never heard such a prediction as the one formulated that fateful afternoon by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Does he not remember describing Mackenzie & Mann reaping every year in the wilds of the Yukon territory, crops after crops of gold as a result of the arrangement they had made with the Canadian government? If I remind my hon. friend of the predictions he made at that time, it is only to emphasize this fact, that on all great issues, whilst it is the duty of the opposition to criticise and find fault with the policy of the government, in order to enlighten the minds of the country and to give a little courage to the Conservative party in the country, yet, Sir, the opposition should not venture to predict and to prophesy, because it becomes a very bad piece of business when facts come a few months afterwards to defeat the arguments propounded by the prophets. Speaking only of our fiscal policy, which, in the words of my hon. friend a moment ago, is a monument to this Liberal government, because as he described the condition of affairs in this country, we have good times, we have good markets, and Canada should proceed to work out its own destiny. Does not my hon. friend remember the words spoken by the honoured leader of the opposition when the British preference was introduced in this House by the present Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding)? Does he not remember the words spoken by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the financial critic of the opposition? I shall not refer to the old Cumberland war horse, to that great Canadian statesman, Sir Charles Tupper, when he said in the House:

> The result is that this tariff goes into operation and the hon. gentleman knows that the industries of this country are already paralyzed in consequence, while honourable members gloat over the destruction of Canadian industries. I was reading the wail, the sorrowful wail, of those industries in the Montreal 'Gazette,' where one manufacturer after another declared that those industries were ruined, that their mills must close, and that they saw staring them in the face a return to the deplorable state of things that existed when the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House was in charge of the fiscal policy of this country. I say that a deeper wrong was never inflicted upon Canada.

These are the words, this was the prediction, made by the leader of the Conservative party in 1897, when the British preferential arrangement was proposed to this House. But, what said the financial critic of the opposition, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), then member for either Kings or York? He said:

> Is it right, is it fair, is it statesmanlike to allow this young and growing industrial life and development to be hampered and shackled, if not totally destroyed by invoking a competition on the basis of a reduction of duty to the extent of .25 per cent in favour of these countries that may come if the standard is as I have said and we have not a word to the contrary from the government.

The hon. member for Kings then, now for North Toronto, was prophesying that the industries of this young country would be hampered and shackled if that British preference came into existence. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), then one of the young members of the House—we were elected the same

year—in 1896, discussing the same measure, said:

What is this noble contribution of 25 per cent——

to British trade and British industries.

—the noble contribution is this that the hon. gentlemen opposite, without taking the trouble, in an important matter of this kind, to ascertain whether they were right or wrong, have seen fit to take a step which can, to my mind, have only one of two results: either it is bound to bring this country into direct conflict with the mother country on this point, or else it is bound to bring the mother country into direct conflict with Germany. One or the other of these results may follow.

We were declaring war on the industries of Great Britain, we were hampering and shackling Canadian industries, we were creating a scare—yes, 13 or 14 years ago we were anticipating the scare of last year—we were creating a real scare between Great Britain and Germany because forsooth we were giving a British preference of 25 per cent. This emphasizes the fact that it is very dangerous to make predictions.

Now, let us come to the arguments which are invoked in favour of this measure. First of all let us rise to the height of the question, let us rise to the height of Canada, let us not belittle our country, let us trust ourselves in this bargain with the United States. Sir, the wealth of Canada baffles all description. Our resources are enormous, are unbounded, our development during the last fifteen years—I maintain the expression fifteen years, which I used at the manufacturers' banquet, because I want to give just a little slice of these good times to my hon. friends opposite—our development during the last fifteen years has been unprecedented. To make a short inventory of the resources of Canada, let me say that it is a country as big as Europe 111,000 square miles, larger than the United States, it could absorb the United States, the United States materially could not absorb Canada; it is a country thirty times as large as the United Kingdom, eighteen times as large as Germany, extending over 40 parallels of latitude, with resources the like of which are not known in any other country in this wide world; we have the greatest timber resources in the world, 550,000,000 feet of standing timber; wheat fields 600 miles wide, 1,000 miles long, waiting ready for the plough, not less than 190,000,000 acres of wheat land; we have 12,500 miles of coast fisheries, 250 miles of which are in the beautiful county of Gaspé; we have 440,000 miles of fresh water fisheries; in coal alone, according to the statistics of the Department of the Interior, 172,000,000,000 tons; in gold we have produced the worth of $260,000,000; in silver we occupy third place in the world; in nickel we have three-fifths of the world's supply; in 1901, of pig iron we produced 160,000,000 tons, in 1904, 509,000,000 tons; we have estimated water-powers available to the extent of 25,000,000 horse-power. Sir, I think it will not appear ludicrous if I give this short inventory of the resources of our country.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition the other day concluded his speech by saying that his motto was: Let well enough alone. I say that with such collossal natural resources, with such a heritage, and with such a future, we can well afford to say: Not let well enough alone, but let us open wide the gates of our country, let us not be afraid to bargain and to trade with our neighbours.

Thanks to a wise immigration policy, our great west is filling rapidly with the best elements of the white people of this world. Not to speak of the two old races in Canada, the English and the French—and when I mention the English, I wish to include my friends from Ireland, from Scotland, from Wales, and I hope that the flag shall wave on St. David's day—not to speak of the last two races which I claim come from the best stock in the world, I say that we have a good element in the other races that are filling up rapidly our virgin soil in the far west. Therefore, Sir, we should not be afraid with such a population, ever and ever increasing, to trade with the United States of America. Not speaking of my own countrymen, but of the English race in Canada, it is the descendants of that hardy race which, in the last two or three hundred years, has conquered all the best markets in the world. Great Britain is not afraid to trade east and west, north and south, not afraid to trade with the United States, not afraid to trade with the Latin republics, not afraid to compete with Germany, with her high tariff wall, not afraid to compete her colonies with those nations which are slowly conquering the deepest recesses of the wild continents of the earth.

Great Britain, that nation of shop-keepers as it was so aptly described by Napoleon Bonaparte; Great Britain by trading with the whole world, by leaving her doors open to all comers has not lost her autonomy. The British race is still the hardy race it was 300 years ago, and I believe that for centuries to come it will continue to lead the world. Canada is looking for markets for her enormous surplus products. We are subsidizing steamship lines east and west and north and south; we are bonusing the construction of railways; we are establishing commercial agencies in the United States, in France, in Belgium, in Germany, in Italy, in Japan, in Australia, in China, and in

Africa. At Durban in Natal I was met by a young Canadian from Ontario who represents there the commercial interests of the Dominion. We have an agent at Cape Town, and I trust the government will soon have an agency in British South Africa—a colony founded only yesterday but which already under the governorship of Sir Percy Girouard a French Canadian is producing enormous quantities of cotton and coffee and tea, and will be able to buy and consume in large quantity the products of Canada. And, if we are subsidizing steamship lines, and bonusing the construction of railways, and appointing commercial agents in the four corners of the earth, why should we refuse an invitation to trade with the United States ; an invitation which by the way came this time from Washington to Ottawa, and did not go from Ottawa to Washington. Why in the name of common sense should we refuse to develop our commerce with the 95,000,000 of neighbours to the south of us, the greatest consuming people in the world?

The policy of reciprocity with the United States is not new. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is an old parliamentarian, and having read the history of our commercial ventures he knows full well that ever since the fight for responsible government in Canada the question of a reciprocity agreement with the United States has always been the first article in the programme of both political parties. Let me recite briefly the circumstances under which the first reciprocity treaty was negotiated. And my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) having given what I think to be a biased recital, may I be permitted to give my version of the history of trade negotiations between the United States and Canada for the last 50 years. We know that when Lord Elgin came as Governor General in 1847, it was just one year after the repeal of the corn laws in England ; laws under which Canada in a degree benefited by a preferential tariff in the mother country. If the corn laws were not completely repealed in 1847 it was because Sir Robert Peel had provided a gradual sliding scale which delayed the result for some years. In 1847 when Lord Elgin assumed the governorship of Canada we were fresh from a revolution; discord and discontent were abroad in the land, and in 1849, the Rebellion Losses Bill was passed, and the parliament buildings burned in Montreal, and Lord Elgin stoned in his carriage on his way to Monklands. A few months afterwards when the sliding scale had run its course, and the corn laws were completely abolished, there was in Canada a deep sentiment of distrust in the mother country because forsooth the Canadians of those days thought they were not supported by the mother country as they ought to be. Then was published the annexation manifesto to which memorable document was attached names famous in Canadian history—Sir John Abbott, Sir David Macpherson, Luther Holton, A. A. Dorion, Sir John Rose ; I need not mention others. At this juncture the leading men in both political parties appeared ready to pass under the stars and stripes because, as I said, there was a deep sentiment of distrust caused by the friction in trade relations between Canada and the mother land. It is a notable thing that the only time there ever seemed to be any annexation sentiment in Canada was a time when we were refused the advantages of a reciprocity treaty with the neighbouring republic. Need I remind the House, however, that our predecessors in political life were labouring under a delusion, and that the statesmen of Britain were not averse to a reciprocity treaty between Canada and the United States. They had more faith in the loyalty of the Canadians of that day than has my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in the loyalty of his fellow countrymen of to-day. I hold in my hand an historic document which I have obtained from the archives, it being a letter of instructions from Lord Grey to Lord Elgin, Lord Grey was colonial secretary, and writing to Lord Elgin on his assumption of the Governor Generalship of Canada, and within a week of Lord Elgin's departure, under date Downing Street, 31st December, 1846, he said :

> This is an occasion upon which I cannot with propriety enter into any discussion of the grounds upon which this change of policy has been adopted.
>
> But without doing so I may express my firm conviction that eventually the welfare of the colonies even more than that of the mother country will be promoted by the abandonment of a system of artificial restrictions upon trade. Looking to the great natural advantages possessed by the British colonies, and especially by the fine provinces of North America, I cannot doubt that adopting a policy of which the object is to render industry productive by leaving it to follow its natural channels of employment, and by affording every possible facility to commerce, must lead to their rapid advancement in wealth and prosperity.

So Lord Grey, in his instructions to Lord Elgin, on the very day after the Canadian rebellion, on the very day when the Corn Laws were repealed in England, was advising the Governor General to give to Canada the benefit of a convention with the United States of America, to do away with the artificial barriers existing between those two countries, so as to develop trade and industry, so as to make the colonies of North America prosperous provinces. As a result of the annexation manifesto, Lord Elgin proceeded to Washington and negotiated the famous

Elgin-Marcy Treaty, which lasted from 1854 to 1866. What was the effect of that reciprocity between Canada and the United States? Turning to the reports published in those days, I find that the exports of the various provinces to the United States in 1854 amounted to $10,473,000; in 1855, the year following the treaty, they amounted to $19,368,000, and in 1866, the last year of the treaty, they amounted to $39,950,000, so that in 12 years the exports from Canada to the United States increased 280 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member may have overlooked the fact that on account of the depreciation of American currency, the exports seemed to be very much larger than they really were. Greenbacks were standing then at about 58.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. These are the values of the exports in gold.

Mr. SPROULE. American currency was not on a gold basis.

Mr. LEMIEUX. At all events, the men who lived between 1854 and 1866 duly appreciated the vast importance of that treaty. Listen to what Sir Alexander Galt, who was the Minister of Finance, said when that treaty came to an end on the 17th of March, 1866:

If we require to find an example of the benefits of free commercial intercourse, we need not look beyond the effects that have followed from the working of the reciprocity treaty with the United States. In one short year from the time when that treaty came into operation, our trade in the natural productions of the two countries swelled from less than $2,000,000 to upwards of $10,000,000 per annum, and now, when we are threatened with an interruption of that trade—when we have reason to fear that the action of the United States will prove hostile to the continuance of free commercial relations with this country, when we know that the consideration of this question is not grounded on just views of the material advantages resulting to each country, but that the irritation connected with political events exercises a predominant influence over the minds of American statesmen, it is the duty of the House to provide, if possible, other outlets for our productions.

And Sir John Bourinot, who for many years occupied the position of clerk of this House, but who is probably better known as a great historian of Canada, in his sketch of Lord Elgin, described the results of that treaty in the following terms:

Not only was a large and remunerative trade secured between the United States and the provinces but the social and friendly intercourse of the two countries necessarily increased with the expansion of commercial relations and the creation of common interests between them. Old antipathies and misunderstandings disappeared under the influence of conditions which brought these communities together and made each of them place a higher estimate on the other's good qualities.

Sir, I prefer this appreciation of Sir John Bourinot, who was a descendant of a United Empire Loyalist family, to the appreciation given this evening by my hon. and loyal friend from East Grey. I know that my hon. friend is loyal to his country; I know that he has faith in his fellow-countrymen, but I could not help thinking this evening, when he was describing his fear of the effects of this treaty on the social and political conditions of Canada in the future, that my hon. friend was, perhaps, more loyal at times to his political party than to his country. Sir, what was the opinion of Canada respecting the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty in 1866? My hon. friend is speaking of the evil effects of that treaty 40 or 50 years after its abrogation, but the men who lived in those days, the men who were at the head of affairs in this country, who piloted the ship of state, thought otherwise. I hold in my hand a Minute of Council adopted on the 19th of February, 1864. Canada was then under the Union. The meeting of Council was held in Quebec, and there were present the Hon. Mr. Thibaudeau, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Dorion, Mr. McDougall, Mr. Fergusson Blair, Mr. Holton, Mr. (afterwards Sir Oliver) Mowat, Mr. Letellier de St. Just, Mr. Huntington and Mr. Laframboise—all names of good old Liberals, loyalists and patriots if ever there were loyalists and patriots in this country. This Minute of Council reads as follows:

Certified copy of a report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 19th February, 1864.

The committee of the Executive Council deem it to be their duty to represent to Your Excellency——

His Excellency, Lord Monk——

—that the recent proceedings in the Congress of the United States respecting the reciprocity treaty have excited the deepest concern in the minds of the people of this province.

Those proceedings have had for their avowed object the abrogation of the treaty at the earliest moment consistent with the stipulation of the instrument itself.

Although no formal action indicative of the strength of the party hostile to the continuance of the treaty has yet taken place, information of an authentic character as to the opinions and purposes of influential public men in the United States has forced upon the committee the conviction that there is imminent danger of its speedy abrogation unless prompt and vigorous steps be taken by Her Majesty's imperial advisers to avert what would be generally regarded by the people of Canada as a great calamity.

The committee would specially bring under Your Excellency's notice the importance of instituting negotiations for the renewal of the treaty with such modifications as may be mutually assented to before the year's notice required to terminate it shall be given by the American government, for they fear that the notice if once given could not be revoked, and they clearly foresee that owing to the variety and possibly the conflictory nature of the interests involved on our own side, a new treaty could not be concluded and the requisite legislation to give effect to it be obtained before the year would have expired and with it the treaty.

Under such circumstances, even with the certain prospect of an early renewal of the treaty, considerable loss and much inconvenience would inevitably ensue.

It would be impossible to express in figures with any approach to accuracy the extent to which the facilities of commercial intercourse created by the reciprocity treaty have contributed to the wealth and prosperity of this province, and it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance which the people of Canada attach to the continued enjoyment of these facilities.

Nor is the subject entirely devoid of political significance, under the beneficent operation of the system of self-government which the later policy of the mother country has accorded to Canada in common with the other colonies possessing representative institutions combined with the advantages secured by the reciprocity treaty of an unrestricted commerce with our nearest neighbour in the natural productions of the two countries, all agitation for organic changes has ceased, all dissatisfaction with the existing political relations of the province has wholly disappeared although the committee would grossly misrepresent their countrymen if they were to affirm that their loyalty to their Sovereign would be diminished in the slightest degree by the withdrawal, through the unfriendly action of a foreign government of mere commercial privileges however valuable these might be deemed, they think they cannot err in directing the attention of the enlightened statesmen who wield the destinies of the great empire of which it is the proudest boast of Canadians that their country forms a part, to the connection which is usually found to exist between the material prosperity and the political contentment of a people; for in doing so they feel that they are appealing to the highest motives that can actuate patriotic statesmen, the desire to perpetuate a Dominion founded on the affectionate allegiance of a prosperous and contented people.

This is the statement embalmed in a minute of council by the men who represented public opinion, who represented the best interests of Canada, on the eve of the abrogation of the famous reciprocity treaty which lasted from 1854 to 1866. That treaty was abrogated, but I come again to my first proposition, and I say that since its abrogation there have been repeated efforts made by every government, every Minister of Finance in this country, to obtain a similar commercial agreement between the United States and Canada. Several attempts at renewals were made. The first were made by Sir Alexander T. Galt, Sir John Rose, Sir Francis Hincks, and in 1874 by the Hon. George Brown; and last but not the least was the attempt made by one of the giants of Canadian public life, Sir John Alexander Macdonald.

My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), referring to the campaign of 1891, said that Sir John Macdonald then declared that if Canada would again return him to power, he would be ready to again approach the American authorities on this question, and particularly Mr. Blaine who was then Secretary of State in the United States, in order to obtain a renewal of the treaty of 1854. In this my hon. friend is right, but where he was wrong was when he said that the policy of reciprocity was defeated at the polls in 1891. It was not. The policy which was defeated at the polls in 1891 was quite different from that of the present government. The policy of the present government is a restricted policy of reciprocity.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not that exactly what I said, namely, that the Reform party went to the country on unrestricted reciprocity, and the Conservative party on a policy of limited reciprocity, and the country decided in favour of the latter.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, and now that these hon. gentleman are getting it, they are not satisfied.

Mr. SPROULE. We needed it then, but not now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What was the attitude of Sir John Macdonald in 1891? My memory of those days is evergreen because I began my political life in 1891, and addressed many meetings in the province of Quebec in favour of the policy of the Liberal party. I quite remember that from 1887 until 1891, the then leader of the opposition, who is now the leader of this government, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and Sir Richard Cartwright, Minister of Trade and Commerce, and my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), offered to this House resolution after resolution in favour of reciprocity—not of unrestricted reciprocity because that policy culminated only in 1891. But they offered resolution after resolution in favour of a policy of reciprocity of whatever form or kind with the United States. Year after year these resolutions were rejected. I shall not say that they were rejected by the servile majority of the day, but they were rejected by the followers of Sir John Macdonald from 1887 down to 1891. When, however, Sir John Macdonald saw that the tide was rising in the country and that his party would be swept by the wave of public opinion in favour of reciprocity, he suddenly, before the parliamentary term had expired, dissolved

parliament and appealed to the country on the reciprocity issue. But the statesmen in the United States, and foremost among them was the late James G. Blaine, took the precaution, for what reason I do not know—of insisting on Canada setting forth what she desired in writing. That same precaution has not been taken this time between Mr. Taft, President of the United States, and Mr. Fielding, the Minister of Finance of Canada. No written agreement was required before the negotiations began. But in those days Mr. Blaine wanted to know what the gentlemen from Canada would propose to the United States; he wanted it in black and white in order that he might know what they would discuss at Washington. And Lord Stanley, our Governor General of that day, wrote to the Colonial Secretary, Lord Knutsford, a series of questions which would be debated by the Canadian representatives with Mr. Blaine and the members of the American executive. The first question they were to debate, according to Sir John Macdonald—because although the letter is signed by His Excellency the Governor General, yet in this country, where we have responsible government, the Governor General speaks only by his Prime Minister and his cabinet—and this letter—the utterance of Sir John Macdonald—was:

> The renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, with the modifications required by altered circumstances of both countries and with the extensions by the commission deemed to be in the interest of Canada and the United States.

Then follow some other questions respecting the fisheries, the Alaskan boundary, the coasting laws and other matters. And let me say en passant, that this unrestricted reciprocity policy, which, for my part, I would not advocate to-day—because I have grown older and probably wiser—so appealed to the electorate of this Dominion, that they divided almost evenly at the polls. And remember that we, of the Liberal party, had lost the services of our great leader, Hon. Edward Blake. We were defeated, but only by a very slim majority. After the elections of 1891, if I mistake not, the majority of the Conservative party, then sitting at the right of the Chair, numbered only 19 or 20, having dwindled to that number from 50 or 60. And what appeals were made to the province of Ontario, and to the province of Quebec and other parts of the country ! It was during the last phases of Sir John Macdonald's brilliant career, his last appeal to the electors,—a British subject he was born, a British subject he would die ! The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who now leads this House had only been selected as leader of the Liberal party a few years before, in 1888 or 1889. He was not then so well known in the country as he is to-day. And he belonged to the minority. Yet, Sir, in the great province of Ontario, the majority for Sir John Macdonald in the elections of 1891, was not more than half a baker's dozen. And the province of Quebec we carried by a majority of 15. We lost in all the other provinces, except, I believe, Prince Edward Island. All this to show you that, now that we are not asking to commit this country to unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, but have receded to the sounder policy of restricted reciprocity, if parliament were dissolved, and an appeal made to the electorate of the Dominion, I have no hesitation in saying, the Liberal party would again carry the country. At all events, the policy of the Liberal party in 1891, for the many causes I have mentioned, was defeated by the electors. But, Sir, the Liberal party, in 1893, again raised the flag of reciprocity.

Mr. WRIGHT. Before the hon. gentleman leaves the elections of 1891, let me point out several points in which he has not stated the facts with accuracy. He says that in 1891 the Liberals carried the province of Quebec by a majority of 15. Quebec only gave them 5. And he is wrong also with regard to the general result.

Mr. LEMIEUX. All I know is, that the party of my hon. friend (Mr. Wright), came back to office with a largely reduced majority. And we must thank the electorate for having postponed the final victory of the Liberal party. If the Liberal party had come into power in 1891—and we were very near reaching the coveted goal—we should have inherited the effects of the National Policy; we would have been held responsible of the Black Fridays; and, no doubt, in 1896, the electorate would have done for us what they did for our opponents.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Had the Liberals come into power, would they have carried out the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux), has just said he is sorry for having advocated ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro), is a lawyer, I believe. As a lawyer, he knows that the witness cannot answer a hypothetical question, especially when it refers to past events. Let bygones be bygones. But in 1893 at the Liberal convention in Ottawa, the Liberal party once more raised the flag of reciprocity—restricted reciprocity—with the United States. We Liberals generally bow to the wishes of the electors. In the platform laid down at that convention appears the following:

That, having regard to the prosperity of Canada and the United States as adjoining countries, with many mutual interests, it is desirable that there should be the most friendly relations and broad and liberal trade intercourse between them;

That the interests alike of the Dominion and of the empire would be materially advanced by the establishing of such relations;....

That a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty would develop the great natural resources of Canada, would enormously increase the trade and commerce between the two countries, would tend to encourage friendly relations between the two peoples, would remove many causes which have in the past provoked irritation and trouble to the governments of both countries, and would promote those kindly relations between the empire and the republic which afford the best guarantee for peace and prosperity;

Since 1896, when we took office, the Liberal party has striven to open negotiations with the United States on this question of reciprocity. In 1898 or 1899 a high joint commission under the presidency of Lord Herschell proceeded to Washington and there and then discussed the question with the American statesmen. We all know why this commission did not meet again after the sittings held in the summer of 1898. We all know, it is a matter of history that it is on the question of the Alaskan boundary that it came to grief. But strange to say, in the document which I quoted a moment ago, the letter of Governor Stanley of Preston to James G. Blaine, then Secretary of State in the United States, the first question to be debated is that of a renewal of the reciprocity treaty with the United States. The Alaskan boundary question has since been settled, alas ! against the best interests of Canada. The question of the fisheries has been settled in the interests of Canada by the Hague Tribunal. The other questions pending between the United States and Canada concerning our boundaries on the lakes and rivers adjoining the United States have also been settled and now, as the crowning event, it is the first question in the letter of Governor Stanley of Preston which is settled last. We have ceased to make pilgrimages to Washington. Washington has come to Canada, and the result is the policy which is now offered to the consideration of the Canadian parliament. Mr. Chairman, I stated a moment ago that the two policies of 1891 and of 1911 are quite different. As I stated, in 1891 we were advocating unrestricted reciprocity; in 1911, we are presenting to parliament a restricted reciprocity agreement. In 1891 we were opposed by Sir John A. Macdonald and the Hon. Edward Blake, because both were opposed to the free interchange of all commodities including manufactures as well as natural products. But, Sir John Macdonald favoured the free interchange of natural products. That is mentioned in the statute of 1879, and in his last address to the electors of Canada. The Hon. Edward Blake—and by the way, I may say his distinguished brother, in a letter published in this morning's 'Globe' stands by the present policy of the Liberal government—the Hon. Edward Blake in his Durham address of 1891 opposed the policy of the Liberal party, first, because in his mind it was discriminating against British manufactures, second because Canada would become dependent on the United States for the adequacy of the Dominion revenue and third because in his mind commercial union or continental union might mean political absorption or annexation. How different from the present situation ! In the first place, there is not in this agreement a discrimination against Canadian manufacturers. There is in our fiscal policy, however, a discrimination in favour of English manufacturers. Our revenue has never been larger and it will become larger and larger as the years roll by. We are discriminating in favour of Great Britain's manufacturers.

Let me quote from a pamphlet issued by the Tariff Reform Association in England. In this pamphlet, Tariff Reform, by Mr. J. Ellis Parker, the effects of the Canadian preference in favour of British manufactures are pointed out. It says:

Before the Canadian preference, British imports into Canada constantly declined. The effect of the Canadian preferential tariff, which was introduced in 1897, upon the British export trade as a whole, and upon the individual manufacturing industries, may be seen at a glance from the following table which is taken from the report on Conditions and Prospects of British Trade in Canada, published in 1908.

Then he gives the three columns of British imports. These figures are in round numbers:

1888..	$30,848,000
1897..	20,217,000
1906..	52,615,000

Proceeding with the advantages that must inure to Canada let me mention in as few words as possible what the farmers will draw from the present agreement. The benefits from the opening of the markets of the United States to the products of Canada are so obvious and have been set forth with so much ability by those especially qualified to deal with the subject that it would be idle to again recite a catalogue of these benefits. Last year Canada exported rather more than $90,000,000 worth of agricultural products. This is nearly one-third of the total exports from this country which totalled $279,000,000. These agricultural products consisted mainly of wheat, oats and flour, and of the $90,000,000,

$71,000,000 were marketed in Great Britain whilst the United States took only $8,200,000. These figures would appear to tell us their own tale so far as the mother country is concerned, and no person listens to the tale more gladly than I do. Great Britain purchases from us as well as from all the rest of the world in great abundance. There is no index more accurate of the value of the services of her great industrial army and the consequent prosperity of a country than the extent of her purchases. But note this, whilst Great Britain sells to the whole world Great Britain buys from the four quarters of the globe. Englishmen sell where prices are highest and buy where they are lowest, and forget to ask whether, as the result of their transactions, they are less English than they were before. Canadians have the freest access to the market of Great Britain, but so have the people of every other country. We must not forget that fact. In 1908, the last year for which we have the British trade returns, Great Britain took over 16,000,000 cwts. of Canadian flour. But she took on precisely the same terms, 17,800,000 cwts. from Russia, and 20,000,000 cwts. from Argentina as well as large quantities from other countries foreign and colonial. The effect of this miscellaneous buying on the part of Britain upon the trade of Canada is well set forth in a tabulated statement prepared every year by the Montreal 'Gazette' on the business done at the port of Montreal. Let me quote on that the report of the export trade at the port of Montreal. It says:

Canada's export grain trade from the port of Montreal for the season of 1910, has been anything but a profitable one to exporters, owing to the unsettled condition of the wheat markets of the world and the keen competition that was met with from exporting countries, which tended to depress values in the English markets, frequently during the season, below prices on the Canadian market.

Mark this, Mr. Chairman. There is no question of the welcome ready for goods in the English market; if only our farmers are willing to take as low prices as the same goods can be had for from any other country. Our farmers are compelled and indeed are quite satisfied to pay their labourers wages high enough to enable them to live according to the standards of a high civilization, but the Canadian farmer will not on that account, receive one iota of advantage over the Indian, Russian or the South American farmer, who can hire labour at wages our farmers would be ashamed to pay their men.

Let us see what is the scale of wages paid in Argentina to farm hands. It is 64 cents per day, in Russia 40 to 45 cents per day, and in India 8 and 12 cents per day.

Mr. AMES. By this reciprocity treaty, do not the natural products of Argentina and Russia come free into Canada?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, I am not ready to answer my hon. friend, but I do not see what the wheat from Argentina, or Russia, or India would do in Canada when we export our surplus production. I am only a tyro in business, but surely my hon. friend will not contend for one moment that we must fear the competition of Argentina in our grain markets.

Mr. AMES. I think the hon. gentleman shows that very strongly.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Would not the same argument apply to the United States, which exports 114,000,000 bushels?

Mr. LEMIEUX. If I were in Scotland I would be willing to be heckled, but I am not in Scotland, I am in Canada. My hon. friend will find my tables and statements in 'Hansard,' and he will read, mark, learn and inwardly digest them. In Canada, according to this table—

Mr. AMES. Would my hon. friend be kind enough to repeat the wages paid in Argentina and Russia?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. The wages of labour in Argentina, Russia and India are, according to late United States consular reports, as follows, in each case without board or keep: Argentina, 64 cents per day; Russia, 40 to 45 cents per day, and India, 8 and 12 cents per day. Now, in Canada the schedule shows the rates for 1899 and for 1909, the comparison being for ten years:

The information received at the Department of Labour is to the effect that there has been no substantial change in farm wages since 1909.

I will not take all the different sections of the country, but I will take the northwest provinces. On a yearly engagement the rate is $35 per month around Winnipeg.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does that include board?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Per month, with board, during the summer season around Winnipeg; Brandon, $30 and $33; Moosejaw, $50; Calgary, $35 and $40. Now, Mr. Chairman, with these figures giving the scale of wages paid in various countries, it is easy to see that as long as we give our farm hands living wages, as long as we uphold the ideals for which we live in a white country in British North America, we cannot compete against the wages paid to the peasantry of Russia, to Indians, or to the farm hands of Argentina. I mean on the British market, not on the Canadian market.

Mr. AMES. The minister probably knows that Halifax is nearer Buenos Ayres than London.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, but Halifax is also nearer Canada, and I would like my hon. friend, with his knowledge as a member of the Board of Trade—and probably one of the protesting members of the Board of Trade—to give me the name of one firm in Halifax importing wheat from Argentina.

Mr. AMES. Of course, at the present time there is no firm in Halifax importing wheat—

Mr. LEMIEUX. Let well enough alone.

Mr. AMES. On account of the duty.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Let well enough alone! Now, with regard to the export of Canadian flour, I shall quote further from this carefully prepared report issued by the Montreal 'Gazette:'

In this department of the export trade the volume of business done during the past season has not been as large as the previous one, which has no doubt been due to some extent to the unsettled condition of the markets for raw material, and the keener competition on the part of other exporting countries for the business, and the fact that the present milling capacity of Great Britain is equal to their requirements, they having the advantage of cheaper labour, and to the fact that the raw material is carried at from 50 to 100 (sic) per cent less than the manufactured article from Canada. In fact, milling in England has reached a state of efficiency equal to that of any other country. Besides, they have the entire world to draw upon for supplies, consequently the English miller to-day is our strongest competitor in some of the importing markets.

So, Mr. Chairman, when my hon. friend says, as he stated a moment ago, that we are going to injure the milling industry of this country by this reciprocity convention, he forgets two facts. He forgets, first, that already there is a refund of duty on wheat exported from Canada to the milling industries of Minneapolis. Second, he forgets that our strongest competitor is the English miller, because the milling industry in England is better equipped and is favoured with lower wages and cheaper raw material than the same milling industry in Canada. I quote from that report, published in the Montreal 'Gazette:'

For the year ending 31st March, 1910, Canada exported $14,900,000 worth of flour, of which $8,900,000 went to the English market.

It would seem, therefore, from this most reliable journal that the retention of the present body of trade with England in flour is quite problematic, and indeed the writer did not scruple to suggest that with her several advantages, notably the employment of cheaper labour than could be got in Canada, Great Britain may be able to wrest from us some of our present markets. So it will be seen that the old mother country is not yet asleep, and I will be able to show that the centuries tilled soil of Great Britain to-day gives a greater yield per acre of wheat than does the virgin soil of Canada. Our resources vast in extent will compel us for a long time to come to seek markets for them, and we have formidable rivals in Argentina, Russia and India. In 1909 with a population almost the same as that of Canada or probably somewhat less, Argentina had an export trade of $397,000,000 against Canada's export trade of $243,000,000 for the same year. Argentina resembles Canada in having an enormous extent of disposable land fit for cultivation. She, Argentina, already exports more agricultural products to Great Britain than does Canada, and there is no possible limit to the expansion of her trade on these lines. Russia, both in Europe and Asia has great stretches of territory available for agriculture and there are other countries coming to be our rivals in the British market, and which have this great advantage over Canada that they have a class of labour which does not exist in this country, a white country, and which truth to tell we do not want. In North America we have a great white population living up to the same standards of civilization. We pay in Canada about the same wages as are paid in the northern and western states of the union, and therefore, we are on a common ground where as rivals we can meet and compete. This enlarged market in the United States will be only another string to our bow. When the prices in the markets of Great Britain are high enough to attract our natural products there will be no reluctance on our part to ship our goods to Great Britain. There is no fear but that the movement towards the mother country will in the future be as it has been in the past, and that taking into account our rapid expansion there will be a steadily increasing surplus of products which must find their outlet in the British market. If our farmers should profit greatly by the new arrangement, as I believe they will, the influx into our prairies from Europe and the United States, of farmers desiring to share these profits, will produce surplus enough to keep prices reasonably low and provide great stores for export. The fear is expressed that our trade will not follow the same route from east to west, but that it will take to channels north to south. This could only take place if the United States consumed all the cattle and wheat and different products we have to sell, and if we on our part replaced the British and European wares we have been accustomed to purchase by wares of a similar character from the United States. This, of course,

is most improbable, and it is only possible when the products of the ill-paid peasants of India, Russia, and South America bring down the price in the British market to a point at which our farmers cannot sell their products at a profit sufficient to enable them and their neighbours to live in the comforts to which they have been accustomed. But, shall we lose the traffic from east to west? The opinion of Sir Donald Mann, one of the great railway builders of Canada is that we will not. The opinion of Sir William Van Horne at one time president of the great Canadian Pacific railway does not sustain that view that we shall. Some years ago a committee was appointed by the Senate to inquire into the feasibility of the Georgian Bay canal, and Sir William Van Horne appeared before that committee and although the Georgian Bay canal when built will take from the railway a vast amount of a certain class of freight, Sir William Van Horne did not oppose the scheme, but on the contrary gave it his strong support. Like this reciprocity agreement, it would add he said to the prosperity of the western farmer and lumberman, and he declared it to be his opinion that the canal would in that way contribute to the business of his railway far more than it took from it. The greater prosperity of the people, whether due to cheaper transportation of grain through the canals or because of higher prices due to reciprocity, means for the railways and the great seaport cities an augmentation of the volume of business in finished products. Neither the Canadian Pacific railway, nor the Grand Trunk Pacific, nor the Canadian Northern railway, are likely to lack any conveyance of natural products for a long time to come. It is the law of nature, that for centuries to come and may be for all time to come the North American continent will be the great purveyor of natural products to the continent of Europe. The trade from Canada to the United States will continue to increase, and it requires no unusual foresight to see that this increase will inure to the benefit of our ocean ports. Montreal will beyond all doubt replace New York as the first ocean port of North America ; indeed, Montreal has already taken the premier position. That is a decree not of mine, not of the Canadian government, it is a decree of nature and of geography. There can be no evasion of the fact that the water route from Montreal to Liverpool is 220 miles shorter than that from New York to Liverpool, and that 1,000 miles of the Canadian route lies within the shelter of adjacent shores. During last season of navigation, and the season before that, Montreal defeated New York in the race, for in the export of butter and cheese the port of Montreal leads the way on the North American continent. And, Sir, fifty years ago Montreal entered in the race with New York and the American ports. Fifty years ago the Post Office Department of Canada carried the mails of the United States by the St. Lawrence river. Fifty years ago the mails from Paris, from Brussels, from London, were sent by Liverpool and Rivière du Loup in the St. Lawrence, not to Canada alone, but to Chicago and all the western states. There were some accidents in the St. Lawrence in those days ; it was not so well lighted and as well buoyed as it is to-day. We have to-day three main lines running from Montreal and Quebec to Liverpool, and I venture to say that 60 per cent of the passengers on those lines are from the United States. Why do they go by Montreal and Quebec? It is because it is the shortest route, and I dare say also because it is the most picturesque route. There need be no fear of our not maintaining the supremacy of the St. Lawrence river for the North American continent. We need not be afraid that the trade of the north will pass to the south by New York or by New Orleans, as has been suggested of late years.

One of the objections urged against this agreement is that so much benefit will inure to Canada from it that we shall waste all our natural resources, devastate our great wheat areas, our lumber and our standing timber, and deplete our fisheries. Well, Sir, there is no fear of our depleting our natural resources, now that the people are becoming impressed, through the policy of this Liberal government, with the supreme importance of the schemes for the conservation of the country's resources. Canada last year produced 21½ bushels of wheat to the acre, which is about 5¾ bushels to the acre higher than the yield of the United States. But in our western provinces we are working a virgin soil of great natural fertility. We have, however, a long way to go yet before we reach our ideal, and indeed the figures which I am about to quote from Professor Robertson, give me the ground for the confident hope that we shall not only obtain for our soil a productiveness 50 per cent greater than it has at present, but will maintain it for all time. England has been taking crops of wheat from her soil for a thousand years, and her soil should have been exhausted centuries ago if constant cropping results necessarily in depletion. But listen to the figures. During the last ten years the average yield of wheat per acre in England has been 31⅛ bushels to the acre, while last year the average was 33⅜ bushels. So that far from a lessened productiveness in England, Professor Robertson assures us that the yield per acre now is higher than ever before.

The farmers of Canada start with an unsurpassed soil, and by the application of intelligent methods, such as are followed in all the leading European countries, they

will increase the productiveness of their fields, and maintain them at the highest level they can reach.

In our forests, we are equally assured. An estimate from the Forestry Branch, which is moderate, gives the acreage of our standing timber as 500,000,000 acres. In Germany, where forest conservation is carried to a high point, it is estimated that every year there is produced new timber to the extent of 100 feet of merchantable timber to the acre. Suppose that, by the methods now put in operation to stop the waste, Canada was able to raise no more than 50 feet of new timber per acre yearly fit for cutting, the produce from this would go far to supply not only the Canadian market, but the whole United States market as well.

What benefits shall we derive from this free market for our Canadian fisheries? With the protection afforded by the regulations of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, I have no fear whatever that our fisheries in the Gulf of St. Lawrence will be depleted. This agreement opens up a friendly market fifteen times larger than our own for fish. We have a surplus of fish. All engaged in the fish industry say that the Canadian market is too limited. Our vast waters, the largest fishing areas, fresh-water and marine, in the world, must produce a surplus which the United States market will take. They depend upon Canadian fish now but with the duty removed an immense increase will result. Our fisheries produce not less per annum than 450 or 500 million pounds of fish of every kind. It can be increased by opening up new waters in the Northwest and probably Hudson bay. Not 50 per cent of these fish can be sold in Canada, even with increasing population.

It will result in better prices. Hitherto United States fish combines have dictated prices to our fishermen and fish firms, and we had the advantage of the duty. With open United States markets our fishermen will not sell through the restricted trade channels or be at the mercy of combines. They will sell at current prices to any buyers, on the same terms as United States fishing firms. The United States buyers want our fish.

Fish will have increased value, especially kinds for which our fishermen get low prices or have no sale. I was reading this morning in the New York 'Fishing Gazette' what Mr. Edward Born, president of the Seaboard Trading Company said, as follows:

> In view of the fact that the production of salt fish on the American side has been entirely inadequate for the requirements of the home market, and that Gloucester has been a heavy buyer of stock in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, free fish is a perfectly logical demand.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Our salt fish have other markets than the United States, but a leading New York fish merchant recently said that Gloucester and other cured fish centres must buy heavily from Canada in the future, hence our salt fish trade will receive an impetus. Herring bait, fresh mackerel, live lobsters, &c., will be in greater demand under the new conditions. Even the Pacific fisheries will benefit. Fresh salmon, halibut, &c., will no doubt be sought, with returns higher than the canned fish bring.

Lobsters on the Atlantic coast similarly will bring far greater profits to fishermen and firms in Canada if shipped fresh or alive. Thus four lobsters in a 1-lb. can, bring 15 or 20 cents, but sold whole, four lobsters bring 80 cents or $1. A free market in the eastern states means increased demand for live lobsters, and increased transportation facilities which may make it easy for Prince Edward Island and Bay of Chaleur lobsters to be sold at these high rates.

Mr. JAMESON. Do not lobsters enter the United States now free of duty?

Mr. LEMIEUX. They may, but with this increased trade between the United States and Canada, the demand will be much larger. I have already answered the statement made by my hon. friend that our transportation systems would be affected by this agreement. It is absurd to say that the trade, instead of running east and west, will run north and south. Why, the railway systems of the United States run many of them, east and west. The great transcontinental lines in that country run east and west. A great part of the American grain, in spite of the existing tariff, now finds its way through American railways and canals to Montreal, and Montreal is taking the lead, as a shipping port, over the ports of the United States. Mr. J. J. Hill, who is such a bogey to my hon. friends opposite, will have to compete against our railway barons of the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern railway, and the Grand Trunk Pacific, and he will meet his equals when he comes against Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, Sir Donald Mann, Sir William McKenzie and Mr. Hays. If you will look at the stock reports every night, you will find that the Canadian Pacific stock has not been affected prejudicially by this proposed agreement, but rather to the contrary, nor has the credit of the Canadian Northern railway, and the Grand Trunk Pacific been injured. The Grand Trunk Pacific will still go on and be soon completed and prove one of the best traction systems on this continent notwithstanding the pessimistic prophesy of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to reciprocity. The dividends earned by our railways will be as large as ever, and as the

result of this proposed agreement, we shall have a large inflow of population into our west. I am told by the officers of the immigration Department that we may expect in the west this year not less than 500,000 people. And with a greater population in the west, more wheat will be grown, and there will be greater hauls for the railways, and lower prices for the consumer. Our hon. friends need, therefore, be under no apprehension that this agreement will in any way prejudice our transportation systems.

We are told, however, by my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that it is a one-sided agreement, and he quoted to this effect the words of two or three prominent men in the United States—I think even the President of the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. So did my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr Foster), but we also have one of the highest protectionists on this continent, Mr. Joe Cannon, Uncle Joe, prominent in American public life, who objects to this agreement because it is one-sided. It is, indeed, strange to find protectionists on both sides of the line agreeing that it is a one-sided agreement to the prejudice of each. Well, I believe with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). with the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), with Mr. Taft, the President of the United States, that it is a compact which involves mutual advantages. That is only natural. Canada could never expect, in dealing with the United States, or even in dealing with the smallest island in the West Indies, to obtain in a trade bargain, a one-sided arrangement.

But my hon. friend says that we have given up our fiscal independence, and he quoted from Mr. Austen Chamberlain, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer in England some years ago, to prove this assertion. But he failed to remind the House that Mr. Chamberlain stated, probably in the same speech, that Canada had just entered into the American vortex. Well, such a statement is a silly one. We are not in any way divesting ourselves of our fiscal independence. We are simply propounding a policy which parliament is free to accept or reject. We have kept clear of all entangling alliances because we know that the conditions of this country are likely to change rapidly within the next 5, 10 or 20 years and at any moment we may alter our course. In a brief period we shall have a much larger population and be much stronger, and the British preference still remains. That preference is still, in the words of my right hon. leader, the Prime Minister, the cardinal feature of our fiscal policy. We gave that preference willingly to the mother country and we asked nothing in return. We have maintained that preference, although it is one-sided, and to the advocates of inter-imperial preference we said: We Liberals, we Canadians, shall never put a price on our loyalty. Why did we give this preference to Great Britain? We gave it in order to show our gratitude for the blessings of responsible government which we owe to her wise policy and the efforts of her statesmen, such as Lord Durham and Lord Elgin? We gave Great Britain a preference because we recognized that her markets were free to the countries of the world and her colonies in particular, and because during more than a century she bore the brunt of Canadian defence on land and sea. We have not altered or impaired in the least our fiscal independence, we have simply made a bargain, and are submitting that bargain to the Canadian people. This parliament is free to accept or reject it, but we still maintain, in either event, the British preference which we gave of our own free consent, and which we still maintain because of our gratitude to the mother country, and also because it suits us.

We are told, however, by my hon. friend, that this is a dreadful blow to tariff reform in England. Well, if such be the case, what then? I am a Liberal, and as a Reformer I accept the verdict of the people—vox populi, vox Dei. On three different occasions, the electorate in Great Britain has been consulted on tariff reform—in 1906, 1909 and a few months ago—and on each John Bull declared that, even for the sake of his colonies, he will not tax the food of the large masses who are working at low wages, and sometimes starving, in London, Manchester, Birmingham and Liverpool. Mr. Balfour himself during the last campaign made a proposal to the British electors. He would not, he said, discuss mutual preference at that election, but if returned to power he would have a referendum. That was the chief plank of his platform in the month of December last. He offered to give John Bull an occasion to show whether he was for or against mutual preference. What did John Bull answer? He answered that he would not even consider the propriety of a referendum of that question. Therefore, it is not this proposed arrangement which is giving a death blow to tariff reform. Long ago in 1906 and 1908, the people of England themselves gave a death blow to mutual preference.

But see what confusion exists among hon. gentlemen opposite. We have my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who rose in his place the other day, and asked the House to postpone the consideration of this question, because forsooth, he had reached in his own mind the idea that we were playing into the hands of the British government in making this bargain with the United States. He wants to postpone

consideration of the question, he will ask the House to defeat this proposal, on the ground that we are playing into the hands of the British authorities. On the other hand, we have my hon. friend from East Grey, we have his leader, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), we have the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and probably my good friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), clamouring that this agreement made by the Liberal government with Mr. Taft, is most anti-British, anti-Imperial, and tends to weaken the tie that binds us to the mother country. Sir, in this agreement, we received the help of that statesman who represents Great Britain and Canadian interests as well at Washington, Mr. Bryce, the eminent writer, the great reformer, whose name will live as long as beats a British heart in Britain. Mr. Bryce helped the case of Canada, and assisted my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). What a different policy was followed by Mr. Bryce from that followed by the British representatives who, in 1871, accompanied Sir John Macdonald to Washington when the dearest interests of Canada were debated. Sir John Macdonald, in a letter to his friend, Dr. Tupper, who was his colleague in the government, was not afraid to write the following lines:

I must say that I am greatly disappointed at the course taken by the British commissioners. They seem to have only one thing in their minds, that is, to go home to England with the treaty in their pockets, settling everything, no matter at what cost to Canada.

How different is the attitude of the British statesmanship from that of the British statesmanship of 1871. What a difference between the representatives of Great Britain under a Liberal government in England, and the representatives of Great Britain under a Tory government in England. Mr. Bryce helped Canada in this agreement. Mr. Asquith, the Prime Minister of England, who voiced the sentiments of Great Britain and of the British Empire —for there is no man, except the King of England, above the Prime Minister—is satisfied with the agreement.

We see it stated that this agreement is a blow at British investments in Canada, and that henceforward British investors will hesitate before they invest their capital in Canada. Mr. Chairman, I am not of British parentage, but I know one thing: British capital will be invested where it pays the British investor. In Great Britain or wherever I have met the Anglo-Saxon in my lifetime, I have always discovered, to my discomfiture at times, that with an Englishman, in matters of business, sentiment is not allowed to intervene. In this connection, nothing is more striking than the view of Great Britain on this very question of British mutual preference. We all know that Sir John Macdonald, as far back as 1885, advocated a policy of mutual preference between the mother country and Canada and the colonies. He was the foremost colonial statesman of the day, and in 1885, when he went to London, he spoke as follows:

Commercially, British federation may be achieved on a basis of give and take. If you will give colonial produce such immunities as you give to no foreign nation I will commit myself to the expression of belief that the colonies will give British goods and only British goods, preferential treatment.

And what did Lord Salisbury answer to that pressing request of Sir John Macdonald ?

I fear that we must for the present put in the distant and shadowy portion of our past, and not in the practical part of it,——

Listen to the business man.

—any hope of establishing a customs union among the various parts of the empire.

And later on, in 1887, the first intercolonial conference was held, and a resolution was adopted favouring a policy of mutual preference. But nothing was done. In 1891 the colonies urged the imperial government to denounce the treaties with Germany and Belgium, which prevented imperial preference. Lord Salisbury declined courteously to take action. In 1891, my hon. friend, sitting on this side of the House, joined with his fellow members, and with the Canadian Senate in passing a resolution in favour of the denunciation of these treaties, because it was stated in England that even if we obtained mutual preference they would have to include Belgium and Germany, because we were bound by old treaties with those countries. The House of Commons passed a resolution asking the mother country to denounce these treaties. But no action was taken. In 1892 the House of Commons made a formal offer of a preferential tariff; in 1893, the Ottawa conference passed a similar resolution. What was the answer of Lord Ripon then colonial secretary ? He said:

A consideration of these practical difficulties and of the more immediate results indicated, of a system of mutual tariff discrimination, has convinced Her Majesty's government that, even if the consequences were confined to the limits of the empire, and even if it were not followed by changes of fiscal policy on the part of foreign powers unfavourable to this country, its general economic results would not be beneficial to the empire. Such theories are really a weapon of commercial war, used as weapons of retaliation, and inflicting more loss on the country employing it

than on the country against which it is directed, and which would not be likely to view them with indifference.

In 1897 we passed the British preference to which I referred a moment ago. The Prime Minister of Canada knew it was the time to strike the popular imagination of Great Britain. It was at the time of the Queen Victoria's Jubilee, and the imperial conference had been summoned. The Prime Minister of Canada was there with his colleagues and at this the psychological moment, a resolution was passed unanimously at the request of the Prime Minister of Canada by the delegates of the various colonies urging upon the imperial government the necessity of denouncing the German and Belgian treaties. It was due to the wisdom, the statesmanship, the ability which one must recognize in the Prime Minister of Canada that the German and Belgian treaties were denounced.

However, there were conferences in 1902 and 1907, resolutions after resolutions were passed urging imperial preferences, and now all the self-governing colonies, yes, even distant Rhodesia, on the shores of the Zambesi river, has adopted a preferential tariff between the mother country and herself. Yet, Sir, the electors of Great Britain, loving their fellow-subjects in the overseas dominions, as they do love them, will still get free food, free bread before taxing the masses swarming within the four corners of the United Kingdom. We have heard protests from Toronto and Montreal against this arrangement. I see among the names given in the Toronto and Montreal papers as opposed to this agreement the names of bankers, of insurance men, of men connected with great trust companies. They urge, all of them, that if we carry out this agreement it means ultimately the fusion of Canada into the United States, yes, we are going to be drowned in the American ocean. Well, Sir, I never thought that the question of dollars and cents might weaken the ties between the mother country and Canada; I never expected that trading with the United States would mean the wiping out of the frontier which exists between the two countries. I did not forget, when I saw the names of those bankers and magnates of insurance and trust companies, the good old French dicton: L'argent ne connaît pas les frontières et l'argent n'a pas de sentiment—money knows no frontier, and no sentiment. Many of our banks, the Bank of Montreal, the Bank of Commerce, to name two of the most important, have branches established in Chicago, in Detroit, in New York, in Baltimore, in San Francisco, Seattle, and, perhaps, in Washington. I am not aware that the managers of these banks, who are Canadians, have become Americans; I am not aware that they have transferred their fealty and their loyalty to the Stars and Stripes, but if I look at the two last bank returns in the 'Official Gazette' for the month of October and the month of December, I see that those bankers who fear for the future of Canada because we are going to trade with the United States, to sell hay, and horses, and wheat, and potatoes, and fish, and lobsters, have made call loans and current loans outside of Canada in the United States to the amount of $144,548,600. I see that in the month of December they made call loans and current loans to the amount of $131,111,276. Still, in Toronto and Montreal, on the shore of Lake Ontario and on the bank of the St. Lawrence, there has been no necessity to call my hon. friend for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr Hughes) to defend those cities, they are still Canadian, the banks still fly the British flag and the bankers reap a good interest from the investment they have made abroad. It is not only their money they invest; there is a little of their money and very little of ours, but it is the money of our fellow-subjects in the different provinces of the Dominion. Do you believe that the insurance men would refuse a good investment in Mexico, Brazil, or the United States of America? No. Last year and two years ago when a commission sat, what limitations were not urged upon the insurance men so as to prevent them from investing too much of our Canadian money abroad? Yet, Sir, in the House of Commons, when we came to study the Bill we gave our insurance men a free scope; we had confidence in them, in their loyalty and fealty: we believed that they were shrewd business men, that money had no colour and no sentiment, and knew of no boundary. They say that reciprocity is injurious to Great Britain and the empire. What is the answer of the home government to that statement? I see that my friend Mr. Buxton the ex-postmaster general, who is now president of the Board of Trade in England, said in the House of Commons on the 8th of February, in answer to Mr. Austen Chamberlain:

> They had neither changed nor modified their view that the proposals of Mr. Chamberlain——

That is the father who was advocating an imperial preference,

> —and his friends would be injurious to this country and injurious to the empire as a whole. This very agreement——

Speaking of our agreement,

> —afforded a good object-lesson of the evils and dangers of the fiscal relations which Mr. Chamberlain suggested should exist between

the mother country and Canada. Had a system of preferences existed——

This is a hypothetical case,

—at the present moment Canada would have had to consult the mother country before entering into an agreement with the United States. Then the local interests of Canada would have been antagonistic to the interests of Great Britain, and colonial preference, instead of being a link in the chain of empire, might well have brought that chain to the snapping point.

This is what the home government answers to the charge that this agreement is injurious to Great Britain. Now, it is stated that reciprocity would even impair the existing preference. I shall not read to the House the answer made by Mr. Buxton, but I will ask permission to file it on 'Hansard.'

OUR TRADE WITH CANADA.

The government recognized the advantages which we in this country received from the preference which Canada had been good enough to give us, but he would point out that Mr. Fielding and his ministers had always based that preference upon the advantage which it conferred upon Canadian trade. Holding the views which they did, the government could not regret any arrangement or agreement which might weaken the opportunities of putting a tax upon corn coming to this country, nor could they regret any fiscal arrangements which tended to the reduction of high duties in any part of the world and to break down tariff walls. Neither could they regret any arrangement under which the trade of Canada itself would, as Canadians thought, be largely increased. They certainly felt very strongly that at the present moment the allegiance and loyalty of the Canadians were not involved in this agreement (ministerial cheers). He could assure the right hon. gentleman that the very pessimistic view which he took of the effect of the agreement upon Canadian preference to Great Britain was much exaggerated. We sent at the present moment nearly £20,000,000 worth of goods to Canada, and of those two-thirds received a preference under the old agreement, and £969,000 represented the goods dealt with in the agreement between Canada and America.

Of the last figure £176,000 represented goods free to all nations, and about £800,000 only was affected by the agreement so far as British preference was concerned. Out of that £477,000 still retained a preferenec of 10 to 12 per cent, leaving a balance of £316,000, or only 1½ per cent, of British imports to Canada on which the duties in future would be identical with the duties on American goods. Therefore he thought he might say that the alarm which seemed to have been excited in some quarters had really been very much exaggerated. Mr. Chamberlain had declared that as a result of the agreement less Canadian corn would come to England, and that the price of corn in this country would consequently go up. That was the argument which free traders had always advanced against a colonial preference which involved a tax on imported corn. They had been told that under tariff reform the growth of corn in the colonies and at home would be encouraged to such an extent that in the end the price would be cheaper. If that would be the result under the proposals of tariff reformers, was it not still more likely to be the result of the stimulus given to Canadian corn growing by opening the markets of America? (Ministerial cheers).

Now, I will answer, and I will conclude here, the last argument—I will not suggest that this last argument is the last refuge because I might bring in the name of Dr. Johnson, and I do not wish to apply the words of Dr. Johnson to my hon. friend—but I will answer the last argument of my hon. friend that this agreement will weaken the tie between Great Britain and Canada. That is a very poor argument. It is more than that; it is a panicky argument. Why Sir, the loyalty of Canada and Canadians stood the test of adversity during half a century. Will it not stand the test of coming prosperity? There were days of adversity in 1775 and in 1812 and we were just a few isolated provinces defending ourselves against the invading armies of the United States of America. Yet the French who had recently been conquered on the Plains of Abraham united with the descendants of the United Empire Loyalists, resisted the invasion of the American soldiers and saved Canada to the British Empire. In 1866, when the abrogation of the Elgin-Marcy Treaty caused all the evil forebodings contained in the state document which I read a moment ago, we were able to steer our own course, and to maintain our dignity. In 1867, when Sir John A. Macdonald, Mr. George Brown, Mr. Alexander Mackenzie and Sir George Cartier united their forces to make this confederation of ours, the United States of America were not slow in passing a resolution in their Congress offering the several provinces of Canada the opportunity of becoming so many different states in the American union. But the Canadians were not lured by the offer made by the United States. In 1870 we repelled another invasion. How did Canada accept the suggestion that England should hand over our country as a compensation for the Alabama claims? A few days ago I was reading the reminiscences of Goldwin Smith and—I do not know if my hon. friend has read the book—it is stated in so many words that there was a time in the seventies when Mr. Gladstone, being Prime Minister of England, was ready to sacrifice Canada as compensation for the Alabama Claims made by the United States. Canada resisted the suggestions made by British statesmen. The great Disraeli, himself, stated that we were a millstone around the neck of the mother country; yet, in spite of these remarks, in spite of this pol-

icy of oblivion followed by the mother country, we remained firm and staunch to our colours and we decided to live under the Union Jack instead of under the Stars and Stripes.

Mr. SPROULE. I think my hon. friend is doing Disraeli a great injustice by that statement; at least, I have no remembrance of his having made it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, I have read it many times. To-morrow I will pass the book in which it is contained over to my hon. friend. It is in Justin McCarthy's History of Our Own Times, and Justin McCarthy, although a well-known home ruler, is an up to date and fair minded historian. He states it in so many words. Goldwin Smith has also quoted it in his book on the Canadian question. Did we ever accept the interpretation of the Monroe doctrine, suggestive as it was, by the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Olney, to the effect that no European power would be tolerated any longer upon the American continent? Did we ever accept with fear the policy embalmed in Mr. Dingley's and Mr. McKinley's Bills? We stood the days of adversity like men, like Canadians, like British subjects and surely with prosperity we can trust ourselves. We gave willingly our help to Great Britain in South Africa. We have offered cheerfully our help to Great Britain for the well-being of the British Empire in the various colonial conferences and we have given, as I stated a moment ago, without expecting anything in return, a fiscal preference. If now, the westerner, in that beautiful country west of Lake Superior, can sell his wheat to the United States to better advantage, if the poor fisherman from Gaspé can sell his catch to better advantage to the eastern states, if the Prince Edward Islander can sell his potatoes in a wider market, if the Quebec habitant can add a dollar to his ton of hay, if the Ontario farmer can raise barley and do a better trade in cattle with the United States, surely his or their loyalty will not be impaired. If, on the contrary these things are done, as my hon. friend suggested this evening, at the cost of the loyalty of Canadians, then indeed the empire possesses no real strength.

I hold no brief to speak for my friends of the English persuasion, but I know that no English-speaking Canadian will ever barter his birthright for the flesh pots of Egypt. I know that no French Canadian at least would ever accept annexation. I can speak for my fellow countrymen. We in the province of Quebec, French Canadians one and all, Conservatives and Liberals are against any idea that smacks of annexation. Why? Because of the privileges we enjoy under the British Crown. By the Quebec Act of 1774, under which Act our language, our faith, our laws, our customs, our usages have been respected in a privileged manner by His Britannic Majesty and by the imperial government. We know what has been the fate of our fellow countrymen in Louisiana and we know that as long as we live under the British flag, as long as we live under the benign laws of Great Britain, our rights and our privileges will be protected and safeguarded, and we are willing to do our duty towards the Crown of England which is not only a bond of unity between the colonies and the mother land, but also between the various races in those colonies. The sentiments expressed by Joseph Howe at the time of the Detroit convention are ours. They are ours to-day as they were ours in 1865:

> I have heard it said since I came to the convention that if the reciprocity treaty is annulled the British provinces will be so cramped that they will be compelled to seek annexation to the United States. I know the feeling in the lower provinces, and I believe I am well enough acquainted with the Canadians to speak for them also when I make the assertion that no considerations of finance, no question of balance for or against them on the interchange of commodities can have any influence upon the loyalty of the inhabitants of the British provinces, or tend in the slightest degree to alienate the affections of the people from their country, their institutions, their government and their Queen. There is not a man who dare, on the abrogation of the treaty, if such be its fate, to take the hustings and appeal to any constituency on annexation principles throughout the entire domain. The man who avowed such a sentiment would be scouted from society by his best friends. What other treatment would a man deserve who had turned traitor to his government and violated for pecuniary advantages all obligations to the country that gave him birth? The very boy to whom I have alluded as having fought manfully for the stars and stripes would rather blow his own father's brains out than haul down the honoured flag under which he was born. If any member of the convention harbours the idea that in refusing reciprocity to British America they would undermine the loyal feelings of the people of those colonies, he is labouring under a delusion. . . . I sincerely hope that all thought of forcing annexation upon the people of Canada will be abandoned.

The sentiments of Joseph Howe expressed in 1865 at the Detroit Convention are the sentiments of Canadians in this year of grace 1911, on the eve of adopting this reciprocity treaty. I say further, that not only are we against any idea of political union with the United States, but that on the contrary, we believe that such agreements as these make for genuine Anglo-Saxon solidarity. The Trent Affair, the Fenian

Raid, the Behring sea seizures are things of the past. A firm friendship between the several branches of the Anglo-Saxon race is worth striving for. We are told, Sir, that we are against the empire in propounding such a policy, but do you know that the greatest imperialist of modern times, Cecil Rhodes, devoted his life and his wealth after his death to the advancement of just such a policy of Anglo-Saxon solidarity. In his will he provides a sum of money to enable young men in each state of the Union to take a course at Oxford University, there to study British life and British ideals. His object was to spread throughout the world that love for liberty and justice and right which is begotten of British institutions and British law. At the end of this century of peace (the celebration of which will take place in 1912 on the wise suggestion of my colleague the Minister of Labour), this reciprocity agreement will be the crowning event of that century. We believe it will be a means of serving the empire and Canada; we believe it will prove a link between the mother country and the great republic. In the past our loyalty has borne its trials, even with the mother country. While we were still suffering from the effects of the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty, statesmen high in station in England gave us to understand that they would see us part from the old connection without regret, but we did not believe that those were the feelings of the people of England, and so we held on, and so we will still continue to hold on. We have fairly won our way into the British brotherhood, and we will not hear with patience that any trade arrangement, however favourable, will turn us from the course we have freely chosen for ourselves within the greatest empire that has been.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.03 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 22, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

DISPOSAL OF SEWAGE.

Mr. LEWIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 122) respecting sewage. He said: I do not think there is any one who will fail to recognize that the grievance which I propose to remove is one that causes severe injury in this country. The Bill I am about to introduce provides as follows:

1. This Act may be cited as the Sewage Act.
2. No person, corporation or municipality shall deposit or cause to be deposited any sewage or refuse of any kind whatsoever in any river or stream in Canada.
3. Any person who violates the provisions of section 2 of this Act shall be guilty of an indictable offence and may be condemned to a fine not exceeding $100 for each day during which such violation continues; and any corporation or municipality that violates the provisions of the said section shall be guilty of an indictable offence and may be condemned to a fine of not less than $200 and not more than $1,000 for each day during which such violation continues.
4. This Act shall come into force by proclamation of the Governor in Council.

I do not see that there is any necessity for me to explain the great need which exists for legislation in this line. I introduce this Bill simply for the purpose of bringing the matter to the attention of the government; and I think that the need for legislation of this kind is so great that the right hon. the Prime Minister should have this measure sent to a joint committee of the House of Commons and Senate. I do not pretend for one moment that the Bill I am introducing, and which has been drawn at my request by one of the best legal men in Canada, covers the whole case; but when we reflect that in the great countries of France and England, with their large and congested population, such a disease as typhoid is almost unknown, I think it is time we should take immediate action.

Mr. SPROULE. I should dislike very much to allow the statement to go uncontradicted that typhoid fever is unknown in France and England. Our medical literature tells an entirely different story, so of course it is much less prevalent in these countries than in this. But what I wish particularly to point out is that this Bill is rather an interference with provincial rights, because the provinces have jurisdiction over all matters relating to health except quarantine, and they are now dealing with this very question of typhoid. Of course if we bring this matter under the Criminal Code, that may give us jurisdiction; but as the provinces are charged with the responsibility in matters affecting the public health and we have provincial statutes dealing with that subject, I am afraid that if we were to undertake to legislate in a similar line we would be interfering with their rights.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 121) respecting the Globe Printing Company.—Mr. Harris.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

FISH HATCHERY AT WINNIPEGOSIS.

*Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. When was the fish hatchery at Snake island, Winnipegosis, established?
2. Who is in charge?
3. What experience had he in the care of a station of that kind?
4. Why was he appointed, and by whom recommended?
5. What moneys have been expended in that plant for all contingencies year by year since inception?
6. What number of eggs have been taken each year for hatching purposes?
7. By whom or by what method taken?
8. At what cost each year?
9. What percentage has been hatched each year?
10. What reports has the department for this year with regard to catch of eggs and success of hatching?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. 1908.
2. A. J. McPherson.
3. Experienced gained while fishery overseer on Lake Winnipegosis.
4. Because he was the most experienced person available. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries.
5. 1907-8, $12,684.42; 1908-9, $6,718.96; 1909-10, $5,604.06; 1910-11 to January 31, $4,019.70.
6. 1908, 16,000,000 ; 1909, 46,560,000 ; 1910, 44,000,000.
7. 1908, Captain E. D. Coffey, parent fish taken in gill-nets; 1909, employees of department, parent fish taken in gill-nets; 1910, same as 1909.
8. 1907-8, $363.58; 1908-9, $833.90; 1910-11, $1,236.48.
9. 1908, None; 1909, 85 per cent; 1910, eggs now undergoing incubation.
10. 44,000,000 collected. Development satisfactory.

CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS IN CITIES.

Mr. MACDONELL:

What was the post office revenue and the customs revenue, respectively, for the years from 1906 to 1910, both inclusive, for the following cities, Winnipeg, Vancouver, Ottawa, Calgary, Quebec, Victoria, Hamilton, Halifax, St. John, N.B., Edmonton, London, Regina, Brandon, Lethbridge, Saskatoon and Brantford?

Mr. PATERSON:

CUSTOMS REVENUE FOR THE YEARS FROM 1906 TO 1910.

Port.	1906.	1907.	1908.	1909.	1910.
	$	$	$	$	$
Brantford	290,453	308,104	355,466	258,304	366,694
Hamilton	1,469,407	1,257,494	1,642,004	1,203,876	1,707,558
London	843,032	696,710	964,416	756,793	914,748
Ottawa	764,004	621,089	961,977	915,586	1,013,772
Quebec	1,451,584	1,113,803	1,801,850	1,450,454	1,421,135
St. John	1,200,804	1,024,360	1,352,691	1,155,400	1,322,223
Halifax	1,586,827	1,132,917	1,659,637	1,617,997	1,627,523
Brandon	151,624	157,420	178,353	148,396	235,359
Winnipeg	3,507,889	3,099,702	4,098,172	3,317,379	4,972,428
Vancouver	1,862,278	1,621,947	2,915,126	2,580,504	3,657,182
Victoria	805,740	678,276	1,191,494	1,027,282	1,235,768
Calgary	269,153	317,499	502,472	423,129	655,243
Edmonton	104,312	134,230	262,457	230,246	277,870
Lethbridge	35,058	32,711	64,426	83,942	171,343
Regina	83,103	115,071	186,113	191,057	310,316
Saskatoon	15,215	33,620	55,528	46,270	122,168

NOTE.—Fiscal period ending March, 1907, was for 9 months only.

COAL IMPORTS FROM UNITED STATES.

Mr. GORDON (Kent):

1. How much coal was imported into the province of Ontario during 1910 from the United States?
2. What was the total amount of duties on such importations?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The quantity and value of coal imported into the province of Ontario during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1910, from the United States was as follows:

	Tons.	Tons.
Bituminous, round	6,376,137	12,041,314
Bituminous, slack	1,023,313	1,053,761
Anthracite coal	2,128,979	9,714,696

2. The duty collected on coal imported into the province of Ontario during the fiscal year 1910 from the United States was as follows:

Bituminous, round	$2,853,615 93
Bituminous, slack	142,945 46
Total	$2,996,561 39

ELECTRIC RAILWAY CHARTERS.

Mr. BLAIN:

1. How many electric railways have been chartered since 1896, and what are their names?

2. What extensions of time for construction, if any, have been granted and when?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Hull Electric railway, Dawson City Electric railway, Ottawa Electric railway, Brantford & Hamilton Electric railway, Edmonton Street railway, Monterey Electric Gas Company, La Compagnie du Chemin de fer Electric, Mexican Consolidated Electric Company, Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley & Lake Huron Railway Company, Chatham, Wallaceburg & Lake Erie Railway Company, Grand Valley railway, Hamilton & Radial Electric railway, Hespeler, Galt & Guelph railway, Montreal Park & Island railway, Montreal Terminal railway, Niagara, St. Catharines & Toronto railway, Oshawa Railway Company, Quebec Railway, Light & Power Company, Windsor, Essex & Lake Shore Rapid Railway Company, Nipissing Central Railway Company, Essex Terminal Railway Company, Montreal Southern Counties. The above appears to be all the electric railways chartered by the Dominion government. There are a number of electric railways chartered and under the jurisdiction of the provincial government, which are not herein enumerated.

2. Ottawa Electric Railway, Act of 1899, chap. 82; 18 months after passing of this Act, and completed within two years. Brantford & Hamilton Electric Railway, Act 1904, chap. 50; Act in force only January 1, 1905. Edmonton Street Railway Company, Act 1904, chap. 75. Monterey Electric & Gas Co., Act 1905, chap 126. La Compagnie du Chemin de fer Electric, Act 1905, chap 167. Mexican Consolidated Electric railway, Act 1906, chap. 125-146. The department has no knowledge of extension of time for electric railways other than is mentioned in the Acts above cited.

METEGHAN LANDING PLACE.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Was the defective condition of the public landing at Meteghan brought to the attention of the Minister of Public Works, during the year, 1909? If so, by whom, in what manner, and when?

2. Has any report from the resident engineer been since asked for by the department regarding the condition of such public work? If so, when?

3. Has any report been received from the engineer, what is the date of any such, and in what condition does it state the said public landing to be?

4 Why have the repairs required on such public landing not been provided for and effected?

5. What provision, if any, has been, or will be made, for the repair of such public work?

6. Was a sum of $4,000 placed in the estimates for the current year for repairs to the public work at Meteghan, and subsequently changed to Meteghan river, expended at the latter place?

7 At whose instance did the minister make the change from Meteghan to Meteghan river in said vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes, by Mr. Jameson, M.P., in Committee of Supply.

2. (A) Yes; (B) April 26, 1910.

3. (A) Yes; (B) May 6, 1910; (C) wharf requires repairs and extension.

4. Provision cannot be made for all requirements at once.

5. Question of making provision in Supplementary Estimates, if any, will have careful consideration.

6. No.

7. The minister assumes responsibility for the change in the reading of the item, which was intended to be for Meteghan river.

MR. GEORGE MERCIER.

Mr. CROCKET:

1. Is the Minister of Customs aware that George Mercier, a customs preventive officer, is said to be a member of the town council of Dalhousie, N.B.?

2 Is this permissible under the regulations of the department.

Mr. PATERSON:

1. No.

2. The customs regulations established by order in council of 14th June, 1875, provide as follows: 'No officer of customs is allowed to hold any corporate office, nor to interfere in political questions, either local or general.' The question of repealing or modifying this regulation is under the consideration of the Department of Customs.

GLACE BAY BAIT ASSOCIATION.

Mr. MADDEN:

1 Who were the members of the Glace Bay Bait Association at the time this association applied for moneys on account of construction of freezer at Glace Bay, Nova Scotia, and when was the first $1,000 paid?

2. What amount was paid to the Glace Bay Bait Association in 1908, and what was the date or dates of such payment or payments?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. D. H. McKay, Chas. D. McKay, Angus H. Gillis, Jesse G. Dunbar, Alex. McPherson, J. W. Cameron, Chas. Burke, J. R.

McKeen, K. McRitchie, Henry Debeson, Thos. McInnes, Nicholas McDonald, J. A. Carmichael, D. N. Brodie, George Keigan, F. A. Ferguson, J. J. Fraser, R. S. McDougald, Geo. B. Bulmer, Lauchlin McLean, H. S. Tate, W. S. Hay. October 21, 1907.

2. $765.30 by cheque on August 10, 1908, and material was supplied during the building of the freezer worth $234.70.

QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew):

1. Was a caisson being used in the rebuilding of one of the piers of the Quebec bridge damaged?

2. If so, what was the nature and extent of the damage and the actual money loss in repairing and replacing the caisson?

3. What quantity of masonry, or concrete, in cubic yards, had been placed in the caisson the cost thereof, and the cost of removal after mishap?

4 What was the date of the suspension of work on pier, and the date when work was resumed?

5. Is the loss sustained to be borne by the government or the contractor?

6. Has the Department of Railways and Canals received notice, either written or verbal, of any claims made by or on behalf of the contractor on account of said loss?

7 Having as an object lesson the deplorable loss of life and money consequent upon the sudden collapse of the defective superstructure of this bridge, did the department have the plans of the caissons, to be used in the rebuilding of the substructure, properly examined by the chief engineer of the department, and do the authorized plans bear the certificate of the latter?

8 What is the name of the chief engineer of the department who approved of the plans?

Mr GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. The pump broke and the caisson was strained through grounding on an uneven bottom, necessitating the removal of the concrete already placed therein, and placing the caisson in dry dock for repairs. The cost to date for labour and material in connection with repairs amounts to approximately $75,000.

3. About 2,300 cubic yards of concrete had been placed in the caisson when the said accident occurred. Approximate value of this masonry in place, $14,000; approximate cost of removing same, $7,000.

4. The work of sinking the caisson stopped on August 31, 1910. No attempt was made to resink the caisson during the same season. All work at the bridge site stopped for the winter, on December 23, 1910.

5. The contractor is responsible for any loss sustained on account of the accident to the caisson.

6. The department is not aware of any claim made by or on behalf of the contractor on account of the alleged loss.

7 and 8. By order in council dated August 17, 1908, a board of engineers, consisting of H. E. Vautelet, chairman, and Chief Engineer Maurice Fitzmaurice, and Ralph Modjeski, was appointed to have charge of the construction of the Quebec bridge. The plans for the caisson to be used in rebuilding the substructure of the Quebec bridge were prepared for the contractor by Alfred Noble, an eminent bridge engineer of New York, and forwarded to the board of engineers at Montreal and were approved by them. The plans for the above work are not entirely completed.

The responsibility for the sinking of the caisson devolved upon the contractor.

STEAM TRAWLERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR :

1. Are the steam trawlers 'Wren' and 'Croquette' registered in Canada?

2. If so, in what port or ports and who are the registered owners thereof?

Mr. BRODEUR :

1 and 2. The 'Wren' is registered at the port of Canso, N. S., and is owned by the Pioneer Steam Trawling Company, Limited, Halifax, N. S. As far as the Department of Marine and Fisheries is advised the 'Croquette' is not registered in Canada.

Mr. JAMESON :

1. Has application been made for the payment of fishing bounty to any steam trawler?

2. If so, by whom was application made, and in respect of what trawler or trawlers?

3. What is the intention of the government with respect of the payment of fishing bounty to steam trawlers?

4. Has any bounty to such been ordered to be paid? If so, when, what amount and to whom?

Mr. BRODEUR :

1. Yes.

2. Application in respect of the steam trawler 'Wren' was made in 1909 by the Pioneer Steam Trawling Company, Limited, Halifax, and in 1910 by the Maritime Fish Corporation, Limited, Canso.

3. It is not the intention in future to pay any fishing bounty to such vessels.

4. Yes, for the season of 1909, $111.50, $44 having been paid to the Pioneer Steam Trawling Company, and $67.50 to the crew.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—NEW BRUNSWICK SECTION.

Mr. CROCKET :

1. What is the general standard of the National Transcontinental railway through New Brunswick, as referred to in the government notice of motion respecting the proposed St. John Valley railway?

2. What is the present estimated total cost per mile of the New Brunswick section of said railway?

Mr. GRAHAM :

1. The general standard of the National Transcontinental railway through the province of New Brunswick comprises a single track railway with necessary sidings of the standard gauge of 4 feet 8½ inches on a roadbed constructed and ballasted in accordance with the general specifications for the construction of the said railway, upon which is the superstructure consisting of steel rails weighing eighty pounds to the lineal yard with steel fastenings and laid on first-class cross-ties. The substructures for bridges are either of concrete or stone, and the superstructure being of steel built in accordance with the provisions of the general specifications for railway bridges issued by the Department of Railways and Canals, 1908 edition. The said railway being constructed with grades not in general exceeding 0·4 per hundred adverse to east bound and 0·6 adverse to the westbound and with curves of a minimum radius of 955 feet. Near Tobique river where same was rendered necessary by the physical features of the country a grade of 1·1 is allowed.

2. The present estimated total cost per mile by construction contract divisions is as follows :

Contract No. 1, extending from the city of Moncton westerly for a distance of about 50 miles is estimated to cost $49,190 per mile.

Contract No. 2, from the west end of contract No. 1 to Chipman, a distance of about 8 miles is estimated to cost $89,710 per mile.

Contract No. 3, from Chipman westerly to crossing of the Intercolonial railway, a distance of about 39·7 miles is estimated to cost $35,333 per mile.

Contract No. 4, from the Intercolonial railway crossing westerly to Tobique river, a distance of about 67 miles is estimated to cost $46,920 per mile.

Contract No. 5 from the Tobique river westerly to about 2½ miles west of Grand Falls, a distance of about 31·5 miles is estimated to cost $133,518 per mile.

Contract No. 6, from 2½ miles west of Grand Falls to boundary between New Brunswick and Quebec, a distance of about 67 miles is estimated to cost $46,484 per mile.

This covers the contract grading items including clearing, excavation, culverts, substructures of bridges, tracklaying, ballasting, ties, signals, interlocking, appliances, telegraph lines, fencing, water supply, track scales, temporary trestles and extra work—also pumps and pump-houses, rails and fastenings, including frogs, switches and diamond crossings, and the steel superstructure and flooring of bridges.

The cost per mile of contract No. 2 is high on account of heavy grading work. At the east end of the contract there is a cut about 2 miles long and 18 feet deep at the highest point. There is also a very heavy fill at the crossing of the Salmon river at mile 57, and a viaduct 1,200 feet long.

The cost per mile on contract No. 5 is high on account of the grading being unusually heavy and there is a steel viaduct nearly 4,000 feet long, and with a maximum height of 250 feet across the Little Salmon river.

MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE.

Mr. FRASER. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to inquire of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if it is the intention of the government to call a meeting of the Marine and Fisheries Committee of this House. No meeting of that committee has been held since the Christmas holidays, and I have some matters to place before it. I have spoken to the chairman, but cannot get a meeting of the committee. Will the government order a meeting of this committee?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

ATLANTIC, QUEBEC AND WESTERN RAILWAY.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I desire to give an explanation with regard to some figures placed before the House the other day as to the expenditure on the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railway. Under the Act governing the granting of subsidies, the usual subsidy given is $3,200 a mile, if the road in question costs $15,000 per mile. After that amount has been reached, subsidies increase by 50 per cent of the additional cost of the road till a maximum subsidy is reached of $6,400 on a total cost of $21,400 a mile. The figures given the other day are those estimated for subsidy purposes and are not necessarily the actual cost of the road. The department always wishes to be sure that the road has cost a sufficient amount to warrant it in paying the subsidy, and, for that purpose, the estimates are made, and the figures given to the House the other day were the figures so obtained. They might be misleading as to the actual money spent on that line or on any other. As the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railway has been discussed to a certain extent, I have asked the head of the Audit Branch of the Railway Department to proceed at once to the offices of the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railway and make a complete audit of the money spent on the line, so that there may be no misunderstanding on the matter. Also, I have asked the chief engineer to send

an engineer over the line to see exactly how much road has been constructed.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I desire to give notice to the government that to-morrow, if they move to go into Committee of Ways and Means, I intend to discuss the question of reciprocity on that occasion, and to prepare the way for the presentation to the House, either to-morrow or at a later date, of an amendment dealing with this question.

DREDGING THE NAPANEE RIVER.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I desire to ask a question of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) with reference to the dredging of the Napanee river. This is a matter with which the minister is perfectly familiar. Petitions have been presented to him, and he has had a deputation down here, and has had a great many letters with reference to the state of the navigation of that river. I think last year the minister went so far as to give an order for a dredge to be sent there to do the work. I do not know why they did not go and finish the dredging commenced in 1909. We have certainly established the need for this dredging. The order was given last year to dredge the river ten feet deep with a channel 75 feet wide. But they found that a mistake had been made by the engineer in the previous dredging. Instead of going, just before the dredging was done and making his report on the facts as he found them, he took an old report, made in 1907, and on the basis of that he reported that the water had fallen 18 inches since the time he had made the survey. Consequently, when they came to do the dredging in 1909, it was found that the appropriation was altogether too small. They started to dredge to a depth of 10 feet and a width of 75 feet, but they found their money was giving out, so they ran a narrow channel 25 or 30 feet wide, and that only part of the way. Besides, owing to the narrowness of the channel, the dirt dropping over the edge of the dipper made a bank on either side of the channel. The result is that navigation is reported by some of the captains of vessels using the river, to be worse than it was before the dredging was done. This is a matter of very serious importance to the town of Napanee and vicinity, because we get our coal by water, and the engineer reports that where they have to lighten up vessels so that they may get into the river, they have to pay 15 cents a ton more as freight. I bring this to the attention of the minister so that he may make an announcement of what he intends to do. I was surprised to find that there was no appropriation in the main estimates, as the minister had learned from the reports of his engineers the need for this work. But there are supplementary estimates to come down and I presume there will be an appropriation in these estimates to do this work. Our county is one that gets very little in the way of government money, but we are modest and do not ask for much. But I would like to see a work of such importance as this proceeded with this year. I am sure it was the intention of the minister to proceed with it last year, because he told me, before I left last session, that the order had been given. And I notice in the return brought down that the order is in the papers. I hope the minister will be good enough to make a promise on the subject now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) called my attention to the necessity for this work of dredging upon the Napanee river, and also that the work was pressed very strongly upon my attention by prominent residents of the town of Napanee and other localities, the people interested in the navigation of the river.

I was also waited upon by a delegation, which urged strongly the importance of the work. I hoped to have been able to continue the work begun under my directions, but I found it was impossible to do it last year, unless urgent work in other localities was neglected. My hon. friend must know that we have only a certain number of dredges, and I thought this was a work which had better be done by a government dredge; but we may find it desirable to engage the services of a private dredge. In case we do that, the work would have to be advertised for, the same as that which has already been done. My hon friend has called my attention to an order made on the 8th of August, 1910. It is quite true that at that time, I expected to be able to continue the work during the past season, and I regretted very much I was not able to do so. As to whether there will be an amount placed in the supplementary estimates for the current year, I am unable to state. I may say, however, that I think it very possible, indeed, I think it very probable, that the work will be undertaken during the coming season, and it is likely that it will be provided for out of the general vote, from an item which is now before parliament for dredging in Ontario and Quebec.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—NEW BRUNSWICK SECTION.

Mr. DANIEL. Referring to an answer just handed over to the member for York, who has had to leave the chamber, he asked me to ask the minister this question in relation to this last part of the answer:

Near the Tobique river where the same was rendered reasonably necessary by the physical features of the country a grading of 1·1 is allowed.

I would ask the minister if that is one of the pusher grades in New Brunswick?

Mr. GRAHAM. 1·1 we call a pusher grade, I think that is one of the pusher grades in New Brunswick.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the minister sure about it?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is my impression.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MONK. Before you leave the Chair I wish to call the attention of the House to a matter of some importance. It seems to me that in the discussion of the question with which the House is now seized, the members require the fullest possible information, and at the stage at which this discussion has arrived, I think that perhaps what will throw most light upon the subject of this trade agreement, and will, perhaps more powerfully sway the members of this House in their decision, is the production of all the correspondence had before and during the negotiations. In this, as in many other matters, the government, I think, shows an unwillingness to deal fairly with this House, and upon this point particularly, to give us without niggardliness, whatever correspondence we require. Let me illustrate this point. Yesterday I asked the government for the production of all the correspondence had since the last letters were laid upon the table, and let me recall the answer of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance:

Mr. MONK. I desire to ask the government if they will table any correspondence had with the American government since the last batch of correspondence was laid upon the table. I understand there has been an exchange of letters, and that notably since what is known as the Champ Clark utterance, there has been some correspondence, letters addressed, I believe, to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), or it may be, to the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). I think that all this correspondence up to the present moment should be tabled.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) refers to some correspondence which the Minister of Finance has had in relation to the Champ Clark utterance?

Mr. MONK. I said that amongst other things it was said that there had been an exchange of letters in regard to that question between the Secretary of State of the United States and my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding).

Mr. FIELDING. There is not a shadow of foundation for that statement.

Mr. MONK. Has there been any correspondence?

Mr. FIELDING.

Note this sibylline answer:

If there is any correspondence in relation to this matter with the United States authorities, properly the subject of consideration by this House, it will always be brought down.

Well, does my hon. friend not think—because he knew it—that when he gave that answer, he might have told the House that there had been correspondence? 'If there is any correspondence.' But he adds another qualification. He assumes to himself and to his colleagues, the right of saying whether that correspondence should be brought down; he and his colleagues will be the sole judges as to what should be given of that correspondence, and what should not. 'If there is any.' I submit to you that that is not a tenable attitude. All correspondence of any nature whatever bearing upon this question, we, who are called upon to ratify this treaty, have a right to see. Now, let me add another word, and I speak in the judgment of the members of this House. This question has already passed through quite a range of discussion and deliberation. When my hon. friends returned from the United States, and when we had the first news of their negotiations issued, not only here but in the United States, the discussions and opinions freely given were as to the value of these schedules, what were the concessions made on each side, and nothing else. Then there came a second phase, and we were invited by the public press of both countries, and by those who spoke upon this subject, to give our opinion in regard to the broader question raised by this agreement, that is its effect on trade generally between the two countries, and more particularly on the transportation question. Then it entered upon another phase, and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that to-day the discussion has assumed much larger proportions. We are treated in the newspapers of the neighbouring republic, and of our own to a consideration almost exclusively of the ultimate effect of this agreement upon our political relations. Open these newspapers and see what our public men have to say: the utterances which they make turn upon this point. Is this going to lead to annexation, yes or no? I do not insist on that point, but I say that is what it has come to. Look at the trend of discussion in the United States, open their newspapers, and in every part of that country, it is not the schedules, it is not the particular bearing of this treaty upon the interchange of the natural products of both countries, it is annexation, and nothing

else. We have seen what Mr. Champ Clark said. I hear a laugh on the other side. Do my hon. friends find that a droll utterance? For my part I do not. We have that utterance coming from a man, who may be an incurable humourist, but who occupies a position very much the same as my right hon. friend does here, or as the leader of the opposition. It is true that the motion made in the House of Representatives by Mr. Bennett did not emanate from a man possessing similar authority : but from what I see in the United States papers, that gentleman holds a certain position in the Congress of the United States. His proposals were not accepted, but although they were condemned on many sides, they were treated seriously. The entire press of the country, the deliberations in the legislatures recently again—perhaps you saw in the reports of this morning the reference to the legislature of Dakota—lead one to believe that they at least, in perfect good faith perhaps, look upon the real question at the back of this agreement as a question of annexation. In our own newspapers it is very much the same thing. Led on by the discussions, by the trend of public opinion here, they are discussing that question in our own country, and when we read the reports which have arrived here, the telegraphic despatches from the other side of the Atlantic, we find that in England they have taken this question quite seriously, interpolations are made in the House there on the subject, and evidently the least one can say is that this phase of the question has created unrest in a country where we would be glad, I may say, to think that there is no doubt as to the attitude of this country.

Are we entirely blameless in this matter? Are the gentlemen who have brought about these negotiations, and the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself able to throw stones right and left? We know what utterances in the past, because we have heard a great deal in and out of the House, have fallen in moments of forgetfulness, probably, from the right hon. gentleman. The difference between a British shilling and an American dollar, ripe fruit falling from the tree, continental free trade—all these matters have been dished up very often, and although I know my hon. friend is not an incurable humorist there was at that time some seriousness in what he said. And my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in that respect, has been a very hardened sinner, I think, because I have not heard him recant, when, time and again in this House, he has been charged with utterances, in the long ago days; of course, in favour of secession and annexation, I think, too.

Mr. FIELDING. I take exception to the statement of the hon. gentleman. When the hon. gentleman says that I was ever an annexationist he is fabricating a statement which no man in this House can substantiate.

Mr. MONK. I assure my hon. friend that I am very glad to hear him make that statement.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman should not be content with that; he should show some warrant for his statement.

Mr. MONK. I could show warrant, if we had the debates of the House in past years, for the statement, that time and again my hon. friend has been charged with holding and expressing in his province views of that kind.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend, I can assure him, is mistaken. I have never been charged in my presence until this moment.

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend states that he has nothing to retract——

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

An hon. MEMBER. Send and get the book.

Mr. MONK. It will be all right.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. MONK. With pleasure. But my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) himself, when younger, in his green and salad days, spoke in that way sometimes. My hon. friend knows it, but he has recanted, he has abjured and denied and the most rigid of casuists would find nothing that would be regarded as a blot on his reputation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. With the permission of the hon. member from Jacques Cartier, I will ask him to what he is referring?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend has often seen quoted, has he not, in the newspapers of the French language in our province, speeches of his own in which he spoke in the sense that I have indicated?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In what sense?

Mr. MONK. I have the whole paraphernalia here and I can get it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In what sense.

Mr. MONK. In the sense of annexation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I now rise to a point of order. I wish to state most emphatically that my hon. friend is in error. I have never, directly or indirectly, expressed any sentiment, by word of mouth or by writ-

ing, in favour of the annexation of Canada to the United States. My hon. friend, if he will allow me just one minute, may have in his mind a speech which I delivered in 1893 at Parc Sohmer, in Montreal.

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will explain the incident. In 1893 the St. Jean Baptiste Society of Montreal had organized a public meeting in order to promote the erection of a building called the Monument National, and a public debate was arranged for by the then president of the St. Jean Baptiste Society, the late Mr. J. X. Perrault. This debate was purely academic.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. Four speakers were selected to discuss the following questions: Statu quo, independence, imperial federation and annexation. I was allotted the privilege——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LEMIEUX—of discussing the question of the independence of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My late friend, Mr. Archibald McGoun, King's Counsel, was given charge of the imperial federation question; my late friend, Mr. Cardinal, King's Counsel, of Montreal, was assigned to the discussion of the question of statu quo; the question of annexation was taken up by a good Ontario King's counsel, Mr. Elgin Myers. The public was given——

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. May I ask a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The public was given a chance to vote on the four questions.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The minister (Mr. Lemieux) is speaking with the permission of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I do not——

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am making a statement.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, it is customary in this House, when a member rises in his place and interrupts a speaker, to ask a question, and not to make a speech. Therefore, I claim that the hon. Postmaster General is entirely out of order.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has the floor. He has consented to allow the minister to give an explanation, but the hon. member for Jacques Cartier can resume the debate whenever he wishes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The public was given a chance to vote——

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Order.

Mr. LEMIEUX—and in connection therewith a certain sum of money was subscribed. I may say that the question of the independence of Canada triumphed that evening. It was a purely academic debate and I would not be afraid, when the occasion arises in this House, to quote my speech from beginning to end. It has been fully reported in the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' and in the press of the country, but as regards annexation, I have always been opposed to it.

Mr. MONK. There is no doubt we are often misjudged in public life, but if I were to pursue this examination of conscience with my hon. friends I am afraid I would take up more of the time of the House than I deem it necessary to. I would have liked had he been present to say something about our friend the Nihilist; the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who at one time earned in our province the cognomen of the Nihilst, because he would concede nothing and claimed everything, and he thought that if we wanted to defend ourselves in this country the home government itself ought to purchase the arms for us, because we could not afford to spend the money.

Mr. TALBOT. How long ago was that?

Mr. MONK. Oh, not so very long ago. Of course I know that to-day his repentance has been complete and we know him now as an admiral. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt upon one point; there is in the United States amongst people best disposed towards us, those whom we meet when we go there, a disposition to think we are not in possession of freedom here. I have noticed it time and again, and other gentlemen of this House must also have noticed that there is a disposition to think that we in Canada require something politically better. Probably their minds are filled with the memory of other days and times when colonial relations were not such as they are to-day. Undoubtedly that feeling exists in the neighbouring republic. Would it not be right for us before we proceed any further in this matter to accentuate precisely our position at this moment. I have not studied in diplomatic schools and I do not claim to know exactly how relations must be conducted between free nations, but I suppose they must be likened to a certain extent to the relations

between individuals, and if I had a business proposal to make to a man I would not be very much flattered if, having my proposal before him, he should discuss the question of annexing me and causing my identity to disappear. It seems to me that we will do a great deal in this country to quiet a feeling of legitimate anxiety which exists if we now voice what is exactly the feeling of the country, because I have no hesitation in saying that there is not a public body in Canada that would not, upon this question, declare themselves, as it seems to me we ought to declare ourselves now. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, without wishing to delay in any way the interesting discussion which was going on yesterday, I beg to move that the following words be added to the main motion in your hands:

But, before resuming the discussion of the terms of the agreement concluded between the government of Canada and the President of the United States, and with a view to dispel the feeling of unrest created in Canada by comments made in both countries as to the political consequence of the agreement, the House wishes to affirm emphatically its determination to preserve intact the bonds which unite Canada to the British Empire, and the full liberty of Canada to control her fiscal policy and internal automony.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that the incorrigible jokers or humorists, as my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) styled them, are not all on the other side of the line; we have some of them in Canada. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has spoken of some friend of mine on this side of the House who gave expression to certain utterances in his green and salad days, but we have all been young, and for my own part I am ready to confess that I have had my green and salad days too. However, they are over by this time with me, although it would seem that there are some men who are always in their green and salad days, no matter how mature in years they may be. I need not mention who the man is on that side of the House who is still in his green and salad days. Sir, this discussion in which we are now engaged has given rise to a great deal of comment on both sides of the line. Men there are on the other side of the line who have interpreted this arrangement as meaning ultimately the annexation of Canada to the United States. Men there are on this side of the line who have taken the same position, but I am glad to say there is not one man on this side of the House who has ever thought of such a thing. It appears that men there are on the side of the House on which my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) sits whose views upon this question are disturbed, and who believe that in the discussion of this question of a better trade arrangement between us and our neighbours the Canadian people would be so wanting in self-respect that they might be driven beyond an agreement so wise in itself to a conclusion which the hon. gentleman dreads. If there are such men in this chamber I repeat that they do not sit on this side of the House. But if it is necessary, in order to strengthen the wavering faith of the hon. gentlemen who sit with and around my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), for my part I have no objection whatever to accept the present motion and to say that this discussion will not in any way affect or jeopardize the allegiance of this country to the mother land. Surely, it is not worth while discussing that; surely there was no necessity for this motion. It affirms a principle which everybody is persuaded of and which no one needed to affirm, but in order to make it doubly sure, in order to affirm not only to this country but to the other side also that this discussion in which we are now engaged does not mean what has been stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) it may mean, I shall for my part vote for his motion and I hope all on this side of the House will vote for it also. I have to say to my hon. friend that all the correspondence that has taken place on this question has been brought down. Why should we not bring it down? What object could we have to serve by keeping anything from this House. I do not know as to whether Mr. Fielding or Mr. Paterson, or somebody else has received a private letter or letters, but any correspondence in the hands of the government has been laid before the House. I have only to say, Sir, that we will vote for this resolution.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I did not know that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) proposed to introduce this motion until after he had come into the House to-day, and therefore, I did not prepare to speak upon it. I would like to say, however, that it would seem to me to have been a wise course for the Prime Minister, if he thinks that conditions at the present time are such as to justify him in accepting this motion, to have brought it in as Prime Minister of this country, and to have asked the parliament of Canada, and the people of Canada to accept it. But my right hon. friend appears to have departed to-day from the line of argument which he took some years ago in accepting this motion. He says that there is no danger, and that the people of Canada realize that there is no danger, and that there is no man in this House who realizes that there is any danger. The loyalty of the Canadian people does not need to be affirmed; but let me tell my right

hon. friend that if these proposals of his mean anything, in my judgment, they mean, in the end that commercial union for which he fought in 1891, and concerning which a man who was his leader for some years, and whom he followed in this House, and in this country, made a memorable declaration over his signature, in a letter published immediately after the election of 1891. Hon. Edward Blake, to whom I refer, had no doubt that commercial union would lead to, would end in the political absorption of Canada into the United States which the right hon. gentleman says is not a danger to-day. My right hon. friend touched with a very light hand some very notable utterances which have been made in the Congress of the United States. I will not deal with the press comment in the United States ; I have seen a great deal of it. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is perfectly right when he says that press opinion in the United States in very many influential quarters is supporting these proposals, not upon economic considerations, but for the reason that they will undoubtedly lead to the political absorption of this country into the United States ; and in that they are of course simply following the line which Mr. Blake took in 1891 when he said that commercial union meant in the end political union. The Prime Minister was inclined to refer in a somewhat jocular way to the utterances of Mr. Champ Clark in the House of Representatives of the United States. There was a very mysterious silence about those utterances in a certain part of the press of the United States immediately after they had been made. As far as one could judge, it was an inspired silence. I find that on the day following those utterances there were press despatches in nearly all the newspapers of Canada, which were designed to lead the people of this country to suppose that Mr. Champ Clark had made those utterances in a jocular way. I took the very first opportunity of examining the 'Congressional Record' to ascertain if possible from the context whether those utterances were serious or jocular, and I will read them to this House from the 'Congressional Record,' with a portion of the context, and hon. gentlemen can judge for themselves whether they were serious or not. It is perfectly true that this gentleman occupies a very important place in the United States at the present time. He is the leader of the Democratic party in the House of Representatives, and it is believed that he will be the Speaker of that House in the new Congress. The vote upon this reciprocity agreement divided the Republican party. A majority of the Republican party voted against it —if I remember rightly, 87 voted against it, and 78 for it. Mr. Clark made his

appeal to the Democratic party, with the result that 142 members of that party besides himself voted for the agreement, and I think only five Democrats voted against it. So that the appeal that carried the Democratic party in the United States House of Representatives to vote for the agreement was the appeal contained in the speech of Mr. Champ Clark. What was that appeal? I will read what Mr. Champ Clark said, as reported at page 2623 of the 'Congressional Record' of the 14th of February, 1911 :

> The chief thing that this country needs in its business is a wider market, and I am in favour of this reciprocity Bill because it gives wider markets to American products. That will be one great point gained. Considered as a whole, our exports are large, but our per capita exports are smaller than those of any other great commercial nation on earth, which is not a healthy condition.

You will observe that there is no humour thus far ; everything is matter of fact and plain and serious. He continues :

> As much as any other living man I desire to see them increased. Therefore I am for this Bill, because it will increase our exports. I am in favour of this Bill because it establishes closer trade relations with one of our nearest neighbours, and the closer trade relations you have with your neighbours the better off you are.

No humour—nothing of a jocular character, thus far.

> When Thomas Jefferson delivered his first inaugural on the 4th day of March, 1801, he enunciated the principles upon which this government should be conducted, and one of the principles was: 'Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none.'

No humour there, and nothing of a jocular nature thus far ; and, by the way, the last clause of that sentence in particular would be a very good motto for Canada at the present time. He continues :

> That has been the mainspring of our policy ever since, or should have been. We have spent or will spend somewhere in the neighbourhood of $500,000,000 to build the Panama canal. Therefore I am in favour of the reciprocity treaty to promote our trade relations. That is what we spent that money for. We are not spending that vast sum because we are altrinsto but as a business matter.

I do not observe anything of a jocular or humorous character in Mr. Clark's remarks up to this point. Then he continues :

> I am for it, because I hope to see the day the American flag will float over every square foot of the British North America possessions clear to the north pole.

I do not observe anything which would lead me to believe that that remark was

made in a humorous or jocular vein. There is not the slightest indication of it. Then he continues :

They are people of our blood. They speak our language. Their institutions are much like ours. They are trained in the difficult art of self-government. My judgment is that if the treaty of 1854 had never been abrogated the chances of a consolidation of these two countries would have been much greater than they are now.

Then he was interrupted with a question :

Mr. MARTIN, of South Dakota. Will the gentleman favour the abrogation of our tariff law entirely so far as Canada is concerned, and making free trade with Canada on all products?

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. By taking Canada in to become a part of the United States; yes.

There was nothing apparently humorous or jocular in that statement. Further on he was interrupted in this way:

Mr. NORTON. I wanted to ask the gentleman something along the lines of universal peace. As I understand it, the gentleman favours this Bill for at least one reason, that it will have a tendency in the end to bring Canada into the union.

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. Yes, I have no doubt about that.

Mr. MORRIS. Will that have a tendency to preserve peace with Great Britain?

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. Why, certainly it will. I do not have any doubt whatever that the day is not far distant when Great Britain will joyfully see all of her North American possessions become a part of this republic. That is the way things are tending now.

It is thus clear that Mr. Clark's observations were perfectly serious and were part of a serious discussion.

There are a great many other observations in Mr. Clark's speech of a very important character so far as the economic features of this proposed arrangement are concerned. I do not intend to go into these to-day, but shall later on for the purpose of showing that the government could not have chosen a more inopportune time and occasion for entering into these negotiations. Mr. Clark distinctly declared that in addition to his reasons which I have already quoted, for desiring that this treaty should be accepted, he considered it merely an instalment of the tariff changes which the Democratic party were prepared to carry out the moment they had control of Congress. In other words, when the Democratic party gets control of Congress, they would, if we had not been in such haste, have given us every advantage we might possibly gain under this treaty, and it would not have been necessary for this country to make any of the sacrifices entailed by the proposal now before parliament. The whole situation as at present developed, shows in what an unfortunate position the government have placed the country when it brings down a tariff to parliament and says you must accept or reject it as a whole. There is a very radical difference between a secret tariff made by diplomatic methods and a tariff proposed to parliament to be considered and passed under the ordinary parliamentary procedure prevailing in this country and in the United Kingdom. In the one case, as in 1894, 1897 and 1907, the government comes to parliament with proposals that have been worked out by the government themselves, and which they present to parliament for its serious consideration; and in the instances to which I have alluded dozens of amendments, and on at least one occasion, hundreds of amendments, were made to the proposals as brought down. But in the present instance, no discretion of the kind is left us. We are told by the government that they have secretly consented to a certain arrangement, which may work injustice to us in many ways, but which we must either reject or approve as a whole. We are in fact asked to give our approval merely as a matter of form. As the right hon. gentleman himself said in 1895 with regard to a somewhat similar transaction: We must either swallow or reject it, holus bolus. It is unfortunate that the government should have placed parliament in such a situation. A tariff worked out in secret by diplomatic methods and then presented in such a way as to preclude any amendment or alteration by this House is bound to lead to dissatisfaction and trouble. Further than that, I am firmly persuaded that it would have been much wiser for Canada and for the United States each to deal with its own tariff in every instance, as seemed best without any understanding of this kind. I venture to affirm that an arrangement of this kind, adopted under such conditions cannot fail to lead to complications, irritation and discontent, and to a disturbance of the good relations which have up to the present prevailed between the two countries. An experiment of this kind has been tried before. It has been tried between the dominions of the empire under the British flag, and experience has shown that it has led to irritation, friction and dissatisfaction.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (York). I propose to say a few words on this question from the national standpoint which has induced my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) to submit this resolution. As regards the suggestion that the proposed arrangement contains the germ of annexation to the United States, I believe it does, but I believe also that Canadians are strong enough in their devotion to their

country to reject any proposal in the direction of annexation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). But what are the circumstances under which this proposal comes before us. A new departure in constitutional government is being introduced. In the old days the King was supreme, and then came the lords and gradually the commons came to have control, and to-day in the old country all the powers are about to be taken by the House of Commons in the interests of the people. But in this country another great development is taking place, and we are asked to give exclusively into the hands of the cabinet the power of making the tariff. That is a crime against the constitution, against the rights of the people, greater than ever attempted heretofore in this House. In the old days, as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), has said, this House had the right to control all money Bills whether for the expending of money or the raising of money for revenue purposes. But to-day we have reached such a stage that the cabinet and the Prime Minister, in an irresponsible way and without consulting this House, frame our tariff and tell us that we must either accept it without amendment or reject it. Well, if there be anything which is of national importance, it is that parliament should control all money Bills and the making of our tariff. But here we have had negotiations carried on in Washington culminating with an agreement with regard to the tariff. That tariff was brought down and we are told that we cannot change it, but must take it as presented. Even the screws are put on the government side, and they are given no opportunity of saying what they think about it. In fact a closure is put on the whole House and the whole country, and we are told that we must accept this tariff proposal without any change whatever. As has been said a few moments ago, every other tariff Bill has been submitted to this House as a government measure, open to explanation, discussion and amendment. Deputations were heard with regard to it, their suggestions were considered, some were adopted and changes made. Other delegations came that were affected by the amendment, and they were heard. And so, after a great deal of talk, after many amendments, after everybody was heard, the new tariff Bill was voted and carried—the result of a compromise, as every tariff Bill ought to be. But here, for the first time in the history of this House, a tariff Bill is laid before us, the result of surreptitious negotiation between the Prime Minister, who is the new czar of this country, and the czar of the United States, and the people of the whole of North America are committed to a tariff proposal to which there is to be no amendment, negotiated by the czars of the two countries. There is a feeling in the United States, as there is here, that if our tariffs are to be made for us in this way, and if they are to be made for us in Washington, as in this case, the people of Canada, or the parliament of Canada not being consulted, then, on the face of it, the tendency of such a proposal is toward the destruction of our national autonomy and our gradually absorption into the United States. I have not any doubt that that will be the result of this proposal. And that that will be the effect the people of the United States believe—not only the members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States, but men, business men generally. And I take that fact from a friend who has recently come from New York, and who has been in touch with business men there. He tells me that the biggest men there regard the proposal as one step on the road to annexation. And if this proposal realizes, or tends to realize, the view expressed by Mr. Champ Clark as to the American flag waving over the whole of North America, is it not reasonable that the United States should be prepared to make tariff concessions to that end? On the other hand, we, by adopting this proposal, say in effect that, for a tariff consideration, for a money consideration, we will endanger our nationality. Is not our nationality endangered if, when a tariff Bill is to be made, word is sent to the Canadian government to send delegates to Washington to look after our interests? It means, if this proposal is carried, that never in the future can there be another tariff Bill introduced in this House without the consent of the people of the United States. This country will be indubitably committed to such a principle if this proposition is accepted. Never, hereafter, can any move be made in connection with the tariff without first sending to Washington to enter into secret negotiations with them. And never again—and this is the most significant thing of all if this method is to be continued, which I hope it will not be—never again will the people of Canada have the opportunity they have always had heretofore of discussing a tariff measure as introduced in this House, amending it, compromising on it, or adopting it as we see fit. That is the thing that is ahead of the people of Canada to-day—that they are losing absolutely their tariff independence.

Mr. TALBOT. Even with a change of government?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). No, not with a change of government. But, adopt this

proposal and the people of Canada, forever after, if hon. gentlemen opposite have their way, will have their tariff proposals brought into this House for discussion, but beyond amendment. Those questions will not be for settlement in Canada, but for settlement by surreptitious negotiations carried on in Washington—and we have, shall have, to be satisfied with that which goes to the lesser as compared with the greater. And once they start to break us down in that connection, all legislation proposed in this House will be on that basis: Come to Washington and have a secret negotiation, and we will give you something that you must take to the parliament of Canada to be passed holus bolus. That is the danger of our situation, and it is the greatest danger that ever came to us. It is a great change, an enormous change, an organic change—and the proposal is introduced in this House without ever consulting the people with regard to it. Surely, a Liberal party, surely a party headed by one who has made the professions made by the leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), would say that if there is to be an organic change, a change of autonomy, it should be only after the people have been consulted by a general election. But there is nothing of that kind. If there is a warrant, as was said a few moments ago by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), the only warrant for this change is that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his friends from 1887 to 1892 were advocates of commercial union. But when they proposed commercial union to the people of this country it was repudiated. Years after the government abandoned it. But, like the dog returning to its vomit, in this quiet and surreptitious way the proposal is made to resume these commercial union negotiations and to put Canada into a commercial union with the United States. And what was the folly of the right hon. gentleman—mention has been made here of 'green and salad days'—what was the folly of his political manhood has to-day become the suicidal madness of his later years, a thing that will bring himself and his party to destruction. I have no doubt that the people of this country to-day are determined to maintain their political autonomy, and above all to make their own tariffs. In that view the people of Canada will repudiate the right hon. gentleman's party in the next election, as they did in the election of 1891. For the proposal which is made—I say it again and insist upon it—means the surrender of our tariff autonomy. I got that idea from my late father, who, in discussing these questions in the old days, constantly insisted on the idea that if Canada was ever to pass beyond the tutelage of the old colonial position, as we have done, it must be by absolute control of her own tariff. We fought it out in this country and took away the control of our tariff from the mother country, and it was the greatest assertion of Canadian independence that was ever made. To-day the government of this country proposes to give up that independence and hand that autonomy over to our rivals of the United States. That certainly is not in the line of progress, and yet that is the proposal to-day—that the old commercial union idea should be revived, that our tariff is to be made in the United States, and that the people of Canada are to have no voice in it. Can that be justified on any grounds? Will anybody say that a surreptitious treaty made by two or three representatives of each nation can take in the broad national aspect of the tariff? Why, in this country, it is proposed that we should have a permanent tariff board. In the United States that has become a practical question—to have a board of tariff experts to deal with the tariff in order that the very fullest consideration may be given to every element of every question arising, that witnesses may be called, that interests may be heard, and tariff schedules worked out that will best meet the conditions. Instead of all that, this new and tyrannical view of the constitution is to be asserted in this country, and people are never again—because it is not for this session or this tariff alone—to have a voice in parliament as to making the tariff, or as to the interpretation of any single item in it. Never was there such an abandonment of national rights and national autonomy as is contained in this Bill; never did any man who calls himself a Canadian have more reason to be ashamed when he sees such a proposal made in the House of Commons of Canada, a proposal to abandon our tariff autonomy and to hand it over to the people of the United States. Well may the people of the United States afford to make tariff concessions. They can tell their farmers: Yes, we are going to let in Canadian farm products, even if they do damage you, because we are not looking at the tariff; we are looking at the effect of this arrangement on national questions, at the effect it will have in raising the Stars and Stripes from Mexico to the Arctic ocean. Now, another aspect which has been raised by this discussion—

Mr. TALBOT. I rise to a point of order, as I see the hon. gentleman is proceeding with his speech. A moment ago he referred to the Liberal party, to the party on this side of the House, as a dog returning to his vomit. I want to know, Mr. Speaker, if you consider that expression parliamentary.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Certainly in no offensive sense at all, but in the or-

dinary sense in which it is used in English literature; and if the hon. gentleman was a little more conversant with English literature, he would see there is nothing offensive in the term in the sense in which I used it.

Mr. SPEAKER. My ruling is that it is a figure of speech.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Even if you had told me I was out of order——

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman does not use the expression in an offensive way.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Certainly not.

Mr. TALBOT. Then it is an after dinner expression.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Now let me come to the continental aspect of this great question. There are two systems of government on this continent to-day; there is the American system and there is the Canadian or British system. What is the difference between them, and where are we likely to land if the Canadian system should disappear? The British system of government as exemplified in the old land, and more or less exemplified in Canada, is an unlimited system of government. Certainly in the old country they can do anything the people desire, they can carry out any view that the people may hold. Let me compare that system with the United States system. In the United States the government is limited in every way and problems that arise there cannot be dealt with. Under the British system they can be dealt with, and are being dealt with, as we see to-day where great social and economical questions are being handled and carried out. In the United States the dominant idea is the exploitation of the resources of the country, the exploitation of its natural resources by the great interests. In England and in Canada more attention is paid to social and economic conditions; but in the United States everybody is devoting his time and energy to the exploitation of the natural resources of the country, and of the public interests by the great corporations. As a consequence of this condition of things, affairs have come to a rather bad mess in the United States, and now we find that the Senate of the United States has gradually absorbed most of the powers of government. Even the integrity of the courts has been questioned, and the control of the legislatures has passed into the hands, to some extent, of the interests. We see now a great magazine movement in the United States, the object of which is to restore the old time conditions and to get them into better shape. They point out that a marvellous change has come about in the last 20 or 25 years, and that the old democracy which existed in that country from the inception of the union down to the period of the great civil war, has disappeared. In former days there was a political equality, one man's vote and influence were as good as another's. Now all that has disappeared. The great interests have control of the legislatures; they have control of the courts, and to such an extent, that the old democratic equality of political power as between individuals no longer obtains, but all power is centred in the great interests, or in what are called the political machines. That is a thing to be deplored. But there is worse than that. There is no longer any democracy of opportunity in the United States, no longer is there any democracy of wealth, all that has disappeared. In the old days one man's wealth was almost equal to another's, but to-day there is an enormous concentration of wealth in the hands of a few. The control of a great many institutions dealing with the savings of the people has absolutely passed to Wall street, the control of the savings of the people vested in insurance companies has passed to Wall street. To-day things are so bad that the people are almost on the verge of revolution. And yet, Sir, at the very time when this great political upheaval is in sight, we propose to enter into closer relations with the people of the United States, and to put the control of our tariff into their hands. When the inevitable disorder and revolution come about, they will have control of our tariff, and where will we be? We will be dealing with a nation whose record shows them to be not over careful or over scrupulous in the way they handle questions of that kind. They would say: The best way to put down a revolution at home is to extend the American flag all over the continent. That is really the proposal that we are dealing with to-day; they wish to divert public attention from domestic troubles, and to turn it upon this question of trade relations with Canada.

In the past we know that they were not friendly to us. The people of the United States drove out the United Empire Loyalists, who made this country. They invaded this country more than once, they allowed the Fenians to invade this country and the dream of every American statesman to-day is the unification of the continent. They have the plan all laid out for taking over Mexico any day, but they say that with Mexico in its present condition the people are too yellow for them and they propose to counterbalance them with the white people of Canada and bring the two countries in together. Will anybody deny that such a feeling is existing over there? I have read it time and again. The republican party of the United States have

refused to entertain a proposal to extend their states farther until a Canadian counterbalance of white people is brought about. Look at the construction of the Panama canal. What is the object of that but the continentalization of the whole of America. They have gradually dipped their hands into the affairs of every little republic in Central America. Morgan, the other day, financed Honduras for the purpose of making it easy to secure American control of the Panama canal. They are building that canal and they are going to dominate the whole of Central America. They took over the Panama belt, not by any right, but by an Act of acquisition, and rough-shod acquisition at that. They are ready to take over Mexico, but they want Canada as an offset. Continentalism is the dream of every American. I do not blame them at all for having such dreams, but I do blame my fellow-countrymen who will aid and abet such dreams by setting down to make a tariff with them to the disadvantage of Canada, the result of which will be that we shall have to go to Washington to make the future tariffs of this country.

Mr. DEVLIN. Was that sentiment existing in the States in 1894?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I cannot say what were the sentiments in 1894; I say that the sentiment that exists to-day is continentalism.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will the hon. gentleman explain why, in this House, in 1894, Sir John Thompson, then Prime Minister of Canada, made use of these words:

> The hon. gentleman says we could have a greater trade than that by throwing down the tariff wall. He goes on the old fallacy, which we have had put forward in this country for ten years, that all we have to do is to pass a statute and have reciprocity with the United States. By all means, if the regulation of the trade with a foreign country is in the hands of this parliament, let us pass a statute and have reciprocity right away.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Reciprocity brought about by the independent action of each House, or rather a tariff made by each House that gives us free trade no one can blame because then each party could act absolutely in its own interest. If such a tariff resulted in promoting trade I could not say anything against it, because it might be a benefit to this country, but to sit down surreptitiously, not openly, and make a tariff without consulting the Canadian people, is a crime against this country, and the country will hold every man responsible who attempts to do it. The tendency of this proposition is towards annexation. The hope of the world is the domination and success of the British system of politics, that system of government which we have inherited from the old land. There is more thought of humanity and progress in the British association of free states like the mother country, Canada and Australia, than in anything else. There is no hope for humanity in the domination of the American republic over the whole of this continent. They are not taking up any of the great questions of to-day. They are not fighting the battles of humanity, they are not fighting the battle of the heathen or the oppressed in the distant continents of Africa or Asia. The hope of humanity in the British system, and one of the bulwarks of the British system is the maintenance of Canadian nationality on the northern half of this continent. There is danger of our Canadian nationality being injured by appeals being made to the people based on their pocket rather than on their nationality, appeals where there is no deliberation, where there is no amendment and no compromise. I say as a Canadian, what I said in opening my speech here to-day, that I have little fear of annexation resulting as some people think. But there is one section of this community that I wish to make an appeal to to-day. Perhaps I will not be credited with much earnestness in making the suggestion, but I do make the suggestion to my fellow-countrymen who live in the province of Quebec, who are of the French race and who value above all the autonomy which they have to-day. I say that anything that tends in the direction of annexation, or if annexation should ever come as the result of these proposals, it means good-bye to the people of Quebec with regard to the autonomy that they have to-day. It will be wiped out like a flash in the night.

Mr. TALBOT. We thank you for the advice.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I knew I would meet that statement from some one, but I say to the people of Quebec that they had better pause when an organic proposal of that kind is being made and not allow themselves to be led into the support of such a proposal because it means the end of their autonomy and any other autonomy within the limits of Canada will disappear later on. To-day is the day to put in a protest, and if the people of Quebec love their institutions, their language and their rights, as I believe they do, they will see to it—and this is to be my amendment later on.

Mr. DEVLIN. Why does the hon. gentleman appeal to Quebec?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I have the right, I hope. They are my fellow-countrymen, as much as you are, and if the opportunity is presented to me——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). If the opportunity is presented to me to say a word for the province of Quebec, which is one of the best provinces we have in Canada—

Mr. DEVLIN. And one of the most loyal.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). One of the most loyal to its institutions. But, if the North America Act, which gives autonomy to these people, is to be destroyed in its most significant clause which gives us control of our tariff and we give that away to the people of the United States what next is to come? Thus I say to the people of Quebec that we have this great organic change proposed in this House and we have hardly a single Quebec member who enters a protest.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). If the old Tory party in England had had its way how much autonomy would the province of Quebec have had to-day?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Thank God, I am not responsible for the old Tory party. Perhaps some hon. gentlemen on the other side are. Certainly the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) is not; I will give him credit for being a progressive Liberal.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would like to know why the hon. gentleman appeals to Quebec?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I have given you my reasons. They have, within the British constitution, certain rights and privileges of their own and if our constitution is to be broken down—

Mr. TALBOT. If.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Yes, and it is proposed here to-day to do that because it will mean that Canada will never again have a word to say in the making of her tariff. This is a great organic change the effect of which will be that we shall never have a word to say in the making of our tariff but that we shall have to go to Washington for instructions. Again, I say to the people of Quebec, pause now before this thing is done, let us take time to deliberate and then it must not be carried until the people of Canada have had a chance to register their voice on the question.

Mr. TALBOT. Why do you not publish a French edition of the 'World?'

Mr. MACLEAN (York). The hon. gentleman is too humorous; if he has no better argument than that, I will not take up my time by answering him. But, if we are to abandon the control of our tariff and give it to the United States, it should not be done without a mandate from the people. There has been no mandate. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), may think he has a mandate. He knows what happened in 1891, when commercial union was repudiated, and he has no right to resurrect that at this time of day without consulting the people in a general election. Does he propose to do it? Will he go to the people on this question? I challenge him to-day to face the people of Canada on this question. There are certain things that a government can take in its own hands; it can lead the people into war and it may have to do it, but the government has no right to make a great organic policy change without consulting the people. Twice has the English government recently gone to the people and they say they have the mandate of the people, and Mr. Asquith, the Liberal leader in Great Britain, is pressing a great constitutional amendment this very day, on what he declares to be the mandate of the people. Is the right hon. the Prime Minister pressing this proposal before us to-day on the mandate of the people? I challenge him to stand up and say that he is. I say that he is abandoning the rights of the Canadian people. He is handing over our commercial integrity to our neighbours and in doing that, he is doing an unconstitutional thing. Again, I tell the people of Quebec that if our privilege in this parliament in regard to the tariff is to go, they will see what may happen to them later on. It is for the people of this country, (not to say perhaps that this nation shall be abandoned for ever), but it ought to be the duty of every man in this House to vote for a proposal that the consideration of this issue shall go further, only when the people shall be given an opportunity to speak in regard to it. To prove how deep my idea of Canadian nationality is, I repeat that we Canadians are on this continent to stay. I believe there is room on this great North American continent for at least two free and independent communities, based on English ideas of government, and that Canada is, must, and shall be one of these—by the grace of our neighbours if they choose to accord it; in spite of them if we must. That is the true idea of Canadian nationality. I have no fear that even while these proposals of the government tend in the direction of annexation or in the direction of commercial union, that the people of Canada, especially the young men and young women of this newer and greater Dominion, will ever have any other aim than the domination of the northern half of the continent by Canadians and by the maintenance of Canadian institutions in alliance with the old land. In a single night that great imperial idea of the mother land and the daughter states being associated, disappears, and the whole

thing starts to slide down the hill if we move in the direction of commercial union. I have spoken from the constitutional and national point of view and later on I purpose telling how this arrangement affects my own riding, my own city and my own province, and how it destroys the industry of the market gardeners around the city of Toronto, who are constituents of mine; an industry laboriously built up by these industrious people. Already the land they cultivate has fallen in value, for fear of this arrangement. The same thing happens with regard to the fruit growers in the Niagara district. Even to-day the future of Toronto is changed by this proposal, and Canadian manufacturers, with annexation in view, are not going to increase their capital and their industries. But the greatest danger of all is to our transportation industry. The transportation of Canada moves east and west and capital moves east and west, and the great source of our capital to-day, is in the mother land, and if we have the policy and commercial institutions of the United States, we soon will see the last of British capital coming to Canada.

Mr. AMES. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean), is now discussing the merits of the proposal.

Mr. FIELDING. He has been doing that for a considerable time past.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). And I have a perfect right to do it, and the great mistake has been that the Bill has not been discussed on the proposal to go into supply. I was quite willing that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames), should go on to-day, and I told him so, but inasmuch as the question came up in this way, I exercise my right to speak on the motion. Again I warn the government that this is an unpatriotic proposal, that it should not go through, that it has a tendency in the direction of annexation, and that no action should be taken until the people of Canada have had an opportunity to pass on this great organic change in our system, which this proposal brings about.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I desire to offer my sympathies to my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), who, according to the programme was scheduled to speak this afternoon and who finds that three gentlemen on his own side have cut in to deprive him of the opportunity which belongs to him.

Mr. MONK. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has stated that I 'cut in' for the purpose of depriving my hon. friend (Mr. Ames), of his right to speak.

An hon. MEMBER. He said 'butt' in.

Mr. MONK. Whether it is 'cut in' or 'butt in' I do not think the expression should be used.

Mr. FIELDING. I would not charge my hon. friend with 'butting in', because it is rather a clumsy way, but I did say that he cut in, which is a more gentlemanly method.

Mr. MONK. I object to the insinuation of my hon. friend that I had a motive.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not ascribed any motive to the hon. gentleman, I merely mentioned the result, namely, that he has kept the hon. gentleman from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), from delivering his address, until at last in sheer desperation, the hon. member (Mr. Ames), had to protest against the hon. member from York (Mr. Maclean), discussing the merits of the question.

Mr. MONK. I have raised my point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not see that any point lies there, unless the hon. gentleman may further explain it.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no point except in what I have stated. We are not favoured in this House with the continuous presence of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean).

Mr. MACLEAN (York). The hon. gentleman is now making an unfair statement. I have been sick quite a number of days, and I have had a lot of sickness in my family, and I would be here long before this, if it were possible.

Mr. FIELDING. Then I withdraw what I have said on that point. I would not charge my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) with improper motives, but he is a busy man, and we know that every once in a while, when he turns up here, we may look out for squalls. It does appear to me that to-day the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean), finding it convenient to be here, and perhaps being obliged to go away soon, thought it would be a nice thing to cut in on a side issue and thus get in his speech, which he would not have got in for several days, had he waited the usual routine. I do not think I am doing any injustice to my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean), when I say that that seems to be the purpose of his address this afternoon. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) seems to be labouring under the delusion that this agreement does not require the approval of the parliament of Canada. He has talked again and again and again of this parliament having no voice in the matter. Well, this agreement is submitted to this parliament and every member of this parliament is as free to vote for or against this agree-

ment as he is to vote for or against any other matter that may be submitted to the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FIELDING. If any hon. gentleman takes exception to that statement, I do not know on what ground the exception can be taken. We cannot give effect to this agreement by any act of ours. All we can do, is to present to the House that which we believe, as we believe this to be, for the best interests of the great masses of the people of this country, and present it to the House with the best information and the best argument we can bring forward, and then await the judgment which the House may give. Agreements of any kind are not usually made out on the public street. Whether they be agreements of business or diplomacy or agreements of any kind they are necessarily made by conference between the parties interested, and all that the parties concerned in this matter can expect is, that the results of such conference will be presented to the people's representatives and that the people's representatives shall have a full and unqualified right to pass judgment upon the scheme that has been submitted to them. That is the position with regard to this agreement; that is the position with regard to every treaty and every agreement that is made anywhere. There have been reciprocity treaties and other treaties in times past. To hear hon. gentlemen opposite talk about this thing having been made in secret, one would imagine that all the treaties made in bygone years, had been made on the public highways. The thing is ridiculous. Every treaty is made by conference between the authorized representatives of the countries concerned, and this agreement, though not a treaty, though less formal than a treaty, has been made in the same way. The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), again and again said: Never again—and he emphasized it in ringing tones—never again will this parliament have a right to deal with a tariff matter. How can the hon. gentleman and those who agree with him, expect the people of Canada to be influenced by such statements as that? and it is only a specimen of hundreds of things that they are saying day after day. What says the document before them? I do not suppose my hon. friend from South York ever took the trouble to read it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I heard it explained by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FIELDING. I am obliged to assume that the hon. gentleman never read it——

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Yes, I read it.

Mr. FIELDING. Or never listened when I read it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the most charitable view that I can express, because if the hon. gentleman read or heard it read and explained, and if in the face of that he makes the statement which he made to-day, then I am afraid I would have to use language of a harsher nature than I would like to use with reference to my hon. friend, and harsher than you, Mr. Speaker, would permit me to use. On the very first page of this agreement we have the statement that the government of the two countries hope that this arrangement will be found satisfactory, and that it will be continued because it will be found satisfactory; and then we have this further statement—and if anybody can make it in stronger language than is contained in this passage, I would like to hear them:

> Nevertheless it is distinctly understood that we do not attempt to bind for the future the action of the United States Congress or the Parliament of Canada, but that each of these authorities shall be absolutely free to make any change of tariff policy or of any other matter covered by the present arrangement that may be deemed expedient.

And with that on the first page of this agreement, the hon. gentleman and friends of his on that side of the House, and men in the press representing them, go on day after day telling the people of Canada that we are bound hand and foot by this agreement. Now, the suggestion was made by the hon. member for South York that we ought to have an appeal to the people on this subject; but I did not find that that suggestion was received with the wildest enthusiasm on the other side of the House. I do not know how many years or how many months we may be from an election, but it cannot be very long before the people of Canada——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. I hope that it will be noticed that hon. gentlemen, spurred up by my gentle suggestion, have said that they want it now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. Very well, let it go on record; it may be useful by and by. But at some time, before very many months—it is a matter of opinion how many—we shall have an appeal to the people, and we have no reason to doubt that the government which has successfully appealed to the people in bygone years will appeal with greater strength than ever by reason of this agreement. I have had occasion to be associated with many public matters in this House, and I say that there never was a public

matter with which I was associated as to which I would be better prepared to go before the people from ocean to ocean, and look for a triumphant victory. But let us admit that at some day not too far distant we shall have an election. If hon. gentlemen opposite have the ghost of a hope of coming into power, why do they say that never again can this arrangement be changed? The agreement says that it can be changed by the parliament of Canada. Yet my hon. friend from South York says never again can it be changed; and when hon. gentlemen behind him slam their desks and applaud that sentiment, it means that never again in the present generation have these hon. gentlemen any hope of being placed in a position to change it.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition is evidently much troubled over this reciprocity matter. He has now given us three speeches on the subject, and he threatens us with one or two more.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not promise to be confined to that.

Mr. FIELDING. I think my hon. friend will find, before this thing gets through, that he will have to make a great many speeches; and when the time comes for him to go before the people of Canada and explain those speeches before the toiling masses of this Dominion, he will have occasion to make a great many. When I first heard the amendment of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, I did not think it was necessary. I thought it was rather useless. It talks about our loyalty and devotion. The man who flaunts his loyalty and the woman who flaunts her virtue are both open to suspicion.

Mr. MONK. Is my hon. friend opposed to the motion?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I am going to show my hon. friend that this motion is needed, and why.

Mr. MONK. If it is needed, my hon. friend had better not attack it.

Mr. FIELDING. It is needed by some persons and not by others—'they that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick.' My hon. friend proposes that we shall make a declaration of the loyalty and devotion of this House to British institutions. Sir, we on this side have no need of making any such declaration. If there is need for this motion, it is because hon. gentlemen opposite, by their own acts, have talked annexation in this country for the last month. Who ever heard of it before?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, it was heard away back in 1849, when the Tory leaders signed the annexation manifesto. In these later days, and in this more modern history in which it is our privilege to play a part, who ever heard any talk of annexation except when hon. gentlemen opposite wanted to use the old flag in order to cover up a bad political record in their attempt to obtain power which they could not obtain otherwise? If there are people in the United States to-day who think there is some annexation feeling in this country, what is the evidence to which they can point? They will say that the hon. members on that side of the House, in their public speeches, and that the press of the Conservative party, in its daily articles, are representing that this commercial proposal means annexation; and if there is any possible doubt—there is none on our side, I rejoice to say—in the minds of the people of Canada to-day as to the position of any man on this question of annexation, it is simply and solely because hon. gentlemen opposite have been proclaiming to the world that this fiscal arrangement has something to do with annexation.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Is Champ Clark a Canadian?

Mr. FIELDING. I will come to Champ Clark in a moment. It is because these hon. gentlemen, and they alone, have been talking about annexation, and I call the people to witness that the only people who talk about annexation to-day are the members of the Tory party.

I have now explained why I agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) as to the need for this motion. As doubts and aspersions on the loyalty of our people have been provoked by the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite, my hon. friend finds it necessary to come forward with a motion which practically says: Do not make any mistake; after all, though we have said a great many foolish things we do not mean them, and are good loyal subjects all the same. Therefore we on this side propose to vote for this motion, not because we think it necessary in our behalf, but because we think it is only right, after all that has happened, that hon. gentlemen opposite should have an opportunity of proclaiming to the world that they, who are the only party whose loyalty is in doubt, are devoted to British institutions.

Mr. MACDONELL. Might I put my hon. friend a question? He has made reference to the opportunities given for the discussion of this matter, I would like to ask if it be true that either before he and his colleague went to Washington or during the time they were there, certain Liberal members of this House were consulted by letter as to whether this proposed arrangement would be desirable or

not, and that no other members of this House and none outside were so consulted?

Mr. FIELDING. There is nothing new or novel about this matter. It is not one which has been sprung upon the House. Many months ago it was announced that negotiations had been entered upon between this government and the President of the United States regarding commercial relations. A certain arrangement was made for the moment which was brought before this House. That arrangement was condemned by a number of hon. gentlemen opposite, but they never had the courage to record their votes against it. That was an arrangement made to serve the purpose for the moment, and then there was an exchange of letters which expressed the desire of the President of the United States and the willingness of the government of Canada to have further negotiations looking to a reciprocal arrangement. All that was known for months, and what we are presenting is merely a consummation of an arrangement which has been under negotiation for a long time.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The hon. minister has not answered the question.

Mr. FIELDING. If I had correspondence with any member of this House with regard to any matter, which correspondence that member and myself saw fit to treat as confidential, I deny the right of the hon. gentleman to put to me any question about it.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I rise to a point of order. The hon. minister has not answered the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. No minister or member is required to answer a question.

Mr. MACDONELL. I would like an answer to the question I have put, which is very simple. I understand that when these negotiations were entered upon, the Liberal members of this House were written to for their opinions, but no request of the kind was made to the Conservative members, nor was the public taken into the confidence of the government.

Mr. FIELDING. Again I say that it is my right and privilege to have correspondence with members of this House; and if any member receives a letter from me and sends me a reply and he and I see fit to treat that correspondence as confidential, I deny the right of any member to raise any question about it.

I do not want to enter into the merits of this whole matter because this is not the moment to do so. This motion is only a species of side show.

Mr. HUGHES. It is a side show motion which seems to worry the hon. minister.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not worry over this annexation bogey. I think that the reply given the other day by the Prime Minister very aptly fits the interruption. If the worst should come to the worst, we may send the gallant colonel to Washington, and if he will only bring Turpin with him the country will be safe. I notice that my hon. friends opposite quote everything they can find in the United States papers in favour of reciprocity and annexation. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) had a good deal to say about a resolution by Mr. Bennett, a member of Congress from the state of New York. Mr. Bennett moved a resolution in favour of annexation, and my hon. friend concluded that Mr. Bennett must be in collusion with the Prime Minister of this country and the other members of the Liberal party. He, however, forgot to state one fact, namely, that Mr. Bennett has two fads at Washington, one of which is to talk annexation, and the other, and the most important, is to defeat this reciprocity agreement. The very man who is promoting annexation recognizes the fact that in this commercial agreement there is not a shadow of annexation, and he takes the view no doubt that should we have liberal commercial relations with our brethren to the south, that will make for a happy, contented and prosperous people on both sides, and when our people are in that enviable condition they will not be anxious for any political change.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it possible that Canada might follow the lead of a distinguished Canadian who dealt with that same question some years ago, and not make two bites of a cherry?

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend refer to Sir John Abbott?

Mr. HUGHES. No, I refer to the Hon. Edward Blake.

Mr. FIELDING. I regret to say that my esteemed and revered friend, Mr. Blake, is in such feeble health that we are not permitted to invite or expect his opinion on this question. In 1891 the hon. gentleman opposite and all his friends, under the leadership of Sir John Macdonald, were endeavouring to get the very kind of reciprocity we are now offering them. There was then nothing disloyal about it; it was all right. The only difference is this, that the distinguished and able gentleman who leads this government has succeeded. It seems to be a very loyal thing to make a failure of the business and a very disloyal thing to bring it to a success. I have said that owing to the regrettable illness of my respected friend, Mr. Edward Blake—and there is no man in this House or out of it who has a higher respect for him than I—we cannot know

his views, but we have the views of a member of his family in pretty close touch with him. I find in the Toronto 'Globe' of yesterday, a letter written, not by Hon. Edward Blake, but by his brother, the distinguished ex-vice-chancellor of Ontario, Hon. S. H. Blake. After some general observations favourable to this project, Mr. Blake winds up with these remarks, which I commend to hon. gentlemen opposite:

> It is always very repulsive to me to find that so many men are now beginning to place the integrity of the British Empire upon the low platform of tariff, trade relations, preference, &c., as if some little change in duty or some little rearrangement of tariff considered to be necessary in the interest of either England or Canada should sever the ties of loyalty and degrade us to the low level of persons who desire to continue the union only because of some material advantage that may arise.

In the absence of any testimonial from Hon. Edward Blake, I present to my hon. friends opposite the opinion of his distinguished brother.

Mr. HUGHES. What about Mr. Lash?

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Lash is a very excellent citizen. I have no doubt that if I wanted an opinion on any legal matter I could go with confidence to Mr. Lash. But I do not know that he is infallible. A good many men have spoken on this matter whose opinion would be highly respected on some things, but who are no better qualified to speak on this subject than the average man.

But let me give one thought in conclusion—and I have already spoken too long. I am going to assume, for the sake of argument, that every human being in the United States favours the annexation of Canada. Why should not they? Canada is like a beautiful woman who expects to be courted and admired. Why, Sir, she feels offended if she is ignored or treated with indifference.

Mr. HUGHES. But she does not want to be tied up to one fellow alone.

Mr. FIELDING. She is not going to be tied up at all. But I may mention to my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) that a decent woman who is to be tied up, is well content to be tied up to one man. But I say, Sir, that Canada has reached a position which has given her a standing in the eyes of the world, of which we should be proud. And if the United States, which has too often treated us with indifference and almost contempt, has come to a different view, if the people of the United States have made up their mind that Canada is worth cultivating, whether in the form of better trade relations or in any other form, why should we complain of that?

But, if one must speak seriously, I do not believe that one responsible man—I should not say that, I suppose, for Mr. Champ Clark, who is to be the next Speaker of the House of Representatives is certainly a responsible man; it is said that his remarks were humorous; all I can say is it is a dangerous kind of humour; —with the possible exception of Mr. Clark, I do not believe there is a man in the United States to-day holding a responsible position in the front rank of either party who would seriously desire the annexation of Canada to the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I do not believe it. The United States have all the territory they can manage to-day They have all the problems of government that it is well for a nation to have. My opinion is that the best and most thoughtful men of the United States have no serious desire to annex Canada, but, if they had, I am not going to quarrel with them for it. Again, I say, it is a tribute they pay, a tribute of honour and admiration to a country which at one time they treated with indifference. But it takes two to make a bargain. And although hon. gentlemen opposite, unwisely, I think, and unjustly too, have tried to convey the impression that there is some portion of the people of Canada who are not loyal to the institutions of our country and to the empire, I am ready to believe that they have done it for party purposes. I believe that every man of them, and every man on this side, and every citizen of this Dominion is bound to maintain the position of Canada as a portion of the British Empire. But, since my hon. friends opposite think that, in view of their record, it is necessary to make a declaration to that effect. I am going to help them to make it.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). I do not rise to debate the question of reciprocity for, upon another occasion, when this House is in Committee of Ways and Means, I expect to have an opportunity to say a few words upon that subject. I simply wish to treat, in a good natured way, some of the remarks of my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean). If I am using a parliamentary expression, I will say that I presume that when the hon. gentleman made his appeal to the province of Quebec, more particularly in connection with the question of annexation, he was speaking in a Pickwickian sense; otherwise I would consider his appeal as most unjust—I must not say, mean, for that would not be parliamentary—and calculated to attract, presumably for himself, certain cheap notoriety in a section of the press. As to the sentiment of the province of Quebec, I am not here to speak. But I do know this, and I wish to lay stress upon it and to

call the attention of the hon. member for South York to it, that long after he and I have disappeared, should the question of maintaining the rights guaranteed to us under the British North America Act arise, should the question arise of upholding the dignity of this country's institutions amongst the foremost provinces to uphold that dignity and those rights will be the province of Quebec. We have heard a great deal about the question of annexation. I would like to quote a page of Canadian history to my hon. friend, and to a few other hon. gentlemen to whom it may do some good I had the curiosity, while listening to what has been said on the subject of annexation by certain hon. gentlemen opposite, to try to find out where the question of annexation really arose, and in whose mind the idea first took root. I find that it originated in the minds of gentlemen allied with members sitting on the opposite side of the House. I find that so eminent an authority in the Conservative party as Sir John Rose spoke very strongly upon the question of annexation, and, though many people in this country may not be aware of it, Sir John Rose was Minister of Finance in a Conservative administration. Speaking at the time of the famous annexationist manifesto, he said this:

To protract is cruelty; and are we unmanly enough to leave as a legacy to our children a task from the performance of which we shrink ourselves?

The hon. member (Mr. Maclean, York) must know that the talk of annexation did not arise with the Liberals of the province of Quebec, but chiefly with the members of the Conservative party. The Liberal party has always been true to this country, the province of Quebec has always been true to this country, and to our institutions. It would be more honourable, in discussing a commercial bargain between the United States and Canada, to appeal to Canada as a whole and not to sections of the country.

Amendment (Mr. Monk) agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. H. B. AMES (St. Antoine, Montreal). I suppose the House is now prepared to settle down to a businesslike discussion, and to deal with the question before us without heat and without partisanship. I hope that we may be able to weigh dispassionately the pros and cons of this proposition. I think the people of this country have been waiting with a little disappointment for a more businesslike discussion of the resolution now before the House. I realize that what I am about to say, is capable of being rejected or accepted by men of good faith on both sides of the House.

The year 1910 has been a record year for Canada. Never has prosperity been greater or more widespread. Our farmers have had good harvests and high prices, our manufacturers have enlarged their output and have increased their plant. There have been great works of public utility and transportation undertaken and carried on to a successful conclusion. Our aggregate trade in 1910 has been greater than in any previous year in the history of Canada. Our banks are increasing their capital, and enlarging their business. During last year credit has been good and payments have been sound, and there has been throughout the country a feeling of optimism, and a feeling of confidence in our selves and in one another. Canada has admittedly been doing well, she has been treading along safe and conservative lines, along lines that should be, and are I believe, satisfactory to the sound judgment of the country as a whole. We can find optimism everywhere, and confidence is general. Now, suddenly, without the slightest warning, and like a bolt out of the clear sky, this government comes into the House and flings upon the table a proposition which alters our fiscal policy that for the last forty years has been profitably pursued on the same lines. This agreement, we are told, must be accepted in its entirety, without any amendment in even a word or a syllable. The whole proposition stands or the whole proposition falls.

Now, we have had tariff revisions before. I can remember them ever since 1893, but I never remember an occasion before when a tariff was taken into consideration with a view of amending it that there has not been ample opportunity afforded to all persons interested to be heard, to state their wishes, and to talk over their needs with the ministers, and only after such consideration, has the tariff been amended. The hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) remembers that in 1907 he brought in a Bill to amend our tariff; and that Bill was altered if I remember rightly in a score of items before it finally passed the House. That is the way to make a tariff. In that way it is possible for interests to be heard, it is possible for injustices to be remedied before it is too late; and Canada, maintaining her own fiscal independence, is able to make a tariff under which all her people may prosper.

Now, we are just beginning to wake up to the consequences of this far-reaching proposition. Every day some new group of people in the country are beginning to realize that this is affecting them, that it is affecting the country; whereas a few weeks ago, or a few days ago, they

had no knowledge that this proposition would affect them in the slightest degree. The area of those who are beginning to feel doubt as to the wisdom of this measure is enlarging with every succeeding day.

Now, I want to ask the government why should they take this leap in the dark? Had the government any mandate from the people to do this? We had elections in 1900, in 1904, in 1908, and not one syllable concerning reciprocity with the United States was uttered on the platforms by either Liberals or Conservatives in those elections. We were told by the premier, when he went to the west, that there would be no tariff changes without a commission, or at least without an opportuity for discussion. And yet there are tariff changes in this Bill that wipe out completely some particular industries, and the people whose livelihood is taken away have not had the slightest suspicion that any such thing was in contemplation. And yet, Mr. Speaker, two men in camera, without the knowledge of a single soul outside the government, make, on behalf of eight million people a hard and fast agreement, an agreement that spells difficulty and sacrifice for thousands, an agreement that spells ruin for many ; and then, when people come forward and ask that the sentence be mitigated, they are simply met with the statement : Not one word, it is all or nothing ; this country is pledged, our credit is given, it is too late, there is the door. Talk about despotism ; there was never anything in the history of Russia that for absolute despotism equals the manner in which this arrangement has been made.

But, says the government, this is a bargain which is advantageous to both the contracting parties, a bargain for the good of Canada and for the good of the United States. We must concede something, we are told. That is true, but do the advantages that are to be obtained in return for our concessions greatly outweigh the sacrifices? Let us inquire for a few moments what are some of the things we are called upon to give up in order to have the privileges which the government newspapers tell us are so very great in this reciprocity measure. Let us examine what we get in return for what we give. Let us see whether we could not have got all that is worth getting by waiting a bit, and then we might have spared ourselves sacrifices.

Now, when we come to consider the cost to Canada of the concessions that we are to obtain from the United States, as the first item of cost I would place the unsettling of our trade conditions. Since confederation this country has been steadily progressing, during the greater portion of that time. We have built up a great interprovincial trade, with an enormous amount of business within each province and between the provinces. It is stated that eighty per cent of all we produce is sold in Canada, either in the province in which it is produced, or in the neighbouring provinces. Now, these producers and these consumers have made a large number of business connections one with the other, ramified throughout the Dominion of Canada. There is a constant ebb and flow taking place between the east and the west, and the west and the east, of the commodities they interchange one with the other. The men who entered into these business arrangements have made trade connections with the expectation that there would be in them an element of permanency. They did not anticipate that one stroke of the pen would throw their whole business into disorder. It was reasonable to suppose that if changes were to be made they would be made gradually, after due warning and that they would be made with due regard for the circumstances. Now what do we find? We find all these interests thrown into confusion. The eastern miller, the eastern packer to-day does not know where, if this agreement is ratified, he is going to get his raw material. He does not know how much of his home market he will be able to conserve, he does not know whether he can do any export trade whatever, and he finds himself facing a dislocation of trade conditions that is a most serious thing for him. The eastern shipper who sends his butter, fruit and meats over all that long string of provinces to the Pacific coast and who has been accustomed to place such and such quantities at different central inland points finds that the whole trade is likely to be dislocated and he does not know what he is face to fact with.

The British Columbia fruit grower finds his market in Alberta and Saskatchewan taken from him. The Alberta raiser of cattle and grain finds that his British Columbia market is likely to be lost. So, all along the line these dislocations of trade are likely to be enormous. The lake carriers are likely to lose their water traffic. The railway companies will lose much of their trade and ocean steamship companies are wondering how their cargo will hereafter be obtained. So, all along the line we have uneasiness in the businesses affected and a recognition of the fact that these unsettled conditions may mean a great deal. Such a rash and sudden dislocation will mean a heavy loss to many and failure to not a few It will mean financial stringency, I believe, in many parts of this country. I believe that among bankers it will be found necessary to curtail the credits of some of their customers, and it will mean a withdrawal of capital and a lack of confidence on the part of people with capital to invest in Canada. I make this prophecy in all earnestness that there will be a long account on the

debit side, and that the results of many years of prosperity will be wiped out before the debt, the loss, is made up from the unsettlement of our trade.

When we come to count the cost there is another thing that we must take into consideration, and it is that this proposition, if it becomes law, is the inevitable abandonment by Canada of the principle of protection all along the line. There are no two ways about that. Since 1879 we have built up this country under protection; we have diversified development and diversified employment. We are making an all-round nation, and we have been committed to that policy until this time. Now, protection to have any possible excuse, any logical defence, must be claimed by all and granted to all classes of the community. You cannot make fish of one and flesh of another. You cannot say to one class of the community: There is no protection for what you produce, and say to another class of the community: We will maintain the protection on what you produce. If you remove all protection from agriculture and leave no protection whatever for any of the farmers throughout Canada, how long do you suppose the farmers of Canada will be content to allow the manufacturers to have protection if they can have none? How long do you suppose the farmers, whose produce is open to the competition of the whole world, will consent to pay the price of protection for the articles they use? That same feeling actuates the farmers on both sides of the line. Just let me read to the House a few clauses from a resolution that was passed at the National Grange meeting, held on the 4th February in New York. The National Grange represents a million farmers in thirty states. Here is part of the resolution:

> The Bill provides for the admission free of duty of all Canadian farm products. Since Canada is the only country from which any considerable quantity of these products can under any circumstances be imported, this would result in practically free trade in everything the farmer produces.
>
> While putting farm products on the free list the reciprocity Bill make no material reduction in the high tariff rates on all the manufactured articles the farmer buys, and therefore gives no relief from the heavy burden of taxation imposed by these duties.
>
> The theory on which our protective policy has always been defended is that all classes and interests are equally entitled to protection.

Then further down it reads:

> We hold that the farmers should receive exactly the same measure of protection as is given the manufacturers, and that there must be no reduction of duties on farm products either by reciprocity or tariff revision, unless the duties on all manufactured articles are at the same time correspondingly lowered.

Mr. AMES.

Just at the same time there appeared in the New York 'Evening Post' this significant editorial. It was addressed to the Democrats in the hope that the Democrats might facilitate the passage of this agreement through Congress:

> Tariff revision is not likely, even on general principles, to lose favour by scoring an initial victory; people are apt, when they have got a part of something they have been trying for, to be all the more eager to get the rest. The fact that they have got the bars down for butter and eggs and wheat will not tend to reconcile them to buying shoddy blankets and clothes at prices that would pay for woollen ones if the tariff were out of the way.

Remember, this is in the United States.

> But in addition to this, there is a special reason for not being afraid that reciprocity will kill tariff revision. How about the farmers in the border states who are squealing now over the threatened competition of Canadian producers? When their share of the tariff has been taken away, is it likely that they will be as well satisfied as they are now to help feed the other beneficiaries? Will they vote to stick to the high tariff for the manufacturers when they must be content with little or none for themselves?

What is said on the other side of the line is said, in this same strain exactly, by the farmers of this country. Just another instance; by a stroke of the pen salt is made free. There is invested $1,500,000 by the Windsor Salt Works in western Ontario, a company which has a pay roll of $60,000 each year. Their salt is now made free, but they still have to pay the full duty on their coal, which is their raw material. Do you tell me that if the people who have been engaged in that protected industry for years, find their protection wholly removed, they are going to continue to advocate protection for others? That will be what the farmer would say, and we will have the butter maker, the fruit grower, the vegetable grower, the salt manufacturer and a great many others saying: If there is no protection for me there shall be none for the rest of you. If the outworks of protection are stormed it will not be long until the citadel will come down as well. The government has been saying to the manufacturers: Do not disturb yourselves; you will not be affected, but the government is opening up a stream, the volume of which it will be unable to check after it has once commenced to flow. You have rendered the position of protection illogical. You have made it class legislation. You cannot have free trade for half the community and protection for the other half. You open floodgates that you cannot close, and you will find that if this reciprocity treaty goes through there will be no stopping the flood until the last vestige of protection in Can-

ada is wiped out. If protection is wiped out in Canada and the United States as against one another if we have free trade across the border and a common tariff against the world, how long will it be before political union will follow?

When we are counting up the cost, Mr. Chairman, we must not lose sight of the fact that we lose our fiscal independence. That has been discussed a good deal this afternoon and denied; nevertheless, the fact remains true. This is not a treaty, says the Finance Minister; it is a pact which may be changed at will. Well, he has read to us this afternoon from this blue-book, and he has told us that we shall be absolutely free to make any change in the tariff of Canada that we see fit; that both countries that are at the present time parties to this arrangement shall be able to make any change they like at any time. Let us see if that really is so. Supposing that this tariff arrangement has been in effect for five years, that we find that it injures us, and we desire to make a change; the moment we do so the Americans resort to reprisals, and every interest in Canada that stands to lose by these reprisals falls upon this government or the government that may replace it and says: You must not sacrifice us, and the government says: Ah, but it is only a little thing. And so they grin and bear it. And step by step there will be that constant encroachment. It is the old story of the camel and the tent—the camel gets one foot in first, then his second foot, then his shoulder, then his head, and soon the camel is entirely in the tent and there is no room for anybody else. Or, if the Americans are the ones who are injured and they desire a change shall we dare to make any reprisals? Did we dare make any reprisals last spring when they threatened us with the big stick? Not at all. Shall we dare to make reprisals? No, there would be too many Canadians who would be seriously injured. And so we will grin and bear it. And I do not see how, Mr. Speaker, if this goes into effect and great avenues of trade are created flowing north and south instead of east and west, I do not see how it will be possible for us to take back anything we have given because the whip hand will be with the larger partner and the stronger partner can threaten us and make us suffer any time. Our fiscal independence henceforth—although on paper I admit we have absolute freedom—our fiscal independence henceforth will be in the hands of the authorities at Washington. They can hurt us and they can hurt us severely; we can hurt them but very little and do our very worst. Is it wise to put all our eggs into one basket and then leave the carrying of that basket to those whose interest it may be to let the basket drop? What would be the worst loss that we could inflict upon them? It would be to take away a market of from eight to ten millions of people; the loss they could inflict on us would be to take away a market of ninety or a hundred millions of people on certain commodities which by that time had begun to flow in that direction. They could injure us infinitely more than we could injure them, and when they see fit to do so they have a leverage upon us—a leverage upon our commercial and political future the strength of which it is hard even now to begin to realize. How can there be any stability or any permanence under such circumstances? There is actually no stopping place until you have reached the place where you have complete commercial union and the larger partner dominates the policy of both.

Now, there is another price we are called upon to pay. We are called on to give up our export identity. We have special advantages in Canada for raising certain articles for export and this paternal government has endeavoured in a very large measure to educate our people to make the most of these special advantages. We have a rich soil, plenty of rainfall, a cool climate, so that there are certain things that we can produce admirably. We have gone in for export business and spent very large sums of money in improving our methods, and in rendering it possible for our commodities to reach the markets of the world. The excellent quality of our products has become recognized. The Canadian name is worth something when stamped on a box of cheese or a barrel of apples. But, hereafter it will have no value in excess of the value that may be given to the mixed commodity of the North American continent. Wheat so carefully graded and guarded hitherto will go down to Duluth or else to Buffalo and there it will be mixed with the inferior American grades and exported from a United States port as grain from North America. The mixture and export of this grain will make such a thing as Manitoba No. 1 hard and No. 1 Northern disappear; in the future there will be no such thing, but there will be substituted for it a mixture that will go abroad as wheat from the North American continent, and the price will fall accordingly. That mixture will enter into competition with the mixture from Argentina and Australia, and Canadian wheat will be only what its value is to tone up the weaker mixture of the other countries. Take our cheese as another example. We have been working with a great deal of energy to secure a reputation for Canadian cheese in the British market. We have given them an honest article; we have replaced the American article by the very honesty of our product. But, now, the cheese factories of both countries can ship indiscriminately through their ports, and it will be perfectly impossible hereafter to get Cana-

dian cheese in any way distinguishable from American cheese. We must come down to their level; there will be North American cheese hereafter and a North American price; such a thing as Canadian cheese will be practically unknown. The same is true about bacon. We have made special arrangements to cater to the British market and we are sending $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 worth of bacon annually, and the hogs are specially grown in Canada and cured in a special manner for the British market. Hereafter there will be no opportunity of distinguishing our bacon products; Canadian bacon on the British market in future will be simply a product of North America. We have been endeavouring for a long time to secure the removal of the embargo on Canadian cattle. We have told them that our cattle were sound and well and that our quarantine arrangements prevented diseased cattle coming in from the United States. Is there any chance of our getting that embargo removed now? Certainly we cannot; we must let all the cattle from Hudson bay to Texas into the port of Montreal hereafter.

And, when we are counting the cost, we must also remember that a preference as far as Great Britain is concerned now becomes impossible. We have lost completely the identity of what we export. The government may increase the preference on British goods if they see fit; the government after cajoling the manufactures and bringing them on year after year to imagine they were in fancied security, may, as a counter demonstration of loyalty decide to make that exhibition at the expense of the Canadian manufacturers. They can reduce the duties on the goods coming from England into Canada just as far as they like, but they can never hope to get any preference in the British market hereafter. Our products will be undistinguishable in the future from the products of the United States, and that renders a preference for us absolutely impossible. And so I think Mr. Bourassa was not very far wrong, when, in his newspaper not long ago, resuming at the end of a series of articles his appreciation of the result that this convention would have upon Canada, he wrote:

Constitue-t-elle un obstacle infranchissable à l'union douanière de l'empire? Oui—et c'est le motif qui, a nos yeux, milite le plus en sa faveur.

Does this constitute an insurmountable obstacle to a tariff union within the empire? Yes it does. And that is the very reason which in my eyes militates in its favour.

Is that the reason which militates in its favour with the Prime Minister?

Mr. LEMIEUX. What paper is the hon. gentleman quoting from?

Mr. AMES. From 'Le Devoir.'

Mr. AMES.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Signed by Mr. Bourassa?

Mr. AMES. Signed by Mr. Bourassa. Let me read from the New York 'American' under the heading 'America Cuts Loose from the British Empire,' the following:

In ratifying the trade agreement, we should understand, therefore, that we are settling a world problem and settling it right. British imperialism will wane in consequence. But American trade routes will run along the lines that were ordained by nature. And the prosperity of the western continent will receive an immense impetus through a definite a final disentanglement from the intrigues of European politics.

That is how it is viewed by the Americans. Let me read this extract from the New York 'Herald' of February 1, 1911:

The discussion of the last few days shows that the key to the imperial reciprocity situation, so far as Canada may be a party to it, is held by the United States.

Yes, that will be the result; the key of the imperial reciprocity situation so far as Canada is concerned will hereafter be held by the United States, and can be used only with the consent of the United States. When the right hon. the Prime Minister and his associates go over to the Imperial Conference in May next, they will go and confess to their friends from other parts of the British Empire that as far as they are concerned they can do nothing in respect of fiscal matters without consulting Washington. We formerly enjoyed the proud position of being the mistress in our own house and daughter in our mother's house. Hereafter we are no longer the mistress in our own house and we become the stepdaughter in our mother's house, and can not even sign our own name without the consent of the dominant party.

Although the contrary has been frequently asserted, I would like again to bring to the attention of the Finance Minister the fact that this proposition does affect the British preference—at least, in one very important item; that is, the item of rolled plates. I cannot see how he ever allowed that to slip into the agreement. Formerly the duty on rolled plates coming from the United States to Canada was 5 per cent, although we permitted them to come from Great Britain free. They are now made free to both countries, and the result is that the whole of our trade, amounting to $4,500,000 annually, will go to the American steel trust.

Mr. FIELDING. That article is now on our free list? What we did was to secure its free admission to the United States.

Mr. AMES. You will not send one ton to the United States, but you will transfer 50,000 tons that now come to Canada from Great Britain in British bottoms to the American steel trust.

Mr. FIELDING. We have more faith in our manufacturers than my hon. friend.

Mr. AMES. The American steel trust will deal with this as with the other opportunities which the Finance Minister has given them to control the markets of Canada, and I can see no hope of benefit to Canadian interests.

Now, we are sometimes told that there are many benefits from this arrangement. I do not deny that there are some benefits, of course, but I do venture to say that if we had not been so precipitate, we could possibly have got most of these benefits without having made the sacrifices that we have made. The New York 'Journal of Commerce,' an independent paper, commenting on the situation, said the other day:

> The concessions we (the United States) made are in themselves for our benefit, and most if not all of them it would be wise to make if we got nothing in return. The concessions of Canada are also for our benefit as wel as that of the people of Canada.

I think there is little doubt that we would have got the greater portion of these concessions without having to make sacrifices for them. There is a moribund administration at Washington. The new Congress has been elected on a pledge to reduce the tariff all along the line. Would it not have been wiser for us to have waited to see what they would do before we rushed in and gave concessions? Would it not have been wiser also to have waited until after the Imperial Conference? Then we would have been in a position to see how far our neighbours to the south would go of their own initiative, and if it were then necessary to make a limited treaty with them on articles on which they were not prepared themselves to give us freedom of access to their markets, it would have been a right and proper thing to do so. One has only to read the letter of President Taft, which has often been quoted in this House, to see how much the United States realize that they are in need of our raw products. The whole letter teems with expressions to that effect: 'We are exhausting our own, we shall soon need more, we must have those of Canada, let us take this opportunity to secure them.' That is the whole tenor of the letter from beginning to end. And yet our ministers rushed down precipitately and practically gave away our whole hand before the time.

Mr. FIELDING. Will my hon. friend say in what respect we are giving them concessions as respects access to our raw materials?

Mr. AMES. I have shown a good many things that we have sacrificed.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon friend says that we rushed to give away our raw materials to them. Will he show by any concession that we are proposing to give them any more access to our raw materials than they have to-day?

Mr. AMES. Yes, there are many.

Mr. FIELDING. Mention a few.

Mr. AMES. Wheat, for example. It does not go free.

Mr. FIELDING. Is my hon. friend referring to wheat coming into Canada or wheat going out of Canada?

Mr. AMES. I am referring to wheat going to the United States.

Mr. FIELDING. They are absolutely free to do as they like. It is no concession on our part that makes wheat free into the United States.

Mr. AMES. I will deal with that when I come to it. Now, I want to look at some of these alleged benefits and see what they mean—whether they are all wool and a yard wide and without serious drawbacks. We are told that this arrangement is for the benefit of the Canadian farmer—that he stands to gain by it all along the line, I admit that when the farmer first hears that he is to have access to the American market, he was inclined to favour this arrangement. But when the farmers of this country begin to learn what tags are on what is given to them, they will not be so sure that they want the present which the Finance Minister is offering to them if they have to take all the responsibilities that go with it.

I think it is a self-evident proposition that in a reciprocity agreement between countries which produce similar products, where one country is weaker than the other, the smaller of the two stands to endure the maximum of suffering. The United States and Canada raise identical products, and the United States can raise them cheaper than they can be raised in Canada, although the prices are sometimes higher there than in Canada; but they have the oportunities and the climatic conditions which render it possible for them to raise the raw products cheaper than we in Canada can. They raise wheat and cattle and hogs and dairy products, and we the smaller country stand to suffer the greater loss on a falling market. Even at the present time, notwithstanding the duties, there is more of nearly all agricultural products imported into Canada from the United States than go into the United States from Canada. The Minneapolis 'Journal' gives a list of these—horses, apples, grapes, cherries, cranberries, potatoes, melons, corn, barley, dressed poultry, eggs, dried fruits, and a number of other articles; and the same paper adds:

> Some persons in this country do not appreciate how much we have the best of it in

a free exchange of agricultural products with Canada.

The Michigan bean growers evidently do not. But, I judge from the equanimity with which the farmers generally receive the agreement, they are on the whole well pleased and that they do understand they have the best of the trade.

There is too much our farmers can grow in abundance which the Canadian cannot grow well or cannot grow at all, yet which the Canadian must have. The few figures I have given you at random from the customs reports on last year's business between the two countries seem to make that clear. Of course, if on so many different products the balance was so heavily in our favour in spite of a high duty, it must be apparent that under a free exchange the American farmer will derive a very great benefit from the natural stimulation of the trade, provided this agreement is ratified.

And the expectation of this paper is that when the barriers are taken down altogether, the American farmer will undoubtedly have the best of it. Now, at times in the United States there are enormous surpluses of agricultural products. Taking them throughout the year, prices vary much more in the United States than in Canada. There are times when they are higher than with us, but there are also times when they are lower and they are more subject to speculation. Our farmers have a safer market on the whole, taking one year with another. At present there is a great glut of many farm products in the United States. I have here a report in the New York 'Produce Review' of the 4th of January, which shows that the stocks of butter held in New York, Chicago, Boston and Philadelphia at present are enormous. These four leading storage centres held on January 4 the following amounts:—

Packages	1911.	1910.	1909.
New York..	237,300	134,400	183,400
Chicago..	350,000	166,000	250,000
Boston..	236,010	154,200	172,300
Philadelphia	64,690	35,000	63,600
Totals	888,000	489,500	669,300

That butter was bought last fall at high prices by speculators, who would be glad enough to-day to sell it at cost, but will be forced to take even less. If there were no duty on butter to-day, our Montreal merchants would not only bring butter from New York but from England, which they shipped in the summer, and the English people would be glad to send their butter back at several cents less than they paid for it.

Sometimes hogs are higher in Buffalo than in Toronto, but the market changes. Three years ago live hogs sold in Chicago at $3.90 per 100 pounds, and four years ago at $4.25; and during the same years in Canada they were selling at $5.90 and $6.25 per 100 pounds. Taking the last 20 years, the average price, in 18 years out of these 20, paid in Canada for hogs has been higher than in the United States.

During the last three months lamb has been cheaper in Chicago than in Toronto. To-day it is one cent cheaper, and Hamilton is actually importing lamb from the United States and paying the duty.

In eggs there is to-day a glut in the American market, and refrigerator eggs are being imported into Canada at 14 cents per dozen free on board at Chicago.

Butter is selling in Chicago at 18 to 20 cents per pound, of the same quality as we are paying 24 cents per pound for to-day in Montreal. If there were no tariff our Canadian farmers would be swamped in a large number of articles which they have to sell.

I admit that the Canadian farmer might secure at certain times of the year higher prices by having the American market open to him; but he stands the danger of having his home market made a dumping ground whenever there is a surplus in the United States, Great Britain or anywhere else, and his prices will be knocked down in consequence. What our farmers have hitherto enjoyed is a steady market at reasonable prices, not subject to the fluctuations of the American market; but hereafter whenever there is an overstock in the United States, the surplus will be dumped on the Canadian market. So that after all, even from the farmers' point of view there is very great doubt as to whether a mutual interchange of farm products with the Americans would be, taking everything into consideration, to our ultimate advantage.

There is another serious phase which has not been touched upon very much by those who spoke for the government or by the newspapers which support it. It must not be forgotten that free trade in natural products between the United States and Canada means practically free trade with the whole world. By letting in the United States, under the terms of this agreement, we also let in all British possessions and no less than a dozen foreign countries on exactly the same terms. The agreement states:—

> The advantages hereby granted to the United States shall be extended to the United Kingdom and the several British colonies and possessions with respect to the commerce with Canada.

Whatever advantages we give to the United States we automatically extend to every British possession throughout the whole world, and also to fully a dozen foreign countries. I know what the retort will be. Hon. gentlemen opposite will say: Why! Would you give these advan-

tages to the United States and not give them to British colonies? I reply, certainly, I would not treat colonies of the British Empire worse than the United States; no one should be treated better than our own kith and kin. But what I do object to is that these concessions and the sacrifices consequent upon them are the mere incidents of a bargain with a foreign nation and not the result of a straight contract among principals. Instead of letting all members of the family in at the front door, you are sending them around to the back door and then admitting them on a stranger's ticket. What is more, you are letting in a dozen strangers besides without any ticket at all. What does it mean to have free entry of natural products? Take for example the producing centres of the southern hemisphere. Let us look at Australia, New Zealand and the Argentine republic and see how far our farmers can compete with the farmers of these countries. We have in Canada a severe winter during which prices usually go up and our farmers labour under climatic conditions which are a serious handicap. But the three countries I have mentioned have in the first place, no severe winters, and in the second place, our winter is their summer. Consequently when our farmers have the smallest quantity of produce for their home market and expect their best prices, at that very time there is in each of these three countries the greatest surplus for export and prices are lower than at any other period. Then our wheat fields and our great cattle ranches are 1,500 to 2,000 miles away from our seaports, so that it costs a great deal to bring these products to the Atlantic and Pacific sea-boards. But in Australia, the Argentine republic and New Zealand, their pastures and wheat fields are not more than 300 miles from their seaports, and their railway facilities are excellent, so that transportation costs them but a fraction of what it costs us.

Take for example Australia. Australia exports annually from 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 pounds of frozen beef, and the Australian government gives the producer of frozen beef every facility and assistance. The most of it is brought down on the hoof to the packing establishments on the sea-board and is shipped in cold storage. I went through some of the establishments in that country and know that they are equipped with the latest improvements, and they consequently export their products to the best advantage. Australia sends from 90,000,000 to 100,000,000 pounds of frozen mutton and lamb out each year, all carefully killed, kept in refrigerators, covered in cotton bags, and sent to the English and other markets in cold storage. Australia exports from 50,000,000 to 75,000,000 pounds of butter annually. She has a beautiful strip of country, about 1,500 miles long between the mountain ranges and the sea thoroughly well watered, about 200 miles wide, and consequently produces dairy products in large quantities, always close to the port of shipment. The quantity of dairy products produced in Australia is rapidly increasing. She has also immense wheat fields. Last year her wheat crop was as large as that of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta, and it was raised not more than 300 miles from the sea-board. If you can imagine Manitoba having a seaport on Lake Winnipeg, you can understand the advantage which Australia enjoys in the export of wheat.

New Zealand is famed for its wool, wheat and dairy products. In 1909, she exported $18,500,000 worth of frozen lamb and mutton, and $13,500,000 worth of butter and cheese. Little New Zealand sends to the British market twelve times as much butter as Canada sends. She sends out 5,000,000 carcasses of frozen lamb, mutton and sheep in a single season. I think it well to read to the House a few of the quotations showing what farm produce is worth in New Zealand. I have here a statement from the Weekly Report of the Trade and Commerce Department, page 138, which gives the prices of produce, live stock and provisions for the provincial district of Auckland during the past year. Let me make a few quotations:—

Fat cattle, per head, $30.
Fat sheep, per head, $3.50.
Fat lambs, $2.50.
Beef ready for the butcher, 7 cents per lb.
Mutton, 6 cents per pound.
Veal, 9 cents per pound.
Pork, 12 cents per pound.
Lamb, 9 cents per pound.
Fresh butter, 20 cents per pound.
Cheese, 14 cents per pound.
Ducks, $1.25 per pair.
Fowl, 75 cents per pair.
Turkeys, $1.25 apiece.
Bacon, 15 cents per pound.
Ham, 16 cents per pound.
Eggs, 21 cents per dozen.

These are comparatively low prices, when you consider that this farm produce, or nearly all of it, will be brought free into Canada, and with only the freight rate against it.

Then, let us take the Argentine. The Argentine is one of the countries that comes under the most favoured nation clause, and consequently enjoys all the rights that we give to the United States. We were greatly indebted last night to the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) for giving us a good deal of very valuable information regarding the Argentine—not knowing, I think, that it is one of the most favoured nations.

However, we can utilize some of the information he gave us. For example, he said that the wages for farm hands in the Argentine were about 64 cents a day, without board, as I understood him. And he said that the rate in Russia was from 40 to 45 cents a day—and Russia is another country whose products will hereafter come free into Canada on this most favoured nation basis. Now, the Argentine Republic has a trade which is larger even than our own. She exports $400,000,000 worth of goods, 90 per cent of which is live stock and agricultural products. Argentina ships to Great Britain six times as much beef as New Zealand and Australia together, and one and a half times as much mutton and lamb. In 1909 Argentina produced wheat to the value of $320,000,000, and exported over 100,000,000 bushels. The flax crop of Argentina is valued at $115,000,000. Cattle, sheep, horses, donkeys and mules as live stock are exported, usually to Great Britain. When you consider that the Argentine is one of the countries that can hereafter ship to Canada, that the Canadian Pacific railway are now arranging a line from Halifax to Buenos Ayres, with cold storage accommodation; that the government are asking us this year to vote a subsidy to a steamship line to the West Indies and South America; that a company is being formed in Montreal for the express purpose of exploiting the business between Canada and Argentina—you will see that the facilities for shipment between Montreal and Argentina in the summer, and between Halifax and St. John and Argentina in the winter in these agricultural products will soon be most excellent, and that we may expect to have our local markets, to a very large degree, supplied by the produce that will come from that country. Be it remembered that the Argentine is peopled mainly by Italians, Spaniards and Germans, who have a scale of living quite inferior to that which our farmers will submit to, and who, as the Postmaster General tells us, are willing to work for 64 cents a day and board themselves. We can see what pressure will be brought to bear on the farmers of Canada to reduce their scale of living and cut their necessities in wages down to the Argentine standard.

How will the products of these three countries coming into Canada in winter especially, affect the home markets on the sea-board? Chilled beef from the Argentine and Australia, frozen lamb and mutton from New Zealand can be laid down in Halifax, St. John or Montreal at ruinous prices. The f.o.b. export price on chilled beef of the entire New Zealand product last year was 5½ cents per pound. With a duty of three cents per pound, we have kept that meat out, for it would cost 8½ cents, plus freight. But with a duty of 1¼ cents that means that it could be laid down in Canada for 7 cents. And this excellent chilled beef from Argentina and Australia, laid down in Halifax, St. John and Montreal, will bring down the price of every beef animal in the eastern provinces. Take, also, the case of New Zealand lamb and mutton. Last year the entire quantity of the New Zealand product exported averaged 6½ cents per pound, and even sold at less. With a protective duty of 3 cents per pound, the price would be 9½ cents, which would be enough to keep it out of our markets. But reduce the duty to 1¼ cents and you bring the price down to 7¾ cents, and you make it possible to lay this lamb and mutton down at 8 cents per pound upon our Atlantic or Pacific coasts, and that is a price which our farmers, who produce for the home market, will be unwilling to accept if they are to compete. Australian butter can to-day be laid down in bond in Montreal at 23 cents. A duty of 4 cents means a price of 27 cents, which is prohibitive. But take the duty off and our farmers will have to get down to 23 cents, the price at which it is possible to bring this Australian butter in. In January, 1909, the Montreal produce men imported 5,000 packages of Australian butter. The market at that time stood at 27½ cents for Canadian creamery. It fell within a month to 19 cents. Eastern township butter makers, who get 25 cents to 26 cents for what is shipped from the eastern townships throughout the west, would have to cut down their prices. To-day a splendid trade is done from the Eastern townships with the west; 100,000 packages go westward every year, and are scattered all along as far west as Vancouver. With reciprocity in force there will be nothing more of that kind. Australian butter coming in from the west and New Zealand butter from the east will each monopolize half our continent, and will meet in competition at Winnipeg.

The same is true at the Pacific coast. There is a large interchange now between Alberta and British Columbia. Meat, grain, dairy products and feed pass west from Alberta to British Columbia, and lumber and fruit pass eastward from British Columbia to Alberta. This trade is profitable to both, and should be continued and encouraged But if this reciprocity measure goes through, chilled beef and mutton from Australia will flow into British Columbia, and there will not be a city or a mining camp in British Columbia that will want a pound of Alberta beef. And the same will be true of butter, cheese, poultry and eggs. New Zealand butter can be laid down in Vancouver at 24½ cents but, with the present duty, 28½ cents, this is prohibited. The millers of British Columbia will grind Antipodean wheat, for they will not pay the

freight rates to haul over three ranges of mountains when they have only to pay ocean carriage from Australia or New Zealand to Vancouver.

Taking the question by and large, it seems to me that natural products will become cheaper at the ocean ports and for a certain distance inland. They will be lower in winter. They may possibly be higher in summer, owing to the opportunity afforded our farmers for sending them to the United States. But our farmer, on the whole, will be worse off than before, because he will have to sell his winter product at Antipodean prices, and will have to stand the chance of bad times and of Canada being made a dumping ground for the American surplus.

There was another phrase of this question that I was going to allude to. It had been my intention in this House to move a resolution in favour of reciprocal trade arrangements with Australia. I had made some careful preparation in that direction, and had interviewed some of the Australian ministers, and having brought the correspondence down, it seemed to me that a discussion of this question would be a useful one in the House. But there is no use now in bringing up the question of Canadian-Australian reciprocal trade arrangements. The whole hand of the government is on the table, the game is played. All those items which we want, all those commodities which we could fairly send to them, we cannot now send without the intermixture of American goods. Nearly all the items on which we were prepared to make concessions to Australia, are now free. We are henceforth handicapped both in giving to them and taking from them, because we have no longer a basis or means of negotiation. Let me put on 'Hansard' this schedule, and you will see what I mean. Australia could export to Canada:

	Formerly.	Now.
Meats	3c. lb.	1½c.
Canned meats	27½ p.c.	20 p.c.
Mutton and lamb	3c.	1½c.
Poultry	25 p.c.	free.
Tallow	20 p.c.	5 p.c.
Butter	4c. lb.	free.
Apples	40c. brl.	free.
Grapes	2c. lb.	free.
Oranges	free.	free.
Peaches	$1 per 100 lbs.	free.
Salt and a few others	5c. per 100 lbs.	free.

On the other hand, the articles we can export to Australia from the Pacific coast are limited to lumber, fish and fruit. Our people in British Columbia were expecting to get a great market opened to them. Now, lumber, fish and fruit are all free, and no distinction is possible between Canada and the United States, and it is impossible for us to get any preference in their market. Consequently, the whole game is played.

Then, under these most favoured-nation treaty arrangements, there are many other countries we have to consider, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Russia, Spain, Switzerland and many others. Norway and Sweden export bacon, salt pork and butter, condensed milk, salt and pickled fish. Denmark exports butter, bacon and salted meats, eggs and potatoes. In 1909 Denmark exported eggs of the value of $8,250,000. Russia exports eggs, and Siberia exports butter. Spain exports grapes and dried fruits. These countries can now get their goods into Canada without our giving anything in exchange; in other words, we have practically instituted free trade in natural products with all the world, and the cheapest producer of all the competitors will set the pace for the rest. If the Italian, the German or the Spaniard can live on less than the farmer in Canada, the Canadian farmer will have to come down to his level; there is no other alternative.

Now let me come to the last phase of my argument and inquire whether there is not a better way for Canada to progress and develop than the way the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs have chosen on our behalf. Speaking generally, it seems to me that it is bad policy for a nation to send its raw material out of the country. It was by a strict adherence to that policy, that the German Empire has prospered so greatly, that France has prospered, and that England has prospered and is prospering to-day. Our natural resources represent potential employment, wealth and prosperity. They spell towns, and railways, and industrial establishments, when they are worked up in the country. What we cannot utilize ourselves, we are in duty bound, I think, to hold in trust for those who come after us. To export our raw materials, and to enable the stranger to grow rich in working up our materials, is to draw upon our national capital from the bank, and to present it to outsiders. What would you think of a manufacturer, a shoe manufacturer, for example, who, having bought sole leather at 20 cents a pound, and finding it was worth 22 cents a pound, should forthwith, sell his supply, and close his factory? You would speak of him as bereft of his senses, and yet that is exactly what is meant by the proposition we are now contending against. I have always cherished the idea for Canada that she should become a highly developed and self contained country, but this legislation seriously endangers that ideal. It is to my mind, the duty of each one to have regard to the welfare of all, for only thus can a common nationality be upbuilt. Now I contend that there is a better way to build up Canada, than the one that has been proposed by the negotiators, and let me illustrate it by way of analyses. Suppose that

A, B and C discover a mine, and agree to exploit it. A, it is agreed, should mine the ore, B should build a railroad and carry the ore across the country, and C should erect a smelter. A, who mines the ore, is to get 50 cents a ton, and he will employ 100 men. B, who builds and operates the railway, also gets 50 cents a ton, and he employs 100 men. C, who constructs the smelter, gets 50 cents a ton, and he employs 100 men. Together they employ 300 men, and together they get $1.50 a ton from working up this raw material. Now, one morning B and C wake up and find to their astonishment, that while they did not know of it, A has made an arrangement with a party on the other side of the mountain to sell his raw material at 60 cents a ton, instead of 50 cents. A says, I am getting 10 cents a ton more than I got before, and what have you got to say to that? He sells his raw material at 60 cents to the man on the other side of the line; and so B's tramway has nothing to carry, his 100 men are thrown out of employment; C has nothing to smelt, and his 100 men are thrown out of employment. 200 men are thrown out of employment in order that A may get 10 cents more a ton on his ore, and only 60 cents a ton is kept in the country on that raw material, instead of the $1.50 which was previously left in the country.

I think it is perfectly fair to apply that analogy to some of the items in this schedule, and particularly to wheat. We hear a great deal about the great concessions that are to be obtained for our farmers by free wheat in the American market, and what great things it means to Canada. Let us see if Canada will realize any benefit from it. The Canadian northwest was purchased and was developed for, and by, the entire people of Canada. The debt incurred thereby, rests upon the shoulders of all the people of Canada, and I do not think it unjust to say that the benefits of that northwest should accrue to all the people of Canada. Now suppose we take a bushel of wheat, for which the northwest farmer now gets 85 cents. If that bushel of wheat passes eastward, along Canadian lines, the railway companies of Canada get 8 cents out of it, the inland shipping companies gets 4 cents, and the port of Montreal gets 1 cent before it leaves the country; therefore, $1 altogether on that wheat is left in the country. Now supposing it is exported south. For the purpose of argument, I am willing to grant that the farmer gets 88 cents, and 2 cents more goes to the road that hauls it to the border, so there are 90 cents left in the country. All the rest of the money goes out of the country to the profit of the men in a foreign nation who handle that wheat. In the one case, $1 is left in the country as an equivalent of that bushel of wheat; and in the other case, 90 cents is left in the country, which, from a national point of view, is not satisfactory.

I verily believe that there will be times when the prices will be practically the same. Take the closing quotations yesterday for May delivery No. 2 Northern; Fort William 91 cents, Minneapolis 93½ cents. The difference is only 2½ cents. Is it worth while to allow the wheat of Canada to pass out of the country to be utilized in a foreign land for a difference of 2½ cents a bushel? Supposing that it were milled in Canada the advantages would be considerable. The Canadian carriers would profit, the millers would make their flour for export, the Ontario farmer could grow his Ontario wheat, which, mixed with the western wheat, would make exportable flour, and the Ontario farmer will be able to grow no wheat at all unless there is Manitoba wheat to grind with it. Then also the bran and shorts will be distributed among the dairymen and there will be a profit on that for them also. All the good of that is sacrificed by this arrangement. I hold in my hand a very interesting editorial which appears in the Weekly 'Northwestern Miller,' of January 8, 1911. I cannot read the whole of the editorial because it is too lengthy, but I think I have time to read several extracts from it which will illustrate better than I could the thought I have in my mind. Here is one. Remember that this is written in Minneapolis from the American point of view, and you will see why the Americans want free wheat in Canada:

> In course of time, owing largely to the growth of the Canadian wheat crop and its inability to enter the United States, the export flour trade suffered a serious decline. . . . Another change is now impending in the trade, and again the 'Northwestern Miller' goes on record with a prediction: that if the opportunity now at hand to obtain free wheat from Canada is neglected, the American miller will suffer.

Further on:

> Bountiful nature has placed at the very threshold of this country a natural wheat field,——

This, of course, refers to Canada.

> —the like of which has never before been known since the world was made. This magnificent source of supply, a mighty empire in itself, produces glorious wheat of unrivalled quality. Its possibilities are difficult to over estimate. The land was created for wheat-raising. This area can and will produce sufficient wheat to keep American mills supplied to double their present capacity, and to extend their usefulness for good to an almost unlimited extent. This territory lies at our very doors. Our mills are ready and willing to grind its product. Its people would gladly find a market for their grain in the milling centres of the United States. All is favourable to this traffic save one thing, and

that places an insuperable barrier before it. Narrow minded protection has built between the mill which needs the wheat and the farmer who needs the market a wall consisting of an absurd tariff of 25 cents on every bushel of wheat that crosses the boundary.

The disposition of Canada's surplus is a question upon the answer to which depends the future, not only of the milling interests of the Northwest, but indeed of the United States. Canadian mills do not have capacity enough to grind this wheat.

Well, why should not their capacity be increased?

If they had the capacity, they would not possess a market for their flour sufficiently large to take it.

Listen to where the Americans expect to find a market.

American mills have both the capacity to grind, and the market to supply.

Should this surplus be shipped abroad, the foreign miller will become possessed of a supply of raw material practically unlimited as to quantity and actually unrivalled as to quality. Therewith he can secure a mixture from which he can produce a flour to rival in strength anything his American competitor can offer. The result must, in the end, inevitably mean the destruction of the American export trade, the shifting of the American milling centre, the gradual decline of the American milling interest to a purely domestic basis, and its ultimate retrogression to a comparatively unimportant place in the list of large American industries.

Well, where will they shift to? They will come to Canada, of course,

Canada cannot grind the surplus crop of her northwestern territories. If America may not do so, because of her own shortsightedness, it follows that the work will fall to the more fortunate miller in Great Britain or on the continent, whose laws are not framed to forbid the free importation of the raw material. The miller who is able to grind this enormous crop will be the miller of the future; and, where he is, there will be the great mills of the world.

Are we going to allow the great mills of the world all to be south of the line when we have the raw materials to keep them going?

To obviate the danger which threatens American milling interests from the north, there is but one course. The free admission of the raw material is the sole remedy. Milling in bond under present regulations is impracticable, and almost impossible. Millers who undertake it will find it too cumbersome and expensive to be profitable, the margin in flour at best being but slight.

Going further on:

Should foreign millers——

That is Canadian of course.

—secure this wheat, they would be enabled thereby to cut off the American export trade, both in wheat and flour.

A terrible thing, would it not be if we in Canada supplied the raw material by which the Americans could cut off our export trade in wheat and flour.

One bushel mixed with three bushels of the less virile wheat grown in the United States and ground into flour, is sufficient to raise the whole high value.

Then, going on, there is a significant passage which I would like to read before I lay this down.

Turning from the pessimistic to the opposite point of view, the contemplation of the future of American milling with the protective tariff removed and free Canadian wheat secured, the prospect is a grand one. With this enormous and steadily increasing crop free to pursue its natural geographical and commercial channel, flowing into the mills and elevators of the States, a splendid tide of activity and prosperity would follow in its wake. Assured of their future supply of raw material, the mills of America would go forward on their developing course, continuing the march of progress which has brought them to the front. New mills would be built, and capacities enlarged. New markets abroad would be sought and conquered. The returns from this renewed and extended activity would be felt in increased commercial prosperity. New railways would be extended into the wheat-growing territory. American railroads carrying the flour from the mills would secure additional freight. American banks would obtain increased deposits, and greatly enlarged exchange accounts; American mill operatives would be in demand, and payrolls would be increased; mill machinery, bags, barrels and other mill supplies would be required in larger quantities; more money would be in circulation; and the benefit would be felt in every artery of industrial life touched by milling. There would be an increase in grain firms, in elevators, and in every branch of the grain-handling and flour-making interests. This would be felt in the added value of real estate and in the solid and substantial development of every undertaking and enterprise that makes a community prosperous. Farmers would find a better market for their products; and, in the end, should this crop be assimilated at home rather than abroad, they will secure an average higher price for their wheat because of the ability of the progressive and successful miller to pay more for his raw material.

There is an article which goes all the way through to show that the milling interests of the American northwest are stationary if not declining, but that if they can only grind Canadian wheat they will not only hold their own market, but the export markets of the world. Is it not better that Canadian wheat should be ground by Canada and that we should have the markets of the world instead of the Americans? Were there time I might apply this same argument to a great many other subjects. The same could be applied to cattle, hogs and a large number of other articles which the farmer produces and which are really

raw material. If as raw materials these go out to supply employment and wealth to others the farmer may get a trifle more at times, but the packing interest suffers, export business becomes impossible, the western market goes to Chicago and the profits of the transportation companies disappear. Canada is poorer if we allow our raw products to go out. I might apply it to hay and we would have the interesting spectacle of seeing our hay going away, and the cattle and farmers going out on the same train to the United States. The same is true of lumber, pulpwood, iron ore and many other things. The farmer will not be unwilling to live and let live. Will he cripple Canadian enterprise to make Americans rich? There is just one suggestion—I make it quite unauthorized—and it is a suggestion that occurs to me because after all we all realize that from the western point of view the opportunity of exporting Canadian grain to the United States is a very great thing, and we must consider that our western friends will not lightly turn down a proposition of that kind.

But I think it is for Canada to take into consideration the fact that we have certain geographical and climatic conditions which render it somewhat difficult for our farmers to compete with the farmers of Argentina, Australia and New Zealand, and that it would be quite in line for this government, or for any government that may succeed it, to do something towards removing these disabilities. The price of wheat is, I think it is admitted, fixed by Liverpool, and the grain grower practically throughout the whole world gets the Liverpool price less the cost of transportation from his farm to Liverpool. Figure that back and you will come to the Canadian northwest. Now, if our Canadian western farmer, say at Regina, cannot send his grain as cheaply over Canadian lines to Liverpool as the American farmer at Grand Forks, Dakota, or some place immediately south of Regina, does, then there is something wrong. It may be that the transportation rates are too high; it may be that there are other charges that are more than the traffic can bear. Well, we have a Railway Commission, and if, after thorough investigation, it is found that for similar distances it costs more to send Canadian wheat to the British market than it does American wheat, I, for my part, would rather see a bonus (of 2 or 3 cents a bushel) paid to the Canadian farmers than to see that grain going to the United States. Let us keep our own materials in Canada, and then the Americans will come over to us and they will be welcome, and they will build their factories here, and we will make up the raw materials here, and we will supply our own home markets and compete for the

export trade of the world. Sir, Canada would present a sorry sight if she were reduced to the position of digging out and hauling to the nearest railway station her raw materials to have them made up in the country to the south, with all the wealth that accrues from that process going into the pockets of the stranger. There are some who say that this is bound to come anyway, and I think the Minister of Finance told me not long ago that if the Americans wished to take off their duties they have a perfect right to do so. That I admit. I admit that when the Americans need our raw materials they can bring them into their country free of duty. Well, let them do so when they get ready to do it. We can then determine whether it is in our interest to put an export duty on or not, but it will be time enough to face that when it comes. In the meantime, what is the difference between the proposition of the minister and my proposition—the minister's proposition is suicide, the other alternative is murder, and one can die with honour, but one cannot commit suicide with honour. As it is near six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour briefly to summarize what I have endeavoured to bring to the attention of the House. I consider that at the present time we are doing well and have been doing well along safe and conservative lines, and to take a leap in the dark which may possibly turn out for the better, but which stands a great chance of turning out for the worse, would be, under the circumstances, highly inadvisable. As far as this particular bargain is concerned, don't let us lose sight of the fact that it means the unsettling of established conditions, that it means the loss of our fiscal independence, that it means the ultimate abandonment of the principle of protection for all classes in Canada, that it means the loss of our export identity, and that it means farewell to any opportunity for a preference in the British market. These are some of the sacrifices which Canada will be called upon to make, and, after all, why should we make any sacrifices, because, probably we can, without sacrifice, get all the benefits which are worth having. And when we come to look on the so-called benefits we find that where there is reciprocity in similar products between two nations, one of whom is great and powerful and the other small and weak in point of wealth and population, that if anything goes wrong it is the smaller one that stands to suffer every time. Let us further remember that in letting in the United States we are admitting all the British possessions—whom I should like to see admitted, but by the front door rather than by the back door—and we are also admitting 12 other countries who are giving us absolutely nothing for the priv-

ilege. This, I think, will affect the farmers' home market very greatly at the seaport towns, and for some distance inland. I think, taking it by and large, that while the Canadian farmer may occasionally take advantage of American high prices and get a little more for his products in summer, he stands a chance of having his market in winter glutted, and of having to take whatever overflow prices may prevail. In conclusion, I bring to the attention of the House the fact that it is bad policy to export raw products any more than we can help. If it be that we cannot use these raw materials in our own day and generation we should at least have the courage and the manliness to keep them for those who come after us. Canadians are a highly developed and self-contained people. I should not like to see them reduced to the position of being mere hewers of wood and drawers of water; mere burrowers of the raw material to send it out of the country to make others rich. I feel that if we pass this measure we are approaching the parting of the ways; that we are turning our faces, which have hitherto been looking round the world, to the other members of the galaxy of British nations; we are turning our faces away from that ideal, and we are looking southward to a nation that has never treated us in such a way as to make us particularly desirous to extend special advantages to her. And, Sir, let me say here and now that even if the sacrifice—the temporary financial sacrifice—might be hard on individuals in this country, I think in the long run we will be better off if we continue along the road which we have been following and remain in the rank we at present occupy in the list of nations under the British flag.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 23, 1911,

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 123) to incorporate La Banque du Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 119) respecting the Ontario Northern and Timagami Railway Company. —Mr. Carvell.

WATER IN THE RAILWAY BELT AND PEACE RIVER BLOCK.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 124) relating to the water in the Railway Belt and Peace River block of land. He said: The purpose of this Bill is to provide for the administration of rights in regard to water in the Railway Belt of British Columbia and in a certain area of land in the Peace River country within the province of British Columbia, to administer rights to water in these areas by the Dominion government in pursuance of the decisions of the Privy Council delivered recently by which that jurisdiction was fixed.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). May I ask if the Bill covers a policy for the conservation of that water and its equitable distribution? Does it take in that view of the case?

Mr. OLIVER. The whole purpose of the Bill is to provide for the conservation of the public interest in the water in these areas. But, the conditions being what they are, the details are not set out in the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUEBEC AND NEW BRUNSWICK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CARVELL moved the first reading of Bill (No. 120) respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.

Mr. CROCKET. Explain.

Mr. CARVELL. The object of this Bill is to renew a railway charter granted about ten years ago. The charter was renewed about two years ago, but the time allowed for commencement of construction will expire, I believe, in April next. The parties are anxious to have the charter renewed for the purpose of going on and probably constructing the railway. The proposed line is from Quebec to the town of Connors in the province of New Brunswick, and, by an amendment added two years ago, from Connors to the city of St. John. There is also provision, I think, to extend across the northern part of the state of Maine. No doubt, some portion of the railway will be built within the next two years.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the Bill simply for an extension of time?

Mr. CARVELL. That is all.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN—PROPOSED LAND ENDOWMENT.

Mr. LAKE:

1. Referring to a resolution of the legislative assembly of the province of Saskatchewan, of December 18, 1909, endorsing the desirability of the creation of a suitable land endowment for the University of Saskatchewan out of the public domain within the province, what was the nature of the reply made by the government to the Lieutenant Governor in acknowledging the receipt of the resolution?

2. Have any further communications in regard to the subject taken place between the government and the provincial authorities? If so, will the government lay a copy of the papers on the table of the House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. The nature of the reply made to the memorial of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan of the 18th December, 1909, is set forth in the order in council of 31st March, 1910, which I lay upon the table of the House.

2. There has been no communication on this subject since.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. REID (Grenville):

If the proposed arrangement of the tariff with the United States is passed, will the following countries be allowed to import goods into Canada on same terms as allowed the United States, viz.: Argentine Republic, Austria, Hungary, Bolivia, Columbia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Venezuela?

Mr. FIELDING:

This question was covered by an answer given to the hon. member for North Ontario on the 16th day of February, 1911. (See unrevised edition of 'Hansard,' page 3744.)

FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. HENDERSON:

What action does the government intend to take on the two requests preferred by the deputation on behalf of the shareholders and depositors of the Farmers' bank, viz.:—

That a royal commission be appointed to make a thorough examination into all matters connected with the incorporation and management of the Farmers' bank; and that legislation be enacted to relieve shareholders of their double liability and to enable depositors to be paid at least fifty cents on the dollar?

Mr. FIELDING:

The government have no reason to doubt that the exercise of the powers given to the liquidator by law, and the performance of the duties imposed upon that officer by like authority, and the proceedings now engaging the attention of the courts of justice in Toronto, will lead to a full investigation into and disclosure of all the affairs of the bank, and that, therefore, there is no need of the appointment of a royal commission. Should anything arise later to indicate that the investigation is insufficient, the question can be further considered. Replying to the latter part of the hon. gentleman's question, the government deeply regret that a number of people who are not well able to bear the loss are likely to suffer from the failure of the bank, but in the judgment of the government it would be contrary to public policy to recoup the losses of any class of investors from the public treasury.

LANDS FOR HOMESTEADS.

Mr. LAKE:

What is the total amount of land thrown open for homesteads since 1st August, 1908, in the following townships: 21 to 33 in ranges 18 to 23 inclusive, west of the 2nd meridian?

Mr. OLIVER:

As far as can be ascertained from the records of the department the approximate area is 61,920 acres.

Mr. LAKE:

What different parcels of land have been thrown open for homesteads since the 1st August, 1908, in the following townships, viz.: 21 to 33, ranges 18 to 23, west of the 2nd meridian?

Mr. OLIVER:

As far as can be ascertained from the records of the department the following lands in the townships mentioned were thrown open for homestead entry:

Tp. 21, range 18, west 2nd mer.—All sec. 31.

Tp. 24, range 18, west 2nd mer.—S. ½ sec. 3; W. ½ sec. 9; N.W. ¼ and S.E. ¼ sec. 17.

Tp. 25, range 18, west 2nd mer.—N.W. ¼ and S.E. ¼ sec. 15.

Tp. 27, range 18, west 2nd mer.—S.W. ¼ 23.

Tp. 31, range 18, west 2nd mer.—N. ½ sec. 31 and N. W. ¼ 35.

Tp. 32, range 18, west 2nd mer.—W. ½ sec. 5; all sec. 7; N. ½ sec. 9; L.S. 1 and 2, sec. 15; all sec. 17; N½ sec. 19; all sec. 21; S. ½ sec. 25; S. ½ sec. 27; S.E. ¼ sec. 31.

Tp. 33, range 18, west 2nd mer.—W. ½ sec. 7.

Tp. 21, range 19, west 2nd mer.—N. ½ sec. 19; E. ½ and S.W. ¼ sec. 31.

Tp. 22, range 19, west 2nd mer.—All sec. 7; all sec. 9; all sec. 17; all sec. 19.

Tp. 23, range 19, west 2nd mer.—E. ½ sec. 19.

Tp. 30, range 19, west 2nd mer.—L.S. 1 and 2, sec. 7; all sec. 31; W. ½ and S.E. ¼ sec. 33.

Tp. 31, range 19, west 2nd mer.—All sec. 5; all sec. 7; all sec. 9; all sec. 15; all sec. 17; all sec. 19; all sec. 21; all sec. 23; all sec. 25;

all sec. 27; all sec. 31; all sec. 33; W. ½ and N.E. ¼ sec. 35.

Tp. 32, range 19, west 2nd mer.—All sec. 1; W. ½ and S.E. ¼ sec. 3; all sec. 5; all sec. 7; all sec. 9; all sec. 13; all sec. 15; all sec. 17; all sec. 21; all sec. 23; all sec. 27; all sec. 33; all sec. 35.

Tp. 33, range 19, west 2nd mer.—All sec. 3; S.W. ¼ 9.

Tp. 22, range 20, west 2nd mer.—N.W. ¼ sec. 13; N. ½ sec. 23; all sec. 25; N.W. ¼ sec. 27.

Tp. 29, range 20, west 2nd mer.—L.S. 7 and 8, sec. 23; all sec. 33.

Tp. 30, range 20, west 2nd mer.—W. ½ sec. 3; N.E. ¼ sec. 5; all sec. 9; all sec. 13; all sec. 15; E. ½ sec. 17; S.E. ¼ sec. 19; all sec. 21; all sec. 23; all sec. 25; S. ½ sec. 27; all sec. 33; all sec. 35.

Tp. 31, range 20, west 2nd mer.—All sec. 3; N.E. ¼ sec. 9; all sec. 13; S.E. ¼ sec. 15; E. ½ and S.W. ¼ sec. 23; all sec. 25.

Tp. 32, range 20, west 2nd mer.—W. ½ and N.E. ¼ sec. 5; E. ½ and S.W. ¼ sec. 9; all sec. 13; S.E. ¼ sec. 23.

Tp. 33, range 20, west 2nd mer.—E. ½ sec. 7; all sec. 31.

Tp. 21, range 21, west 2nd mer.—N. ½ sec. 19; all sec. 31.

Tp. 22, range 21, west 2nd mer.—All sec. 31.

Tp. 25, range 21, west 2nd mer.—S.W. ¼ sec. 13.

Tp. 28, range 21, west 2nd mer.—E. ½ and N.W. ¼ sec. 15; W. ½ and N.E. ¼ sec. 31.

Tp. 30, range 21, west 2nd mer.—S.W. ¼ sec 1.

Tp. 31, range 21, west 2nd mer.—N. ½ sec. 9; W. ½ sec. 15; S.E. ¼ sec. 17; S.E. ¼ sec. 19; all sec. 21; all sec. 27; all sec. 35.

Tp. 32, range 21, west 2nd mer.—All sec. 1.

Tp. 33, range 21, west 2nd mer.—N.W. ¼ sec. 13.

Tp. 21, range 22, west 2nd mer.—S. ½ sec. 7; E ½ and S.W. ¼ sec. 23.

Tp. 28, range 22, west 2nd mer.—N.W. ¼ sec. 5; W. ½ sec. 13; N.E. ¼ sec. 15; all sec. 17; N.E. ¼ sec. 19; W. ½ sec. 27.

Tp. 29, range 22, west nd mer.—N.E. ¼ sec. 7; S. ½ sec. 9.

Tp. 31, range 22, west 2nd mer.—E. ½ sec. 1; N.W. ¼ sec. 23; N.E. ¼ sec. 33.

Tp. 32, range 22, west 2nd mer.—E. ½ sec. 31.

Tp. 21, range 23, west 2nd mer.—All sec. 7.

Tp. 22, range 23, west 2nd mer.—S. ½ sec. 15; S.W. ¼ sec. 23.

Tp. 23, range 23, west 2nd mer.—All sec. 5; E. ½ sec. 7; all sec. 19.

Tp. 27, range 23, west 2nd mer.—S.W. ¼ sec. 7; L.S. 1 and 8, sec. 19.

Tp. 28, range 23, west 2nd mer.—S.E. ¼ sec. 5; N.W. ¼ sec. 13; all sec. 17; all sec. 21; E. ½ sec. 23; all sec. 25; all sec. 27; E. ½ sec. 31; all sec. 33.

Tp. 29, range 23, west 2nd mer.—S.E. ¼ sec. 1.

Tp. 30, range 23, west 2nd mer.—W. ½ sec. 19; S.E. ¼ sec. 23.

Tp. 32, range 23, west 2nd mer.—All sec. 7.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES—POSITION OF CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I desire to refer to my question to which an answer has just been handed in. The question is as follows:

If the proposed arrangement of the tariff with the United States is passed, will the following countries be allowed to import goods into Canada on same terms as allowed the United States, viz.: Argentine Republic, Austria, Hungary, Bolivia, Columbia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Venezuela?

The answer handed in by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is that this question was covered by answer given to the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) on the 16th February, 1911; see unrevised edition of 'Hansard.' Now, I did not name in my question all the countries covered by the question of the hon. member for North Ontario. My question is capable of being answered, 'Yes' or 'No.'

Mr. FIELDING. I object that it should be answered 'Yes' or 'No.' A question may be so asked that to answer it 'Yes' or 'No' would be misleading. I think it is right to give the information; and every point of the question my hon. friend (Mr. Reid, Grenville), was covered in the answer as published in 'Hansard' of some days ago.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have read the answer in 'Hansard,' and to me and other hon. members that answer is not plain enough to be understood. I would like the minister to give an answer to my question.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is regular to discuss the subject now.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I can discuss it on going into Ways and Means.

Mr. MONK. I might raise a similar question. Mine was the last question on this list, question 13. I do not see how I can get an answer to this question by converting it into a motion. I submit also that it is a question which could be answered without having recourse to a motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no necessity for moving it; it stands as an order.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That from this day to the end of the session government orders on Monday will have precedence immediately after questions to be put by members.

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary, Montreal). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the right hon. Prime Minister to kindly put off the motion till the following Monday.

Under the heading of 'Public Bills and Orders,' in the journal of the House, these are very important proceedings. I think

it would be convenient that the motion do not include Monday next.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would suggest to the Prime Minister that the motion do not include Monday next. I would also suggest that for the words 'after questions to be put by members,' the words 'notices of motion for the production of papers' be substituted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no objection.

Motion as amended, agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That when this House adjourns on Tuesday next, the 28th instant, it stand adjourned to Thursday the 2nd March.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That from this day to the end of the session the House will meet on Wednesday at 3 o'clock p.m., and that the sitting on such days shall in every respect be under the same rules provided for other sitting days.

Motion agreed to.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES—MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS.

Mr. OWEN. Before you proceed with the orders of the day, I have here a telegram which I wish to read, and to ask a question about it. It comes from a very important place just at present, being dated Washington, February 23.

Senator Cummins has served notice that he will propose amendments to the Canadian Reciprocity Bill to admit free from Canada manufactured product not mentioned in the treaty.

The question I wish to ask is this : Should the American government change their reciprocity treaty soon, I suppose about to be entered into between Canada and the United States, so as to allow the manufactured products of Canada to enter the United States free, will our government also allow the manufactured products of the United States to come into Canada free?

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid my hon. friend is not correctly interpreting the telegram. If I understand it, the motion of Senator Cummins is that manufactured products of Canada can be admitted into the United States free of duty. There is nothing in this agreement which will prevent the United States doing that if they want to.

Mr. OWEN. But should the American government change the treaty so as to allow—

Mr. MARTIN (Montreal).

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is mistaken, that would not be a change in the treaty.

Mr. OWEN. If they do that, will our government allow the products of American manufacturers to enter Canada free?

Mr. FIELDING. I would wait until I received the proposal before I considered it.

HOURS OF LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. KING. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to make a correction. In a communication I received this morning my attention was drawn to the fact that when I was asked during the course of the debate on January 16, if I had received any representations respecting amendments to the Eight Hour Bill introduced by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville), from the workingmen employed on the Intercolonial, I replied, no. I find that I was in error in making this reply, that in fact communications were received during my absence, and acknowledged by the Deputy Minister of Labour, and subsequently further acknowledged by myself. The question was asked me in the due course of debate, and I answered on the spur of the moment without having recollected the communications I now refer to.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to two returns ordered by the House, one on the 23rd of January, the other on the 16th of February. The one on the 23rd of January was for the by-laws, &c., of the Bankers' Association as approved by the Treasury Board ; the other was for the reports of the curators of the different banks to whom curators had been appointed. I would like these down just as soon as the minister can get them.

Mr. FIELDING. I will call the attention of the officials to them. I was not aware the order of the House had not been complied with.

Mr. FOSTER. I might also ask the minister to hurry up the other editions from day to day of reciprocity resolutions and amendments pro and con. These are becoming very interesting now, and we would like not to be behind date.

FISHERIES PROTECTION SERVICE.

Mr. JAMESON. I call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) to this despatch which I find

in the Ottawa 'Free Press' of February 22 :

'RAINBOW' MAêES FIRST SEIZURE.'

The Department of Naval Affairs has received a message to the effect that the new Canadian Cruiser 'Rainbow', while rounding Cape Scott, had caught the steamer 'Edric' of Seattle fishing within the three-mile limit, and was proceeding to Esquimalt with the 'Edric' in tow.

I would like to ask the minister if this report is correct, and if so, to what nationality the vessel seized belongs.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have seen the report in the newspapers, and I asked the department to send me the particulars. I expect to receive them in a few minutes, and will inform my hon. friend. I suppose that the information is correct. All the vessels of the Canadian navy are utilized in the protection of the fisheries.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business will be taken up to-morrow)?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-morrow we intend to proceed with Supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What particular department?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall state that later in the day.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a special Supply Bill for the current year with which some progress has been made. That will be the first item.

WAYS AND MEANS — RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I beg to bring to the attention of the House a communication I have received from the Trent River Paper Company, it is as follows:

E. Gus Porter, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I learned from the papers, that Sir Wilfrid Laurier has promised to carefully consider any objections filed against the proposed changes in the tariff.

Relying upon this promise, I appeal to you as our representative in parliament, to bring to the attention of the Premier, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the truth concerning the position the strawboard manufacturers of Canada would be placed in, should the proposed change in the tariff regarding paper, pasteboard and similar products selling for 4c. or less than 4c. per pound, be put into effect.

The Hon. Mr. Fielding when introducing the reciprocity agreement, stated that he has consented to admit all manufactures of paper selling for 4 cents or less, into Canada, free of duty, because he is of the opinion that the Canadian manufacturers should be able to compete, with manufacturers of similar products in the United States.

Unfortunately for the manufacturers of strawboard in Canada, the Hon. Mr. Fielding has failed to realize the true position of affairs, and I submit, through you, for the consideration of the Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Hon. Mr. Fielding, the following facts:

1st. The freight rates on strawboard, from strawboard mills situated in Ohio, are lower to Windsor and London than our rates are, and as low as ours to Paris, Hamilton, Niagara Falls, Berlin, Guelph, Galt, Brampton, and Brantford, and only 40 cents per ton higher to Toronto. Our Winnipeg business would be lost to Michigan or Indiana mills, owing to the great difference in freight rates in their favour.

2nd. Our product is to be admitted free, and we are called upon to pay the following rates of duty:—

	Per ton.
On slack coal (a large item in our cost of manufacture)..	$0 14
Freight from International bridge ..	1 30
Or, in all..	$1 44

Beyond a doubt we have got to pay $1.44 more per ton for our fuel than the United States manufacturers have. Further however, on this subject of coal, the freight on a ton of coal from the mines to the international bridge is $1.25 per 2,000 lbs. On the other hand, all the board mills in Ohio can bring their coal supply to their mills for less than $1 per ton or thereabouts.

Therefore, Canadian manufacturers are under a handicap of from $1.25 to $1.50 per ton on the manufactured product, in so far as coal consumption alone is concerned.

Again, it must be remembered, that we have to endure rigorous winter season, and the amount expended in fuel for the mere heating of the mill buildings is considerable.

The duty on felts, another large item in the cost of manufacture, is 35 per cent, the duty on wire cloth, 30 per cent, the duty on machinery and parts thereof is from 27½ to 30 per cent, on valves and steam pipe, and steam pipe fittings, pumps, belting and all other supplies, we pay a high rate of duty.

We consider that the duties on outward and inward freights we pay, place us under a disadvantage of from $2.50 to $4.50 per ton, according to distance or point of delivery from our mill. The business west of Boston we will lose—no hope in that direction.

This question of the paper and pulp section of the reciprocity agreement seems to me to be in a very complex condition. As I read it, only paper or woodboard, the major part of which consists of mechanical or chemical pulp, is to be admitted free into the United States, and even then, only when the pulp is produced from timber cut upon land, upon which there are no provincial government regulations, hindering the free export of pulp wood to the States. Such paper or board to be of the value of 4 cents per pound or less than 4 cents per pound. On the other hand, as far as I understand the wording of this same paragraph as it reads in the reciprocity resolution introduced in the House of Commons, all paper, pasteboard and similar

products valued at 4 cents or less than 4 cents per pound are to be admitted free into Canada from the United States, as soon as the United States government consents to admit pulp and paper free from all parts of Canada.

What I wish to make plain is this, that I gather from the two wordings that strawboard will be admitted free from the United States although the United States will not admit strawboard free. I can hardly believe that the Hon. Mr. Fielding will allow the agreement to go through in that way. Free admission to the United States for our strawboard will not be of any use to us, but that is only added proof that we are placed in a helpless position. I would like very much to have the opportunity of having a short interview with the Minister of Finance, just for the purpose of explaining our position.

Yours truly,
The Trent River Paper Co., Ltd.,
W. S. MILLER,
Managing Director.

I would ask the Minister of Finance whether an interview such as it is desired here would be accorded?

Mr. FIELDING. We are here from day to day, and we are only too happy to receive any gentlemen who come to us on public business.

Mr. KNOWLES. I am requested to communicate to the government and the House this important and I believe wise and patriotic resolution passed unanimously by the Swift Current Board of Trade. The resolution reads:

This board of trade views with satisfaction the reciprocal tariff arrangement recently negotiated between Canada and the United States, and on behalf of the agricultural interests of Swift Current strongly urges upon the government of Canada that the promotion of better commercial relations between this country and the great republic to the south of us will not affect our national loyalty but will greatly stimulate the agricultural interests of this country and assist the development of these resources.

Respectfully,
A. WEBER,
Secretary.

Mr. GOODEVE. I desire to bring to the attention of the House the two following resolutions which have been communicated to me:

RESOLUTION OF THE CRESTON FRUIT AND PRODUCE ASSOCIATION.

Whereas the proposed agreement introduced by the Hon. Mr. Fielding will inflict a severe blow to the fruit and lumbering industries of British Columbia without giving any equivalent; and whereas the fruit industry is in its infancy and needs fostering; and whereas the fostering of home industries is of vital importance to the welfare of this province; and whereas the proposed agreement would impair the capital investment of those interested in those industries; now be it resolved, that the Creston Fruit and Produce Association in regular meeting here assembled, strongly condemns the proposed agreement so far as it applies to these two industries.

And whereas the principle of reciprocity with the United States involves fundamental changes in the policy adopted during the past ten years and with such success by Canada, and may involve Canada as a whole, in a policy which will result in our commerce being diverted, and flowing north to south, instead of east to west as at present, to the great disadvantage of Canadian railways, manufacturers and producers; therefore the Creston Fruit and Produce Association, in regular meeting here assembled, requests the earnest attention of the government to these facts, before any change whatsoever is made, in the present successful Canadian tariff policy.

And that copies of these resolutions be sent to Premier McBride, A. S. Goodeve, Senator Howitt Bostock and Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Resolution passed unanimously by the South Kootenay Farmers' Institute:

Whereas, the fruit and vegetable growers of South Kootenay have invested heavily in the fruit industry, relying upon the government of Canada to maintain existing tariff conditions as affecting their products; or in case of any modification of the tariff affecting fruit, vegetable, and poultry products, to benefit, at least, to an equal extent by the modification of the tariff on other articles affecting the cost of production of these commodities; and

Whereas, the cost of production in this district is increased by the fact that labour and all supplies are higher by reason of a generally protective tariff, and by the distance from eastern Canadian manufacturing centres; and

Whereas, the proposed reciprocity arrangement with the United States would remove the protection which we now enjoy, while there is nothing in the proposed reciprocal arrangement to reduce the cost of production; the result, therefore, will be both injurious and unjust to us, and will doubtless mean the ruin of many who have invested their all in these industries.

Therefore, be it resolved, that we, the members of the South Kootenay Farmers' Institute, do unanimously protest against the abrogation of the present duties on fruit, vegetables and poultry products, and respectfully urge that the government of Canada may find some other means of securing such concessions as they may desire from the United States than the partial extinction of these most important industries.

Signed on behalf of the Institute.

GEO. A. PAULL,
Secretary.

Dated at Columbia Gardens, B.C.,
Feb. 13, 1911.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I wish to call the attention of the government to the following item from the Toronto 'News,' which is published in the Montreal 'Gazette':

Toronto, February 22.—The 'News' says that President Stuart, of the Quaker Oats Company, a large American concern, with a Canadian branch at Peterborough, while in the city a few days ago, stated to Z. A. Lash, K.C., that if the proposed agreement

is adopted at least 80 per cent, of the business now done at Peterborough will be transferred to the United States, which will practically mean the closing of the Peterborough mills.

I wish to ask if the government has had any representation in regard to this matter ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have read the article in the press to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I desire to call the attention of the government to a resolution passed by the Associated Boards of Trade, of the province of Ontario at their meeting in Toronto yesterday, the resolution was introduced by a prominent Liberal and seconded by the Hon. E. J. Davis, ex-commissioner of Crown lands in the Ross government, and it reads:

In the opinion of the Ontario Associated Boards of Trade the proposed reciprocity agreement threatens Canadian nationality and autonomy and is opposed to the true interests of Canada and should not be ratified.

This resolution was carried by a vote of 97 to 18. I also desire to call the attention of the government to a statement made yesterday by Sir William Van Horne, who, speaking on the reciprocity agreement said:

It has made me sick and ashamed; too sick and too ashamed to say anything on the subject.

In view of the representations of men of the standing of Sir William Van Horne; in view of the representations of an association representing all the boards of trade in the province of Ontario, and in view of all the representations that have been made by all the associations and boards of trade throughout the country, I desire to ask if these will have any effect whatever upon the determination of the government to force through this reciprocity compact.

Mr. FIELDING. The only new point in my hon. friend's remarks is the high admiration he has now for the Hon. E. J. Davis. We are glad to know that hon. gentlemen opposite think so well of him.

Mr. LALOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the government to a resolution of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, which, by a vote of 69 to 13, condemned the proposed trade arrangement between the United States and Canada. This resolution was moved by Mr. W. H. Cross and seconded by Mr. D. C. Cameron, who was Liberal candidate in the last election in the city of Winnipeg. I wish to know if resolutions of this kind will have the effect of causing the government to withdraw the agreement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read the resolution.

Mr. LALOR. That resolution reads:

That the Winnipeg Board of Trade, after careful consideration of the proposed reciprocity agreement between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, is firmly of the opinion that the same is not in the best interest of the Dominion, particularly that portion of the country west of the Great Lakes, and desires to impress upon the government its urgent wish that the proposal be not ratified.

Mr. LAW. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to a resolution passed by the Yarmouth County Farmers' Association, which is composed of both Liberals and Tories alike. I may say that this resolution was passed unanimously and without division. It reads:

Whereas the reciprocal trade arrangement recently drafted by representatives of the United States and representatives of Canada is now before the parliament of Canada for ratification.

And whereas, in the opinion of this Yarmouth County Farmers' Association the ratification of said arrangement and the amendment of the customs tariffs of both countries in accordance with the schedules to said proposed arrangement, will establish between Canada and the United States, not only a more liberal trade policy than heretofore, which must have many advantages, but will promote and encourage the commercial interests of both countries and strengthen the friendly relations now happily prevailing between them, and thus add another safe-guard to the peace of the empire by further promoting the union of Anglo-Saxon nations for their common interests.

Therefore resolved, that this Yarmouth County Farmers' Association place on record its approval of said trade arrangement, and of its hope and desire that it may be ratified both by the Canadian Parliament and the American Congress, believing that its ratification will effect a marked increase in the prosperity of the people of Canada.

Further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honourable W. S. Fielding, Minister of Finance and to B. B. Law, M.P., at Ottawa.

Yarmouth, N.S., February 17, 1911.

I wish also to say that the Yarmouth County Farmers' Association is one of the largest, if not the largest farmers' associations in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. HENDERSON. I beg to present a petition from the Fruit Growers' Association of the village of Burlington, in the county of Halton, which I will read:

Burlington, Ont., Feb. 2, 1911.

Whereas it is proposed to establish free trade in fruits and vegetables between Canada and the United States.

And whereas, millions of dollars are invested in Canada in these industries.

And whereas, under free trade, competition would be unequal and the Canadian power heavily handicapped by reason of having to sell in a wide open market and to buy in a

protected one, and also on account of ten or twelve times the amount of capital invested in the fruit industry in the United States as compared with Canada, and the larger investment always tends and strives to crush the smaller.

And whereas, the value of fruit and vegetable lands would be materially diminished.

And whereas the fruit and vegetable growers have from time to time in the past emphasized to the government of the day the desirability of a moderately protective tariff; therefore, be it resolved that:

The Canadian government be respectfully requested to maintain the present Canadian tariff on fruits and vegetables entering Canada, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Mr. David Henderson, M.P., for Halton.

Moved by A. W. Peart, seconded by Robert Fowler.

H. T. FOSTER,
Pres. Burlington Fruit Growers' Association.
W. E. A. PEER,
Sec. Burlington Fruit Growers' Association.

I present this petition Mr. Speaker, hoping that it will assist the right hon. gentleman to find a reasonable excuse for withdrawing from the compact which he has announced to the House.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I do not know that these extracts are all in perfect order, but as we have been having some of them, and as I have here a newspaper that has been sent to me without any communication, asking me to read it to the House, perhaps it would be as well if I should do so. The article is from the Summerland 'Review,' which I suppose is the organ of the fruit industry in British Columbia. There is an article from Mr. Burrell, with reference to the question, and this article in the 'Review,' is headed 'Sober Second Thoughts.'

Mr. BURRELL. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that this extraordinary article is from my pen?

Mr. PATERSON. No. It may, perhaps, come from the hon. gentleman's pen after he has the sober second thought which the editor recommends. The editorial in this fruit organ is as follows:

SOBER SECOND THOUGHTS.

When the people of Canada have overcome the scare many have apparently been driven into in connection with the reciprocity agreement between the United States and Canada, we believe that the general opinion will be that the agreement is one of the greatest achievements of statesmanship to be recorded in the Laurier regime, in fact, something too good to come to pass, for the American Senate will hardly pass it. This may sound strange coming from a newspaper essentially Conservative in its politics, particularly in view of the fact that many of our politicians see in the agreement much out of which to make political capital.

Mr. HENDERSON.

In matters so great as this, where the interests of the whole Dominion are at stake, and Canada is getting that for which the Dominion has worked hard since 1865, we believe the matter of politics should be laid aside and the question studied soberly so as to be fully understood.

Going back to 1854, a treaty of reciprocity in natural products was entered into between the United States and Canada. This was the result, largely, of the personal work and influence of Lord Elgin, then Governor General of Canada. This treaty proved of great value to both countries and under it Canada revived in a marked degree. That treaty covered the navigation of the St. Lawrence, the fisheries question, and provided for mutual free trade between Canada and the United States in the products of the two countries. For six years the Elgin treaty worked particularly advantageously to Canada. Then the strained relations between England and the United States over the Alabama claims, brought on the question on the part of the United States of the abrogation of that treaty. For five years more it was continued, then in 1865 the American Senate cancelled the agreement.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I do not think it is quite proper for a minister of the Crown to obstruct his own motion for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means by reading a long article in defence of the government's policy, and thereby setting a bad example to the House. I want to ask your ruling on the question whether this conduct is strictly in accordance with parliamentary usage.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Minister of Customs has seconded the motion before the Chair, and I presume that he has a right to speak.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not object to the point of order. I am glad that it has been taken. It just emphasizes the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite cannot hear the truth and remain quiet under it—that they are afraid of free discussion—afraid of anything being said which will conflict with their pet theory.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The motion is for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means. I ask whether the hon. gentleman can discuss the matter contained in the motion, as he is doing, by reading an extract.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have been consulting Bourinot in the last day or two on that point, and I find that it would be irregular to discuss the resolution now before the committee. But the doctrine laid down by Bourinot is that on a motion for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, or into Committee of Supply, almost any question which is not on the Order Paper, or in committee, may be discussed; but a specific reference to the resolution before

the committee I would consider out of order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then this is strictly in order, because it has nothing whatever to do with the resolution before the committee.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Is it your ruling, then, that an amendment dealing with the resolution before the committee would be out of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not called upon to rule on that point. If the point is raised, after hearing the old parliamentarians, I will decide it.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The hon. gentleman is out of order, then?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is in order; he is speaking to his motion.

Mr. PATERSON. It is strange that the hon. gentleman could not see that. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been reading to the House extracts from newspapers, and have been asking time and again for any expressions of views that have reached the government with reference to this question. Here is an expression of view with reference to it, and why it should be thought that I am contravening any rule of the House by reading it I cannot understand. The article continues:

Since that time numerous efforts have been made to renew the reciprocity trade relations between the two countries. In 1866 a Canadian delegation went to Washington to negotiate a treaty; in 1869, Sir John Rose made the effort; in 1873 George Brown and Sir Edward Thornton repeated the effort, and in 1890-92 Hon. Robert Bond did likewise, with no result.

While these prominent Canadians were making the effort on the part of Canada, various Bills and resolutions for reciprocity with Canada were tabled or voted down in Congress from time to time. After this came the 'Joint High Commission,' which was to settle all points of difference between the two countries including reciprocity.

From this brief history of reciprocity and reciprocity negotiations covering half a century or more, it will be seen that Canada is now getting something our statesmen, at least, have believed all along the Dominion was in need of, and, whether we can all agree as to what should and should not be placed on the free list, we must recognize this, that reciprocity is something our greatest statesmen have fought hard to bring about.

There is another article in the same paper dealing with the same question, which is as follows:

OUR FRUIT HAS NOTHING TO FEAR.

Without wishing to disparage the argument sincerely made by many against the removal of the duty on fresh fruit and vegetables to and from the United States, as provided in the proposed reciprocity agreement, we object to the underlying thought which bottoms all such argument, that Canadian fruit growers are not able to compete with the American fruit growers in the matter of picking, packing and selling their fruit.

British Columbia fruit, such as peaches, pears and apples,—particularly apples,—could be sold at the highest price in the best markets in America alongside of the best fruit from California, Colorado Washington and Oregon. We have seen Colorado Jonathans push the California Belleflower off the market at Los Angeles, the greatest fruit centre in the world. And, under reciprocity British Columbia fruit growers could ship apples to such centres as this and find a market already built up. For our fruit growers have nothing to fear in competition with the fruit from any of the American districts.

Speaker Cannon, of the American House, spoke significantly at a banquet of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers a few evenings ago.

We have lately had sent to Congress a commercial agreement in name, but a treaty in reality, but one that goes primarily to the House. In a month's time we shall be called upon to enact it as law. I do not know what we are going to do with it. Ask the fruit growers of California what they are going to do when Canadian fruits are free. What answer are we going to give one-third of the population of the country—the farmers?

And are we to fear the American apple on our markets when our fruit is so much superior? If our fruit growers could produce the quantity, the product from the other side would not stand any chance here, for our fruit would command the market. Until we do produce the quantity the present tariff or any other tariff is but a superficial remedy.

As I said, the other side of the question is set out in the letter published in this same paper and signed by Mr. Burrell.

Mr. LALOR. Is that a resolution or an editorial article?

Mr. PATERSON. They are both editorials.

Mr. BURRELL. As the hon. minister has seen fit to introduce my name in this discussion and has also quoted an editorial from the Summerland 'Review,' British Columbia, it is only fair that I should ask the House to bear with me a minute or two along that same line. I have in the Vernon 'News' of February 9 an article which gives the report of the Associated Boards of Trade of the Okanagan valley, which met at Summerland, and which expressed very clearly and explicitly the overwhelming convictions of the fruit growers in that district. That resolution is as follows:

That the Associated Boards of Trade for the Okanagan Valley at their annual meeting now assembled urged in the strongest manner upon the Dominion government the absolute necessity of maintaining the present import duty on fruit as from the United States.

The fruit industry in British Columbia is in the infant stage with great possibilities which has been stated by responsible men will equal the lumber industry of the province, and at present stage requires careful handling and fostering. There are millions of dollars invested in the fruit industry in the province more than in the farm implement business of Ontario which has been nursed and protected, by so doing these factories of Canada are classed in this line as the leading industries of the world. Without this protection through their growing years, these magnificent plants now employing thousands, would never have existed. The same applies to the British Columbia fruit industry in which the growers have invested many millions of dollars, besides the very large investments of capital in irrigation systems running into millions of dollars.

The necessity of a protection duty outside the fostering of a young and promising industry, is the undeniable fact that the natural market for British Columbia. 'The Northwest Territories' is made the dumping ground for surplus fruit from the northwestern states which already possess a large and fully developed fruit industry and the pernicious action of consignment is resorted to on a large scale. It is well taken that the fruit growers are entitled to have their rights guarded the same as has been the case for other enterprises.

It winds up with the strongest representation that this fruit industry absolutely needs protection. The minister has seen fit to quote the views of one editor of a newspaper. I do not know the gentleman who wrote the article or what weight it carried, but the overwhelming majority of the whole of that district entertained diametrically opposite views. I have a copy of the Vernon 'News' of February 16, to show you how strongly they feel on this question. I may say that at a very large meeting on February 15, they quoted various statements made by the government and others with reference to this industry, and among these statements I find the following:

The Shoreham Hotel,
Washington, D.C.,
21st January, 1911.

G. C. Johnston, Esq.,
Secretary, Board of Trade,
Vernon, B.C., Canada.

Dear Sir,—I am just in receipt of your telegram of the 20th and have carefully noted all that is stated therein.

I shall bring the matter before my colleague, Hon. Mr. Fielding, and you may rest assured that it will have our most serious consideration.

Yours truly,
WM. PATERSON.

So that these gentlemen who were representing the fruit growing industry in the Okanagan valley wired to the minister at Washington the disastrous effects which would follow if the duties were taken off, and the hon. Minister of Customs wired in reply, before the negotiations were concluded, that he would seriously consider their representations. The hon. minister has intimated that the gentleman who wrote the article he quoted is a Conservative. I have here a copy of the Kelowna 'Courier' and Okanagan 'Orchardist,' which is edited by one of the strongest, most consistent and vigorous supporters of this government that I know of in western Canada.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not say that this editor was a Conservative.

Mr. BURRELL. My hon. friend was endeavouring to say apparently.

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. BURRELL. He said that paper was Conservative, which would lead to the inference that this was a Conservative authority, but the gentleman who edits Kelowna 'Courier' is one of the most indefatigable Liberals in British Columbia, and is rarely to be found opposing or criticising harshly anything this government does. I want to read a leading article from this gentleman on February 16:—

Free trade is theoretically the best policy, failing which fair trade, which would consist in a reasonable tariff to use as a weapon in making countries with high protective tariffs come to time; but there should be no picking and choosing, and a lopsided reciprocity agreement which leaves untouched the majority of the high protective duties on manufactured articles, but strips the farmer and fruit grower of their share of protection, is grossly unfair.

And he goes on:

As a Liberal, albeit always an independent one, it pains us to find ourselves in opposition to the policy of the leaders of our party, especially when Liberal rule in Canada has been signalized by such abundant prosperity, but we cannot endorse a departure from the established policy of the past fifteen years so discriminatory in its character that it throws the burden of loss and disaster on the infant industry of horticulture, only beginning to direct its wavering steps along the path of progress, while the manufacturing trusts of Eastern Canada, gorged with the accumulated profits of years, sit sleek and smiling behind an impregnable tariff wall.

Now, before I close this short reply to the Minister of Customs, I would like the minister to understand the emphatic opinion of a gentleman whom he ought to respect. And I would call the attention of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), to this, and that of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) also, for, if I understood the latter gentleman rightly, he implied that they were Conservatives largely, who were in-

dulging in the fiercest criticism of the tendency of this policy from the national point of view. The gentleman whom I am going to quote, is one who had the honour and pleasure of entertaining my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in the city of Vernon. I refer to Mr. Husband, mayor of Vernon, a lifelong Liberal, and highly respected in the district, and who, so far as I know, has always been a consistent Liberal. At the board of trade meeting, at which they protested strongly against the proposals, Mayor Husband spoke strongly on the point to which I have referred. I quote from the Vernon 'News' report of the meeting:

Mayor Husband then said that he would like to offer a few remarks regarding the reciprocity agreement, and proceeded to set forth in very lucid and convincing terms his reasons for opposing it. He thought that every one in the district, who had any knowledge of the circumstances, would agree with the resolution passed by this board——

That is the resolution protesting against the removal of the duty.

—and the associated boards, protesting against the removal of the duty, and he went on to review very thoroughly the various conditions which gave the old established fruit growers of the states to the south a great advantage over us on the prairie markets. . .

Still more important, however, was the effect that such an arrangement would have on our national and political life. The great and patriotic statesmen who had made it their object to build up a strong nation in Canada under British institutions had commenced by uniting the east and west by a line of railway. We have pledged our national credit for many millions to build other roads, with the view of uniting our provinces and maintaining our trade in our own channels. He believed that the trade policy inaugurated by Sir John A. Macdonald was the best possible for Canada at the time, and it was fortunate that another such great statesman as Sir Wilfrid Laurier had continued the development of this policy. Have we reached a stage, he asked, when we can afford to let down our tariff walls? . . .

He felt that any step towards reciprocity was premature and dangerous. It was the beginning of the parting of the ways which might eventually lead to Americanizing the country. While he had every confidence in Mr. Fielding, who he regarded as one of the best finance ministers Canada ever had——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BURRELL. The hon. gentlemen who cheer that sentiment, should let me finish the sentence.

—he feared that in his anxiety to increase trade he had overlooked the grave political danger of such an agreement.

He disliked and mistrusted the attitude of the United States in this agreement. He felt that there was an ulterior motive behind their actions, and concluded by comparing them to the Greeks at Troy, reiterating the classic warning to beware of the Greeks especially when they bear gifts.

That is all I have to say. I want to make it absolutely clear that the little matter of editorial opinion quoted by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), is abundantly repudiated, and he has his answer at the hands of the Liberal gentlemen whom I have quoted.

Mr. BRADBURY. I hold in my hand a letter from the market gardeners of Manitoba. Last year, I presented to this House a petition in the interests of the market gardeners, and I received a promise from the Finance Minister that nothing would be done in the way of changing the tariff until an investigation had been made. This letter goes on to say:

As secretary of our society, I make a strong protest on behalf of our gardeners, because the government have taken this step without consulting our producers and without any consideration for the petitions already sent to them, and further without any regard for the capital invested in this industry in our country by those now in the business and many others coming in renting land at a big figure and putting their last dollar into their outfits. Free vegetables will simply put these men out of business. The government should consider our local conditions—expensive labour and working and keeping clean these gardens which is a very costly item compared with cheap southern labour, and also our climatic conditions, our severe winter necessarily entailing an enormous expense in heating greenhouses which must be used in order to compete. Our market now is not as it should be, being controlled by a few middlemen. We are just now taking steps to have the city of Winnipeg establish a central market place. The number of gardeners around Winnipeg for five or six miles would be fully 100, with others growing potatoes and other vegetables who do not make a regular business of it. The amount of capital invested would average from $1,000 to $3,000. I estimate roughly the amount tied up in these outfits, including horses, machinery, wagons, greenhouses, &c., and not considering the land value, about $400,000, or perhaps $500,000. If you included the land value, of course it would be very much more. On learning from the newspapers that this arrangement had been made, I communicated with the President of the Market Gardeners' Association and asked him for a special meeting on Monday next to protest against the action of the government. I see by the papers that it will be up in the House on Tuesday next.

A copy of the resolution sent forward to the government has been sent to me, and I beg to put it on record. It is in the form of a memorial:

To the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Premier of Canada, and to the members of the House of Commons.

Gentlemen,—We, the undersigned market gardeners in the vicinity of Winnipeg now assembled humbly desire to impress upon

your honourable body the importance of the duty now being imposed upon green vegetables coming into Winnipeg from the United States.

We therefore petition that this duty be left as at present and sincerely hope your government will not remove the same as asked for by the wholesalers and jobbers in the session of 1909, which would benefit only themselves and neither the producers nor the consumers of Manitoba.

And it would only be the means of depriving our gardeners of a very large portion of their earnings and in fact many of them would have to go out of business.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

In view of the fact that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), promised across the floor of the House last year, to give these men an opportunity of presenting their views, and at least to make an investigation, I think it is absolutely unfair, by the proposition brought down, to deprive these men of the protection they enjoyed under the old tariff. I beg to call the attention of the government to another resolution passed in the city of Winnipeg. This was passed by the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, two-thirds of the members of which are Liberals:

The Winnipeg Grain Exchange, by a vote of 54 to 15, adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, that it is the opinion of the members of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange that the proposed measure of reciprocity trade between Canada and the United States of America now under consideration at Ottawa and Washington, if ratified, will not be in the best interests of Canada.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES—POSITION OF SOME OTHER COUNTRIES.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I brought a question up here a short time ago, and asked the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), if he would give me a definite answer. The hon. gentleman replied that the information asked for by my question, had been covered by the answer to a question asked by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), on February 16. The question was with regard to this reciprocity treaty. The hon. member for North Ontario asked a question on February 16, as recorded at 3744 of the Unrevised 'Hansard':

1. What is the number and the names of the countries, if any, that will be entitled to have their natural products and manufactured articles come into Canada under the same terms as the United States under the proposed reciprocity agreement?

Now, I am not finding fault with the answer that the Minister of Finance gave to the hon. member for North Ontario. That answer, perhaps, was satisfactory to that hon. gentleman. That answer reads as follows:

Mr. BRADBURY.

1. France is a favoured nation country to a limited extent, that is to say, as respects the lists of articles specified in schedules B and C to the French treaty. Twelve countries: Argentine Republic, Austria-Hungary, Bolivia, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Venezuela—are accorded most favoured nation treatment generally.

That does not answer the question definitely. It also states:

These are consequently enjoying the benefits of the French treaty As respects the dutiable schedules in the agreement with the United States, the concessions to be granted to the United States are largely the same as already have been granted to France and the favoured nation countries.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that the whole tendency of this answer is to mix the question up so that people will not understand it.

As respects a large part of the list, therefore, no additional advantage will be enjoyed by such countries.

That is not a fair, straight-out answer to this question.

There are, however, a few articles in the French schedules which in the agreement with the United States are made free or dutiable at lower rates.

There are, however, a few articles in the French schedules which in the agreement with the United States are made free or dutiable at lower rates. In these cases the advantages granted to the United States will extend also to France and the favoured nation countries. In the case of the few articles which are not to be found in the French treaty, the favoured nation countries will be entitled to receive concessions on the same terms as the United States, but France will not be so entitled.

In every sentence of this answer there is a tendency to mix up the whole question, so that the public may not understand it.

Although not arising from any agreement, in no case has any advantage been granted to any foreign country that did not at the same time extend to all parts of the British Empire. In the few cases in which the rates to be established are lower than those already enjoyed by British countries, the reductions will apply to such countries.

Now, I can understand why it was possible for the Finance Minister to mix up this question, because there is no doubt that in answering it he would have to bring in France, with whom we had a special treaty. But in order to get an answer as to the names of the countries that would enjoy the same conditions as the United States in bringing into Canada every article produced by the farmer outside the French treaty, in asking my question I mentioned the Argentine Republic, Austria-Hungary, Bolivia, Colombia, Den-

mark, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, and Venezuela. I left out the name of France, because we have a treaty with her. As I understand it, these are the favoured-nation countries, and as I understand it, every one of these countries will be entitled to ship their farm products in here, and to compete with our own farmers, if this treaty goes through. Butter from Denmark can come in to Montreal in competition with our Canadian butter, and come in free, butter from Australia can come free into British Columbia and flood the market there, and the same remark applies to every other country I have named. Now, when this deputation of western farmers was down here last fall, and they were asking for a lower tariff with the United States, we did not hear either the Minister of Finance or the Prime Minister, who received that deputation, telling them : Gentlemen, if we carry out your wishes, there will be twelve other countries allowed to send in their stuff and compete with yours. If the Minister of Finance, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Customs had stood up then and told that deputation from the west : If we do this for you, you are going to have the Argentine Republic, you are going to have Russia, shipping their wheat in here free to compete with ours, you are going to have butter, and poultry, and cheese from all these countries coming in here free ; I venture to say that if the government had told the western farmers this, they would have turned round and said : Don't make any such arrangement with the United States. Now, my object in asking that question was that the farmers of this country, from one end to the other, would understand what the effect of this arrangement would be, and whether it allows twelve other countries besides the United States, and the British colonies to send their goods in here free. There are members of this House who, until a few days ago, did not really understand the whole situation ; and why should not the Minister of Finance, when this question is asked him, jump up and tell the people the exact truth. I venture to say that the Minister of Finance dare not go out into the Northwest to-day and tell the farmers that all these countries are going to import their stuff free into Canada. Every farmer with whom I have talked yet, when he is told that there are twelve other countries going to have the same advantage as the United States, is opposed to this proposition. The whole course of the Minister of Finance shows that he is trying to deceive the people of this Dominion as to the true position of the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. REID (Grenville). I want the Minister of Finance to answer that question, yes or no.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no right to speak. My hon. friend has asked a question, and I could not answer it in any plainer English than I used in answering the same question more comprehensively put by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe). I think the hon. member understands it well enough, but it suits his purpose to pretend that he does not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not regard the answer as entirely definite. The reference in it is to dutiable goods, it says nothing at all about the free list. I suppose there was an obvious intention in making that omission. Why should not the hon. gentleman be able to inform this House, in the first place—

Mr. FIELDING. On what point?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Whether the Argentine Republic will have the right to send its goods into our territory on the same terms as the United States?

Mr. FIELDING. That is answered, my answer says so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, we have the answer now ; that is correct. Then will the hon. gentleman tell us if Austria-Hungary will have the same right?

Mr. FIELDING. The same answer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will Bolivia have the same right?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will Colombia have the same right?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Denmark the same right?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Japan the same right?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Norway the same right?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Russia the same right?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Spain the same right?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Sweden the same right?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Switzerland the same right?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Venezuela the same right.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, if the hon. gentleman had said this before, it would have saved the House a good deal of time.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I am not taking up the time of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, but the hon. gentleman has done so, and he complains if any one else does it.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I do not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He reproached me yesterday for having made three speeches, and I was obliged to tell him that I would have to make many more. I ask him now if we will have the right to send our goods into those countries on the same terms on which we can send them into the United States.

Mr. FIELDING. Surely the hon. gentleman is not serious. He knows the meaning of the favoured-nation treaty. It means that you get in those countries the best terms that are granted by those countries to any people on earth.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Surely this is a very plain question : Will we have the same right to enter the markets of those countries, both in respect to free and dutiable goods, that we have to enter the markets of the United States under this reciprocity proposal?

Mr. FIELDING. Every one of these countries makes its own tariff laws, as we make ours. Every country may send its products into the Dominion of Canada subject to our tariff laws, and our products must enter every country subject to the tariff laws of that country ; and every country having a favoured-nation treaty guarantees to us that no other country will ever get any advantage over us in its markets. That is favoured-nation treatment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not ask the hon. gentleman to make a disquisition on the favoured-nation treaty, I was asking a very simple question. We did extract certain information from him by going over these countries one by one, but with difficulty, and much reluctance on his part. Now, I ask him this: As under these reciprocity proposals, the goods of Canada can enter the United States, some of them on the free list, and some upon the reduced list—will we have that same right in respect to the countries I have mentioned? That is a plain question, is it not? And it is a question which the government ought not to be afraid to answer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Mr. FIELDING. There is no fear in answering it. These favoured-nation countries are to-day, as I said in the answer I gave to the member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), they are to-day enjoying to a large extent the concessions which this arrangement gives to the United States. These concessions to a large extent are the same as were granted to France, and when they were granted to France, they were granted to the favoured-nation countries. The favoured-nation countries are getting them to-day, and they are not getting them by virtue of the reciprocity arrangements at all. Second, the reciprocity arrangement does not deal with favoured nations. Whatever obligation we have in the matter of trade relations has been on the statute-book for ages; it arises out of treaties made by our mother country years ago. We have been subject to these treaties for years. There is nothing new in them to-day, there is nothing in this reciprocity arrangement which in any way creates any new favoured nation condition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has not given a conspicuous example of courage, because he has still been afraid to answer the very simple question put to him.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend will be good enough to repeat the question, I will be as brave as he is known to be.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman did not understand the question he is the only hon. gentleman in this House who did not.

Mr. FIELDING. Pity my ignorance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If his intellect is not keyed up to the pitch of understanding such a question as I have addressed to him, he had better give over the control of this treaty to some one else.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, no he hadn't.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I make that suggestion.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has not been invited to do that. If he will repeat the question I will try to answer it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will repeat it once more, and try to make it so plain that even the Minister of Finance will understand it. I asked whether or not the terms which are extended to this country by the United States, under these tariff proposals, will be extended to the products of this country entering the countries that I named only a moment ago. If that is not plain, I cannot make it plain.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman's question is, whether the terms we obtain in the United States will be obtained in these various favoured nation countries ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. I answer—and if the hon. gentleman did not know it, it is a marvellous thing that one in his position did not know it, and I must be permitted to doubt whether he did not know it,—that this arrangement does not in any way touch the rights which we have in any countries in the world. I repeat that every country makes its own tariff arrangements, that the United States has no power to determine on what terms and conditions Canadian products will enter Austria-Hungary. Every nation makes its own tariff.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Except Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. Canada makes its own tariff. I would have thought that after our little interview of yesterday, never again would we have heard that very foolish statement. I have a better opinion of hon. gentlemen than to suppose they do not know the principles of favoured-nation treatment. Favoured nation, simply means that in every one of these countries, we have a guarantee that no other country will ever be allowed to get any advantage over us. That is what favoured-nation treatment means, and I rather suspect that the hon. gentleman knows it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course I do.

Mr. PATERSON. I beg pardon, I only spoke once, and I was called to order, when I was entirely within my rights, and here is an hon. gentleman making four speeches.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I yielded on every occasion in order that the Minister of Finance might ask a question.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know that you have an absolute right to ask a question, and demand three or four answers to it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have allowed a great many questions to be put, because I have felt it was the sense of the House that they should be put. Of course the minister having been called on more than once, cannot be called on to make a speech on each occasion, and therefore, it is irregular to put these questions, because they cannot be put without there being a right to answer them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not calling in question the right of a minister to answer my question, that would be an utter lack of courtesy. I asked the minister a question, and I yielded the floor in order he might have an opportunity to answer. I could not compel him to answer, but I yielded the floor to him to answer if he saw fit.

Mr. PATERSON. No, because you spoke three or four times.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have never understood that a gentleman who sits down in this House in order that some one else may answer a question thereby yields his right to the floor. The Minister of Customs does not seem to know any more about the rules of the House, than he does about this reciprocity treaty.

Mr. PATERSON. I take the point of order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I knew perfectly well what the answer of the Minister of Finance ought to be, but I sought to let him give a plain statement to the House of what the facts were, and with a good deal of skill he has in some sort of half-hearted way, endeavoured to make a plausible answer, and at the same time to avoid giving a direct answer.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you understand it now ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. PATERSON. I raise the point of order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the point of order?

Mr. PATERSON. The point is that the hon. gentleman has spoken half a dozen times and he has not the right to do that. I was called to order when I was speaking perfectly within my rights, I had not spoken before or anything, and the hon. gentleman has taken the floor four or five times, occupying all the afternoon, after having all his questions answered.

Mr. SPEAKER. I consider that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), is within his right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think I am entirely right in the conjecture which I ventured a moment ago, that the hon. Minister of Customs knows just about as much about the rules of the House as he does about the reciprocity arrangement. That has been made absolutely manifest by the result of the point of order which he raised just now. I understood perfectly what the situation was, but we desired to have the understanding of the government upon the same point. The question was really not open to argument. We in Canada, under these reciprocity proposals, will be obliged to open our markets to all the countries that have been named upon the same terms as are contained in these proposals with reference to importations from the United States of America. There is no doubt at all about that, but on the other hand, when our products go from Canada to these countries, they do not go on the same terms as those on which products of Canada enter the United States. In other words, to sum it all up, by these reciprocity proposals,

our markets are opened upon these terms to the products of some 13 or 14 countries, while the market of only one country is opened to us, under the same terms and conditions. If the Minister of Finance had answered directly on the point, he would have said that which I have just now stated to the House, as to the correctness of which I absolutely defy contradiction by any hon. gentleman in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. Following the good example of the Minister of Customs, I have a burning desire to entertain this House for a length of time by reading important editorials. They are very long and argumentative, and I have no doubt, will afford a great deal of valuable information to members of this House, and since it has been ruled that it is in order to do so, especially by a minister of the Crown, who, in the judgment of some is obstructing the motion which the government has made, to allow the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, I hope to entertain the House probably for the next 24 hours, if I am able to stand up that long. I believe in following a good precedent and a good example.

I have one editorial here extending over two columns and a half; it is ornamented with a photograph of one of the ministers at its head, and I am sure it would be very interesting to the House. But I have been debating in my own mind whether it would be the part of wisdom to do as the Minister of Customs has done and obstruct the business of the House by reading this article. Of course, the Minister of Customs said that no time was wasted by his reading an editorial, and so I might entertain the House by reading an article from the Montreal 'Star,' covering 14 columns, which is filled with valuable advice and courteous advice and kindly advice to the First Minister and the Minister of Finance, and which speaks out on behalf of the interests of our great Dominion and the menace to our connection with the mother land. I would be strongly tempted to read that article if I could do so before the House rose at six o'clock. Of course, we are not in a hurry, because the Minister of Customs has told us that time is no great object, and I could interlard this editorial with a few of my own remarks, which might be jocose in imitation of the Minister of Customs. When my hon. friend from Kootenay was quoting some references to the Minister of Finance this afternoon, hon. gentlemen opposite all cheered the first part of the article, but when the latter part was read they all remained silent. It reminded me of the story of the man who saw a little vicious animal called a bull in a field pawing up the ground and exhibiting his desire to get over the fence and at the man. And the man said: You little brute, I feel like going over that fence myself, taking you by the horns, slinging you down the hill and breaking every bone in your body. Well, the man thought this was a good idea and he had a hearty laugh at it. However, no sooner was he over the fence than the bull charged him, threw him up in the air, and when he came down to earth with nearly every bone in his body broken he said: It was a mighty good thing that I had my laugh beforehand. And so, if these hon. gentlemen opposite had waited until the end of that article they would never have had that opportunity to cheer. But, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding my desire to enlighten and entertain the House and my inclination to follow the good example of the Minister of Customs, I am inclined to be merciful and to spare my fellow-members. I, of course, have a strong desire to economize the time of parliament and let the government get on with their very interesting measure, which is doing so much to bring down on them the odium of every intelligent man in Canada, and, therefore, I will not at the present moment read these important editorials, although later on it may be necessary to do so, especially in view of the fact that every time a minister of the Crown rises to tell us something about this beautiful trade arrangement he plainly shows that he knows nothing about it. For the present, Sir, I shall content myself with the observations I have made, and I shall defer until some future occasion, following the example of the Minister of Customs in reading these newspaper editorials.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I see in the newspapers this afternoon a cable despatch from England, which, I ask the Minister of Finance, to reconcile with the statement he made in the House a few days ago. This cable reads:

MR. BRYCE NOT INSTRUCTED.
(Canadian Press Cable).

London, Feb. 23.—In the house of commons to-day Sir Edward Grey in answer to Mr. James Hope said that no instructions had been given to the ambassador at Washington in connection with the Canadian-United States agreement.

Mr. Hope: Do I understand that no instructions were given at all?

Sir Ed. Grey: No instructions were sent beforehand. We have not yet received the full report of the speech of the Canadian minister who said Ambassador Bryce helped all through the negotiations.

Mr. DANIEL. It was the Postmaster General who said that.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). No; it was the Minister of Finance when he made his speech congratulating Ambassador Bryce for the valuable assistance he had rendered in Washington.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Minister of Finance has already spoken on this question, and he cannot be permitted to make another speech.

Mr. FIELDING. I should be glad to answer.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like it to be understood by the House that I cannot allow a minister or a member to speak more than once on the same motion.

Mr. DANIEL. Perhaps the Postmaster General will explain his statement that Mr. Bryce, the British ambassador, had assisted the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs to help along this reciprocity arrangement at Washington.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The meaning of what I said was that Mr. Bryce had given his assistance and help to the ministers who were at Washington negotiating with the American government, but that did not imply that he had received any instructions. He is our ambassador and naturally he would assist and help Canada whenever Canada needs him. That is the duty of the British ambassador and that is what I said.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yesterday one of the ministers of the Crown tried to make the House and the country believe that the members on this side of the House and the Conservative press throughout the country were largely responsible for promoting the annexation idea. In answer to this, may I be privileged to read a resolution signed by 18 prominent Liberals in the city of Toronto, worded as follows:

PROMINENT LIBERALS OPPOSE RATIFICATION OF RECIPROCITY.

We oppose ratification of the proposed reciprocity agreement with the United States of America:

1. Because in the years 1897 the parliament of Canada repealed the legislation then existing relating to reciprocity and since such repeal neither the people of Canada nor their parliament have entrusted the government with any duty or authority to negotiate with respect to any agreement on the subject.

2. Because the present unexampled prosperity of Canada is the result of the policy which has been pursued in the development of her trade and of her natural resources. Because this has involved the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars upon railways, canals, steamship and other means of transportation between east and west and west and east, and the obligation to incur further great expenditures for the same purpose; and because further development along the same lines would be seriously checked by the proposed reciprocity agreement and the benefits of the expenditures referred to would be to a great extent lost.

3. Because it is essential to the continued national unity and development of Canada that no trade relations with any country should be agreed to by Canada on any basis which would check the growth and development of trade between the various parts of Canada with each other, or between Canada and the various parts of the empire; and because the proposed reciprocity agreement betwen Canada and the United States of America would seriously check the growth and development of this trade.

4. Because any present benefit to any section of Canada or to any interests or individuals therein which might accrue from the proposed agreement would be more than offset by the loss and injury which would accrue to other sections and interests and individuals and because the result to Canada as a whole would be greatly injurious.

5. Because as a result of the proposed agreement the freedom of action possessed by Canada with reference to her tariffs and channels of trade would be greatly curtailed, and she would be hampered in developing her own resources in her own way and by her own people.

6. Because after some years of reciprocity under the proposed agreement the channels of Canada's trade would have become so changed that a termination of the agreement and a return by the United States to a protective tariff as against Canada would become a disturbance of trade to an unparalleled extent, and because the risk of this should not be voluntarily undertaken by Canada.

7. Because to avoid such a disruption Canada would be forced to extend the scope of the agreement so as to include manufactures and other things.

8. Because the agreement as proposed would weaken the ties which bind Canada to the empire, and because the unrestricted reciprocity which would naturally follow would still further weaken those ties and make it more difficult to avert political union with the United States.

9. Because the disruption in the channels of Canada's trade which was caused by the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 and the subsequent establishment of a protective tariff by the United States gave rise to a decided leaning in many minds towards annexation with the United States, and this at a time when Canada was mainly peopled by native-born Canadians and other British subjects to whom the prospect of annexation was most unwelcome, and because Canada in a comparatively few years will have millions of newcomers, a large percentage of whom will have come from foreign countries, and because if Canada should then have to chose between disruption of her channels of trade with the United States or political union with them the preservation of Canadian autonomy and Canadian nationality would be enormously more difficult.

10. Believing as we do that Canadian nationality is now threatened with a more serious blow than any it has heretofore met with, and that all Canadians who place the interests of Canada before those of any party or section or individuals therein should at this crisis state their views openly and fearlessly, we, who have hitherto supported the Liberal party in Canada, subscribe to this statement.

February, 1911.

SIGNATURES.

B. E. Walker, John L. Blaikie, W. D. Matthews, W. K. George, Z. A. Lash, W. T. White, G. T. Somers, Robt. S. Gourlay, Wm. Mortimer Clark, R. J. Christie, H. Blain, H. S. Strathy, L. Goldman, Geo. A. Somerville, W. Francis, James D. Allan, E. R. Wood, John C. Eaton.

My object, Mr. Speaker, in placing this resolution on 'Hansard,' is to convince the Finance Minister of the inaccuracy of the statement he made yesterday to the effect that the Conservative members of this House, supported by the Conservative press, were largely responsible for the annexation agitation throughout the country.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Chairman, I need scarcely say to the House that it is somewhat of a relief to a nervous man to have come through the usual daily amount of guerilla warfare, which naturally will take the place of regular opposition methods, when you have an opposition without a tabulated policy, and demoralized largely by the strength and popularity of the policy of the government of the day. I am sure that I carry with me the consensus of opinion of the whole House when I express my personal gratification that the member for the St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames), has been able, after his serious illness, to take his position once more amongst us, and make his painstaking contributions to the study and exposition of public affairs. I should like to reciprocate the wish which that hon. gentleman gave expression to, when he said that we ought to approach this question of reciprocity in a spirit calm and non-partisan. If he were to ask us to be non-partisan in a resolution, I should be disposed to say reasonably non-partisan so far as the hon. member for St. Antoine is concerned. Now, I do not intend to devote very much attention to the details of the speech of my hon. friend, who very courteously informed me that he had to leave for New York at four o'clock this afternoon; and he, I am sure, will not think me guilty of a bad return for that courtesy in not referring to his speech in detail. There are, however, one or two points to which I would like to draw attention. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), some little time ago, depicted myself as occupying a somewhat lone position in this House—as being a kind of Canadian Rosebery, ploughing my lonely furrow. Well, I am bound to say that there was an admission at the beginning of the speech of the hon. member for St. Antoine, that takes away a great deal of my feeling of loneliness to-day; because he said that protection to be of any use, must be protection all round, otherwise it became class legislation, and was doomed to be destroyed. He saw, in what is going on now, the fall of the outworks, and he said the citadel would soon come down. Well, that is very consoling to a lone free-trader in a foreign land; for I should like to point out that we never have had protection all round in this country, and there never has been protection all round in any country upon earth. That is not the nature of the thing; that is not the object of it. The only object of protection is to give a minority the chance of protecting themselves at the expense of the majority. My hon. friend from St. Antoine, and I think, my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid), have indicated the opinion that the western farmers, when they understand this question, will not be so keenly in favour of reciprocity as they are supposed to be at the present time. These hon. gentlemen need not be alarmed. The western farmers have been studying this question for some time, and to a great deal of the speech of the hon. member for St. Antoine, I think I can furnish an answer which was placed in my hand to-day by Mr. Bower, the president of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, who allows me to use his name in saying that the United Farmers of Alberta, the Grain Growers of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and the Grange of Ontario are all unanimously in favour of reciprocity. The grain growers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and the Grangers of Ontario are unanimously in favour of reciprocity.

Mr. BRADBURY. That is the political machine.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Am I to understand that my hon. friend is opposed to reciprocity?

Mr. BRADBURY. Most undoubtedly, as you propose it.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Then I can only say that there will be more lonely men than myself, if I understand anything of the opinion of the western farmers and the meaning of legislation such as this.

I have been frequently called a theorist on this question, and I suppose that my hon. friend from St. Antoine division of Montreal (Mr. Ames) is put forth as a man of affairs, who understands business, and who approaches the consideration of politics from the business standpoint. Well, in that connection I was surprised to hear him suggest, apparently seriously, the giving of a three cent per bushel bounty on the raising of wheat. In the west last year we raised in the neighbourhood of 100,000,000 bushels of wheat. Three cents per bushel bounty on that would amount to a trifle of $3,000,000 bonus to begin with, and we have only begun cultivating wheat in the west. Does my hon. friend want this House seriously to believe that he and his

friends would put that as a serious proposition before the people, and then pose in this House as a man of business who wants to be considered a practical politician. I dismiss a suggestion of that kind without further comment. You cannot goldbrick the farmers of this country with a proposition of that kind.

My hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) further said that the cattle raisers of Alberta were convinced they would lose their market. How did my hon. friend come to know the opinion of the Alberta raisers of cattle? I am in a small way an Alberta raiser of cattle myself, and I do not think the market for that cattle is likely to be lost; but there is no answer to what Mr. Asquith has aptly termed the sloppiness of the protectionist argument. Actually the logical protectionist speaking in the person of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), says that the multiplication of markets means the loss of markets. Well, with gentlemen who argue in that fashion, it is impossible to continue a serious or relevant discussion.

If the House will extend me its patience a little while, I should like to make a few remarks on the general aspect of this question, and also reply to some of the objections we have heard, and I trust that my remarks will be strictly pertinent to the debate as far as it has gone. Personally I should be quite content to leave the defence of the position of the government as it was left by the speech of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) the first night of the debate. The hon. minister (Mr. Paterson) in that speech was logical, forcible, cogent and commendedly brief. I do not know however, whether I ought not to modify that compliment about brevity, because since then my hon. friend seems disposed with some other members, to eke out his original contribution by supplementary remarks. There is another quality in that speech which we should all endeavour to imitate, and that is that he looked at the thing from the broad national standpoint. My hon. friend reminded me of some one who had been living for some time in a very inhospitable climate and had suddenly found his youth and vigour restored by returning once more to breathe his native air. But the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition reminds me of the man who is still living in an inhospitable clime and likely to remain there much longer.

I find myself, however, in agreement with the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), and my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) when they said that Canada was big enough to look after her own tariffs, and to make her own tariffs independently of other countries. But if I agree in that, it is as a free trader. I learned the doctrine in the form of an aphorism from a great Conservative—possibly the greatest Conservative leader—who was at the head of the Conservative party in England in the 19th century, a great financier, the teacher of Mr. Gladstone in matters of finance, and the man to whom Mr. Gladstone, to the very end of his career, referred always in terms of veneration and respect. Sir Robert Peel, after eight years of instruction at the hands of Cobden, came to repeal the corn laws, and laid down what I conceive to be sound philosophy today, as it was then, with regard to tariffs, and that is that the best way to combat hostile tariffs is by a system of free imports. As a free trader, therefore, I am bound to endorse the position that Canada is big and strong enough to attend to her own tariffs. That was the theory laid down by Sir Robert Peel, and which has been put in practice by the greatest commercial nation in the world during 70 years, and how has it worked out? It has worked out, as good theories always do. It has been proved by practice up to the hilt. Take for instance what has happened as regards trade between the United States and Great Britain. Britain takes the imports all right, she gets wire nails from the United States at $6.50 per ton for which the people of the United States pay $10 per ton. As a man who uses wire nails, I prefer to buy them at $6.50 per ton rather than at $10 per ton. A well educated American told me lately that, to his own knowledge, fencing wire manufactured in Rochester is taken across the Atlantic to Britain and then reshipped to Brazil and sold in Brazil cheaper than in Rochester where it is made. That is dumping, and Britain gets the cheap goods. Sir Robert Peel said that free imports are the best method of overcoming hostile tariffs. How does Britain get on after 70 years experience of hostile tariffs? At this juncture it is sufficient for me to say that British ships plough through the hostile tariff of the United States to such an extent that she exports more manufactured goods to the United States than to any other country in the world. Britain, with her free imports, commands the trade all around. She gets the cheap goods and compels the other countries to take her manufactures in exchange. Sir Robert Peel was a great Conservative statesman and financier, and when he made an aphorism in political economy he made it for all time.

I have ventured to trespass on the patience of the House in order to illustrate why I am an adherent of the position taken by the opposition in this regard. But, how does the position accord with their theory. How does it lie in their mouths to state that they believe Canada is big enough to make her own tariff? Another example of

the sloppiness of the protectionist argument. Why, in the mother country the friends of my hon. friends opposite have for seven years been telling the people that one of the main uses of a tariff is to bargain with other countries. That is the main item in the protectionist programme of Great Britain. It is the main contention of every man advocating a protectionist fiscal policy. And, yet, when it suits their purpose, my hon. friends come forward and says that this is the main use of a tariff, but how dare these two ordinary gentlemen put a tariff to that particular use?

I am in agreement with another position of these hon. gentlemen. I concede that history will probably record that the reciprocity arrangement, which I trust will soon go into effect, took its origin in the economic necessities of the United States people and the political necessities of the Republican party. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in taking up that position, makes a lone free trader still more comfortable, because he says that it arose from these conditions and we need only have waited for it. What is that but a contention that protection is breaking down in the United States? Does he want Canada to embark upon a foolish policy which the United States people now feel they have to run away from? My hon. friend from North Toronto is coming to see what Mr. Lloyd-George sees very clearly in England, for he stated the other day—truthfully, as I think—that the ice of protection is cracking all over the world.

Well, now, what is it that the government have done against which such complaints are formulated? As my hon. friend from Richmond, N.S. (Mr. Kyte) pointed out in his very able speech, they have remitted over $2,000,000 of taxation. And hon. gentlemen opposite would like to contend that this was in answer to their criticism or at any rate in accordance with their expressed wishes. Well, it is not a very horrible thing to remit two millions of taxation. Every government that I have ever lived under sought, and received, gratitude from a reasonable population for giving any remission whatsoever in taxation. But I do not know that I have any right to include the hon. member from North Toronto in any reasonable population. This argument of my hon. friend from Richmond is capable of extension. These hon. gentlemen opposite have not only been telling the government, ever since I came to this House, that the government have broken their pledges to reduce taxation, but they have also said: 'You promised to find us new markets, and you have not done it.' Now the government find new markets, and these hon. gentlemen say: 'How dare you do it?'

Well, what can you do with a front bench of an opposition like that? The hon. gentleman also says: 'The government have taken steps to increase the trade of the country.' How horrible! I wish hon. gentlemen opposite would recall what John Bright said and apply it to economics, to trade. He said that he failed to find any different code of morality for a nation than that which would apply to a man. Well, I cannot find a different code of economic laws, or trade laws, for a nation than I do for a man. When did my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) fail to develop any opportunity that presented itself of expanding his business? Well, Canada is only an aggregation of human beings something like my hon. friend from St. Antoine, and the government of Canada has as plain a duty in regard to extending the trade of Canada as it has in looking after the taxation of Canada and in finding new markets. They have remitted taxation; they have found new markets; they have extended our trade. And hon. gentlemen opposite say: 'How dare you do it?—you are breaking up the constitution!'

It is extremely refreshing to me to find my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) taking up these well-worn free trade positions; but I must say that their discussion of them does not impress me very strongly with their logic or with the consistency of their political opinions. But, perhaps, they are unconscious free traders.

Now, I want to say a few words on the economic outcome of this policy as it appeals to me. I notice that the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto were very non-committal on this point, in fact the leader of the opposition accomplished the extraordinary feat in his speech in the first night of the debate of taking up an hour and twenty minutes on a reciprocity agreement and discussing everything but reciprocity. This non-committal attitude, so far as the hon. member for North Toronto is concerned, is chronic with him in such circumstances, for I find that in 1897, he spoke of the scope of the tariff which was being introduced at that time by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and its effect on the interests of the country, and he had to confess candidly that he had not been able to make up his mind yet on these particulars. That is just why the proper place for him was opposition; and that is just why the proper people were in control of the government. Those in control of the government were able to frame a fiscal policy for the good of the country, and they could see well what was to come out of that policy, as all

hon. gentlemen opposite now know what actually has come out of it. They are wise after the event; therefore, opposition is the proper place for them. But some of their number at that time were not so reticent, as was pointed out by the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) the other evening. 'Industry paralysed!' 'Industry destroyed!' The 'wail of industry.' In 1897, this was what some of these hon. gentlemen talked about. Why, it was necessary to add an adjective to describe it, so it was called the sorrowful wail' of industry. Sir Charles Tupper used that language (he might have been anticipating the speech my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) made the other night) the sorrowful wail of the manufacturers of Canada in the Montreal 'Gazette.' The sorrowful wail has been patented now, and is being sold by the yard, accompanied by a life-like photograph of the Prime Minister to give some credit to the thing.

There are some prophecies concerning what is going to come out of this arrangement that will not be fulfilled. I venture upon that prophecy very firmly. I think it is a safe position because the prophets are driven to contradict one another and themselves, and their prophecies cannot all work out. It is clear that this arrangement cannot at the same time ruin the Canadian consumer and the Canadian producer of the products that are being consumed (or not being consumed; I do not know what hon. gentlemen opposite really think is going to happen then)—but that is what we are being told, on one hand there is a reason for the greatest alarm on account of the consumer, and on the other hand that the producers of the goods to be consumed are ruined. I think we may confidently look to the nonfulfilment of one of these prophecies. There is some part of the 'sorrowful wail' that will not work out. Now, my hon. friend from North Toronto gave a very good example of his capabilities in the way of prophecy by being a double prophet in his long speech. One of the difficulties of a speech of four hours' duration is that a man is almost sure to forget at the end what he said at the beginning. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) spent three hours in trying to prove that this arrangement would be the disruption of the empire, the ruin of Canadian nationality, and the end of all things. And then, at the end of his speech he turned round quite coolly and said: This is not a reciprocity arrangement at all, it is simply a matter of exchange of jack-knives. We on this side of the House do not regard the British Empire and Canada as quite such flimsy things that they are going to be destroyed by an exchange of jack-knives.

Now, with regard to the effects of this arrangement upon the people of Canada, I think it is a good, sound position to take that trade makes prosperity, that prosperity makes for increased wealth, that prosperity and increase wealth must mean more employment to labour, and benefit all round. Why, Sir, that is capable of very simple proof. Last year this government—which has never reduced any tariffs, which has continued the National Policy, though, by the way, a year after they came into power they were going to ruin the industries of the nation by departing from the National Policy—but that is a small inconsistency—a year ago this government made an arrangement with regard to the German surtax. I was in Prince Edward county ten days ago, and I met a gentleman there who is engaged largely in the evaporation fruit industry, and he told me that at the time that arrangement with Germany was come to, he had 600 cases of evaporated fruit which he could not place. The moment the arrangement was made he got $300 more for those 600 cases by selling them to Germany than he could have got before the arrangement was made. I think that is very practical proof that the lowering of tariffs promotes trade, that trade promotes prosperity and wealth, because that $300, or what it represents, would come into Canada, be circulated in Canada, and to that modest extent would increase the material prosperity of the Canadian people.

Now, I think that Mr. Scallion, who came down with the grain growers, put the case for reciprocity in a brief and convincing shape. I was surprised to see that so prominent a man as Premier Roblin, of Manitoba, yesterday said that no one had asked for reciprocity. Well, that is an extraordinary statement for the premier of the province to make, where the grain growers have their headquarters, and it is very scant courtesy to Mr. Scallion to say that no one asked for reciprocity. Mr. Scallion pointed out in so many words what he thought would be the benefit to the farmers of extending their markets; he pointed out that there would be opposition along certain lines, and I must say that he portrayed very accurately the lines of opposition which we have had elaborated in this House. Then he asked the very practical question with regard to this breaking up of the empire. He said: We do $350,000,000 of trade with the United States now, and I would like to know the exact amount of trade which would be dangerous, because there is no question that, while we have been doing that trade, it has not been leading to the destruction of the empire.

Now, Sir, I do not know that I would dare to make some of the prophecies that are

being made about the effects this arrangement will have upon the price of special commodities. I do not think that a lowering of the tariff is likely to raise prices to the consumers of the country; yet I am sure that so far as the west is concerned it will benefit the producers. The farmer in the west stands very largely to benefit by the increased price of his land holdings. It is the magnificent prerogative of Canada to-day to offer to immigrants a splendid heritage of free land and independence in the possession of their land. I think if we get this prosperity I am talking of, the farmers will benefit by the increase of their wealth, such is the fortunate position of this great country, without damaging consumers at all. As a free trader, I should regret if any lowering of the tariffs led to the punishment for one moment of the consumers. There may be temporary inconveniences, there may be temporary upsets of things in certain localities, but we believe benefit will be the broad outcome of the policy.

Now, I want to look for a few moments at some of the main positions which were taken up in a very serious argument by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), some of the main positions which were not dealt with at all by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). I certainly think that with those parts he did deal with, he proved to be a successful controversialist. But I think there was an argument presented which deserves the consideration of some one in this House; because, when the hon. member for North Toronto favours us with his views at such length he naturally commands our attention, our respectful attention, and his arguments in favour of protection, and, therefore, against the reciprocity arrangement, have to be examined. Now, the member for North Toronto said: There is a labour question involved in this. I may say that I listened to every word of his speech, and I took notes of it; that was all I needed to do to give due respect to my hon. friend. After all, if one listens to a speech of four hours and then has to read it, one would be forgetting what was due to the consideration of the brevity of human life. I will endeavour not to misrepresent my hon. friend's position in any way. There was a suggestion of hurt to labour. There is great solicitude on the part of protectionists for labour. The labouring men, of course, in a democratic country, like this, have votes, and unless the labourers can be deluded into supporting protection the thing is doomed past all redemption. It is pathetic in the extreme to find the interests interested in labour. It is one of the hoary-headed fallacies with which error has bolstered itself, and reappears generation after generation. When Mr. Cobden was fighting in Great Britain sixty or seventy years ago for the repeal of the corn laws, he made great fun of the contention that British labour would be hurt by cheap labour somewhere up the Baltic. He said: I do not know where it is, but it is somewhere up the Baltic, and British labour is going to be ruined by it. I wish that hon. gentlemen who talk upon this labour question would reflect that the very things they are saying in regard to this reciprocity question hurting Canadian labour are being said on the American side about the cheap Canadian labour hurting American labour. That would surely, even to the most partisan intellect, bring conviction that there is nothing in this outcry. What are the facts about labour? There was this peculiarity in the portion of the speech of my hon. friend with which I am dealing, which deposes me from the position of the champion theorist in this House, for, as regards some of the figures, they were knocked into the proverbial cocked hat by the hon. member for South Wellington. In defending his theory of protection he gave the facts of the history of commerce the widest berth it was possible to do. I am in the memory and judgment of the House when I say that his speech along these lines was pure theory, woven out of his own brain. He might never have known there was a history of commerce, he might never have known there was trade going on all over the world among the nations of the earth. I want very briefly to follow an exactly opposite method and to cede to my hon. friend willingly any honour there is in being a pure theorist. What are the facts that bear upon this argument of how far labour is going to be hurt? It is beyond possibility of contradiction that the best paid labour in Europe to-day is the labour of the British islands, whether skilled or unskilled, and I take it that that nearly ends the argument, because there is no fair comparison between the labour of Great Britain and the labour of this continent; labour on this continent is so scarce that it is bound to be highly paid, and protection, in my mind, has nothing whatever to do with it. I take it that that fact is an argument which cannot be contradicted, and nearly ends all discussion upon the subject.

Mr. Hobson, a well-known British economist, wrote a pamphlet a short time ago in which he showed as clearly as statistics can prove anything that in the United States under the McKinley tariff the proportion of the total wealth of the country going to labour was smaller than under the lower Wilson tariff, and that the proportion of wealth going to labour under the lower Wilson tariff raised and then under the Dingley tariff it sank once more.

The fact is that there is nothing in this world so striking as the exploitation of labour by protection. Will the House allow me to give an example, for this is a strange statement to make. I read recently a book by a member of the Philadelphia bar on the tariff. The evidence is by a cultured and educated American. He tells us, and I can almost repeat it in his own language, how the article borax was sold in the United States of America for $50 a ton until there was discovered in the United States the richest mine of borax in the world. That mine is situated in California and the neighbouring states. Having discovered this rich mine, the author says a great misfortune fell upon the American people. The discovery of a rich mine should not be a misfortune to a people, but the writer goes on to prove his case. He said that the moment the mine was discovered it needed to be protected, and through the proper influences at Washington, it got protection under the McKinley tariff, 5 cents a pound was put on borax; under the Wilson tariff it fell to 2 cents a pound, and under the Dingley tariff it was put back to 5 cents a pound. A very simple calculation will reveal to the House that that is $100 a ton, and the price of borax to the American consumer immediately rose to $150 a ton, while the borax was taken to the coast of the Atlantic and sold to Germany and Britain in competition with the world at $50 a ton. Oh, but say the protectionists, it is necessary to protect American capital. Unfortunately for that argument, the author says, every cent of the capital working that mine is the capital of a British syndicate. Yes, but the protectionist is not so easily bowled out. What about labour, look at the protection of labour—and this is the point that pertains to the argument which I am contending against, that there is going to be any injury to labour in this reciprocity arrangement. It is a very unfortunate position to be driven to for the protectionist, because my author informs us that the borax is dug out of the mine by Chinese coolies living in shacks. That is a fair example of how labour is protected by this system, and goes far to justify my statement that protection is the greatest exploiter of labour in the world.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) had something to say about interprovincial trade. If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery he should feel flattered, because Premier Roblin yesterday repeated most of what he said, in the Manitoba House, and the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) dealt liberally with him in the same fashion. I wish to cite a few figures in this connection. In my opinion the hon. member for North Toronto was on very, very weak ground when he spoke lightly of the importance of foreign trade. I do not think I misrepresent him, I am sure I do not desire to, when I say he spoke lightly of foreign trade. I think it is capable of exact proof that there is no surer test of the greatness of a nation than its foreign trade. If I were to ask any hon. member on either side what are the four greatest nations in the world I should get the same answer from every one of them, the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany and France, perhaps in a different order of preference; if I did not happen to be a modest man, I might have put Great Britain first. That would be the universal consensus of thinking men anywhere. Yes, Sir, but these four nations are also at the head of the foreign trade of the world. I take it that this is almost a proof that you can have no better test of the greatness of a people than by its foreign trade, and no better test of the rapidity with which it is marching to greatness than by the way it is expanding its foreign commerce, and it is a matter of congratulation to us on both sides of the House that Canada is the country that is making the most rapid advances in this direction.

The next proposition I should like to lay down in regard to what fell from my hon. friend on interprovincial trade is that there is no real quarrel between interprovincial trade and foreign trade; on the contrary they advance, in my judgment, pari passu. Does the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) think there is no interprovincial trade in Germany or in Great Britain or in France? Does he not know that there is interstate trade, but that these nations also have the greatest foreign trade in the world? There is no quarrel between interprovincial trade and foreign trade.

I wish to offer an illustration upon that point. In 1893, an interesting year, three years before the change of government, the foreign trade of Canada was $247,000,000 all told, export and import. That was when my hon. friends were building a nation under the National Policy, and when the finances of this country were under the guidance of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). In the year 1894, the year after that, the foreign trade and commerce had dropped from $247,000,000 to $240,000,000, and in the year 1895, the figures had dropped still further to $224,000,000. I should like to ask any candid hon. gentleman on the other side of the House whether Canada at that time, when her foreign trade was not only insignificant but diminishing, had an interprovincial trade that was anything to boast about? There was no west for the east to trade with. Talk of the prosperity of Canada having a growth of 40 years. I have not been in Canada 40 years, I have not been here since 1896—

I am very glad I came after 1896—but I can read the story of simple and plain figures and the simple and plain figures teach me what I wish to present with all respect to my hon. friend that when the foreign trade was insignificant and diminishing the interprovincial trade was small too.

But, this is not a matter of figures and of theories only, is it not a matter of common sense? What is the object of Canada in all of her policies at the present time? What is the object of her immigration policy; what is the object of her transportation policy—the one object is to get a huge surplus of wealth from out of the land, the great heritage which the Almighty has given us. And surely when we get that surplus it is common sense to know that we must and can only dispose of it by foreign trade. Allied to this argument is what my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) said about the frightening of capital; he told us Britain's capital is going to be frightened from Canadian investment. Well, I cannot think so. I received a letter yesterday telling me that two acquaintances of mine in the north of England, and their wives are coming here in May, and they have considerable capital; they are not frightened; I talked with a young Northumbrian the other night who told me he had a letter from a young man who was sailing in the month of March to Canada, and as they are somewhat politicians in Northumberland, this young man who is coming out wrote congratulating my friend (who is one of the free-traders so scarce in this country according to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on the fact that he was living in Canada, where the fiscal policy was approximating to the fiscal policy of Great Britain. I would like to ask my hon. friend whether he thinks the financiers of Great Britain will be really frightened to embark their capital in an atmosphere of freer trade when they know very well they made all of that capital in an atmosphere of absolute free trade. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) also said that this policy was inimical to our industries, and as the hon. gentleman has been courteous enough to come into the chamber I ought perhaps to tell him that I heard every word of his speech but I excuse myself from the double task of both hearing it and reading it on the ground that life is somewhat brief. I shall endeavour, from the notes I took as I heard it, to state fairly his position. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) said that this trade arrangement was inimical to the building up of the industries of Canada. We hear that outcry from various quarters and I must say it is rather a curious outcry considering the source it comes from, for were I a manufacturer I should have lain as low as 'brer rabbit' at this particular moment. What does the outcry from that particular quarter mean; what is making them cry out? Personally, I would have made them cry a good deal harder if that were possible. They cried hard enough in 1897—industries were paralyzed and destroyed then according to them, and I do not know that we can do much more to a thing than first to paralyze and then destroy it. But no disaster happened to them then, and somehow or other I do not feel it is going to happen to them now. To be serious upon this point, I do think that the great moneyed interests do not live up to their responsibilities when they oppose thus lightly what I believe to be a policy that is supported by the great masses of the people of this country. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition seemed to lend himself to this argument: That the policy of reciprocity and of freer trade is inimical to the building up of industries, and I must say that in this respect he did not follow his usual custom of carefully buttressing his position by facts. The hon. gentleman said twice over in a somewhat demonstrative way, that the United States was the greatest manufacturing country in the world. Well, I should not make superlative statements about anything unless I were prepared to offer some evidence. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) did for once stoop to figures at this point, and he seemed to think it was a wonderful thing to turn to his followers and say: Why the United States of America exported $440,000,000 worth of manufactured goods last year. Well, they live on a continent and they have 90,000,000 of inhabitants, and they have protection thrown in to help them. I was reared in a small country, the country of Britain, and I am sure my hon. friends opposite who are the British party will be glad to hear what Britain has done. You could put the United Kingdom twice over into the province of Alberta so that her area is somewhat restricted for carrying on her operations, and she only has 45,000,000 people as against 95,000,000 in the United States, and my hon. friend thinks that $440,000,000 worth of manufactured goods is a wonderful record under protection. Well, I think it is, but free trade is a different matter. What does he think the exports of manufactured goods from Great Britain were last year, exclusive of ships—£334,000,000 sterling worth. If you multiply that by five you will get somewhere around $1,670,000,000 worth of manufactured goods from a little country which is having imports dumped on it from all the world, and which according to all protectionist theories ought to have had its manufacturing industries destroyed off the face of the earth. There has been some talk of an expert tariff commission upon how industries are built up, and if I may trespass on the time of the House, I should like to give a little expert testi-

mony. Mr. W. H. Lever is the biggest soap man in the world. By the way I might remark that we manufacture in free trade England, as little things as soap and as big as Mauretanias, although my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) tells me, without proof, that the United States is the greatest manufacturing nation in the world.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I meant by that, that I was under the impression, and I am still under the impression, that the manufactured product of the United States is greater than that of any other country in the world.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I have no desire to misrepresent my hon. friend, but I am sure I quoted his exact language.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is what I intended by it, and I stand by that still.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Very well, I do not want to labour the point. Mr. Lever is at the head of a well known company, which manufactures soap, and allied products. They have factories in the United States, in Germany, in France, in Switzerland, in Belgium, in Australia, in Canada, and in South Africa, all grown up from little free trade Britain. I take it that Mr. Lever is somewhat of an expert in this particular line of manufacture, and the story he tells is very interesting. It was published in a magazine article, and it has been reprinted and scattered broadcast in pamphlet form.—It is because of the wide information the British people get on these points that they vote so remarkably well. Mr. Lever says that Gladstone took the duties off soap and soap maker's materials in the middle of the last century, and at that time the exports of soap from Britain were scanty; protection had not built up the manufacture of soap to any great extent, and not only was the manufacture of soap scanty, but the soap was poor in quality, dear in price, and the soap imports large. That was the state of affairs in the middle of the last century, and to-day Mr. Lever makes himself responsible for the statement that Britain's exports of soap are equal to the exports of soap of the whole of the rest of the world put together, that the imports of soap into Britain are a negligible quantity and that soap is to-day to be had in Great Britain of the best quality in the world, and at the cheapest possible price. That is not a bad way to build up manufactures surely—to build up an industry which extends all over the world and produces these magnificent results. Contrast that with a telegram from Washington, which appeared in the London 'Daily Telegraph' at the time of the Payne-Aldrich tariff was before the United States Congress, stating that a member of a firm of manufactures in the States, was in Washington—you know for what purpose—and that he had sent an urgent appeal to his partner to come to Washington at once, even if he had to leave the affairs of the firm in the hands of the office boy. He went there, and of course, began log-rolling at once. Mr. Lever's statement is, that he has been able to make the great advances that he has made in his manufacturing, by means of cheap raw materials added to attention to business, and he asks the very pertinent question: is it not in accordance with the common sense of any one of us that manufactures or anything else will be built up better by cheap raw materials, and attention to business, than by dear raw materials and attention to log-rolling.

My hon. friend had something to say in this connection about the kind and variety of manufactures, and he implied, though he did not state, that it was only under protection that you can secure variety in manufacturing. My reading on this question goes to prove the exact opposite. It is being proved by the best-informed minds in Germany to-day, that the effect of protection there, is to build up cartels—known on this continent as trusts, which pay lower wages than are paid in Great Britain, and whose whole object is to turn out huge amounts of goods, and make big profits for those at the head of the concerns. It had been proved that the half-finished articles produced in Germany are being sent to Britain, and that British workmen are getting the higher wages for doing the finishing work upon them under free trade—the exact opposite of the argument used by my hon. friend. In this connection, my hon. friend must know what was stated in the tariff debates in the old country. Mr. Joseph Chamberlain thought he had discovered a magnificent illustration in support of his views when he found that a number of steel billets had been shipped from Germany to Barrow-in-Furness. But the fact was explained by Sir Hugh Bell, one of the greatest manufacturers in England, thus: 'It is true that the steel billets went there, but Mr. Chamberlain did not find out what happened to them there. It is the business of a manufacturer to find that out. A firm of Barrow shipbuilders had a contract for ship-building which they secured in competition with the whole world, and the contractors put those billets into the ships and sent the ships back to Germany where the steel billets came from.'

Intensive farming was a subject which I had hardly expected to hear my hon. friend from North Toronto growing eloquent upon. He did, however, seem to hint that intensive farming would be hurt by this reciprocity arrangement. He did not give any facts to support that idea. What are the facts? Mr. Cobden, in a speech which he

delivered after the repeal of the corn laws, drew attention to the fact that the most notable thing after the repeal of those laws was the improvement of agriculture in Great Britain. We know what is sure to happen if a man is held up on his feet: he will never develop the muscles of his lower limbs. The same is true when a state undertakes to support farming industry. There are numbers of men in this House, who have attained their present position by their own character and efforts, and who know that men grow stronger by reliance on themselves, and that manufacturing and farming grow strong in the same way. There is not a fact in the history of commerce to show that intensive farming was ever helped by protection. In free trade Britain to-day—if I am wrong, the Minister of Agriculture will correct me—33 bushels of wheat to the acre are grown on the average; in protected America the average is 14 bushels to the acre, and in Canada, with our virgin soil, it is only 17 bushels. What is the matter, I ask my protectionist friends, with little Britain as a country where intensive farming is carried on under free trade?

My hon. friend went on next to say that the policy of mutual preference had been destroyed by this reciprocity arrangement. That was a somewhat sad confession on his part. I think he said that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister had dished preference. Well, that was extraordinary adulation. We on this side of the House are sometimes deemed servile for serving up adulation to my right hon. friend, but he never had such a dish of adulation served up to him on this side of the House. We never charged him with running both Canada and Great Britain at the same time. It was the more extraordinary phrase coming from the hon. member for North Toronto, because in another part of the same speech he had referred to my right hon. friend as a very ordinary man, while he was furnishing evidence that he was a very extraordinary man. However, I am quite sure that my hon. friend would not claim that for himself. The great thing for me is his admission that British preference is dished. I think there is no doubt about that fact, but I do not agree with his charge that it has been dished by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. We on this side of the House, as I believe all the people of Canada, are reasonably proud that we have for Prime Minister of this country a man whose opinion goes for a great deal in Great Britain, but neither he nor we would claim that he is the author of what my hon. friend from North Toronto must consider such a terrible misfortune. This mutual preference is a preference which meant a movement on the part of Great Britain towards restricted trade, whereas the Fielding preference was a movement towards freer trade on the part of Canada —two very different things economically considered. It must have been with a very sad heart that my hon. friend discovered that this infant of mutual preference, into which he had tried to breathe the breath of life for years, was not an infant at all, but only a wax doll. The hon. member for North Toronto said in this House in 1892, as recorded in 'Hansard':

> If I read public opinion in the old country aright, I believe that the free trade sentiment pure and simple, founded on what were thought to be irrefutable principles almost divine in origin, is largely changing in Great Britain.

Well, some men need a long time for the fulfilment of their prophecies. I am not sure that my hon. friend feels that there is so much change in that direction in Great Britain at the present time. It could reasonably be argued that if the principles are true, they are of divine origin. That may be the reason they are not recognized by my hon. friend. I have often been afraid that he looked in another direction for his economic inspiration. Even if I did not admit that the policy of protection is bad enough to come from a direction opposite to the divine, I would certainly admit that it is an intensely human thing to say the least of it.

At six o'clock committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Chairman, I quoted some figures, in illustration of an argument which I ventured to present to the committee at the very beginning of my remarks, from a speech which I had read in the Winnipeg 'Tribune,' as made by a governor of an American state. I quoted these figures from memory. But, on examining critically, it is clear I must have been in error as to the quantity of nails procured at a certain price. It is perfectly immaterial to the argument which I was presenting. It does not need figures to prove that goods are sold cheaper in Great Britain and other protected countries. It certainly does not need figures to prove that to protectionists, because they are continually taunting Great Britain with being the dumping ground of cheap goods. I mention the matter only because it is desirable to be accurate even in small things, and not because it affects the argument I was presenting in that connection.

When the committee adjourned at six o'clock, Sir, I was trying to answer the question: What dished preference? And I set out to show that preference in the sense of the Chamberlain preference was never likely to live if it depended in any degree

upon the phophecies of those who advocate it in this country. I had shown that in my researches I came across the speech of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in 'Hansard' of 1892, which is the first reference I have found of his in relation to this subject. We find the hon. member next figuring on this topic in the Imperial Conference which was held in Ottawa in 1894—seventeen years ago. I think it quite important to look at these things, I think it quite important to go into the history of my hon. friend in this connection and look at the Chamberlain preference for a little while. For it will be clear to the whole House that one of the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite is that we ought to postpone trade arrangements with other parts of the world in case we may interfere with some possible trade arrangement in the future with Great Britain. At page 234 of the report of that conference, the hon. gentleman from North Toronto ventured a prediction—as he so often does—and said that in twenty years time the larger part of Britain will be outside of Great Britain. At page 184 he places the time at twenty-five years. Well, that puts these prophecies within a few days of one another. A discrepancy of five years in the prophecies of a man who takes eternity to fulfil his prophecies is not a very long time. That was seventeen years ago. Senator Pulsford, of the Australian Commonwealth, has shown that these prophecies so far from giving promise of fulfilment, not only have the outlying portions of the British Empire not grown in a way to surpass Great Britain, but it happens that they have not grown even proportionately as fast in population as the United Kingdom has grown. And this prophecy was due to be fulfilled in twenty-five years. The hon. member for North Toronto spoke again upon the subject, as reported at page 205 of the report.

Since our meeting yesterday, I have read the comments in the British papers, and, you may depend upon it, that in the British Empire to-day the seed has more than sprouted; it is germinating.

He got a little mixed in his botany, I think, unless I am misinformed, germination comes before sprouting.

The idea is growing, and it is going——

Mark the courage, the confidence in himself.

—it is going, ultimately, to bring the different parts of the empire together, in spite of all the doctrinaires that live and breathe upon the face of the earth.

The House recognizes the style. Well, now, I do not know the exact condition of this botanical specimen to-day, but I think it is withered pretty badly; I do not think the growth is taking place very rapidly. What a magnificent contempt for doctrinaires my hon. friend has—almost as much contempt as he has for the members of the present cabinet. I wonder that he did not reflect, in 1894, that his record as a trade producer—for that was the middle year of the three years I quoted this afternoon when the trade of Canada was disappearing under his fostering hand—I wonder that he did not reflect that he was scarcely the man to talk to either doctrinaires or anybody else about how to promote trade either in Canada or in the British Empire. Just imagine the hon. member, with such performances and such prophecies, coming into this House and telling the hon. ministers who, after all, having found that trade as he had it diminishing have been able to show a marvellous expansion of the trade of Canada in the last fifteen years—just imagine him standing upon a pedestal raised there by his performances, and by his sense, no doubt, of his own greatness, and saying: 'They are two very ordinary men; and the other members of the cabinet are thirteen very ordinary men.' The time has come when some one has got to say in this House and this country that the hon. member for North Toronto has no record as a statesman, and no record as a prophet which for one moment justifies him in using language like that to any hon. member on this side of the House. And then he had contempt for the doctrinaires who did not quite see this thing as he saw it, mere tyros in politics, men like Gladstone, and Peel, and Lord Salisbury, and Cobden—men of absolutely opposite sides of politics in Great Britain, but all of whom knew more about this preference thing, and the difficulty of making it live than the hon. member for North Toronto had even dreamed. And I should like to advise the hon. gentleman, if he pays any attention to what I say, not to be too much impressed by what he reads in the Tory papers of London. During the whole of my life, it has been a safe thing to prophesy that, in elections, the United Kingdom will go just in the opposite direction from the prophecies of the Tory press of London. That is an almost invariable rule; and if the hon. gentleman had known that, he would not have been so elated at what he read in the London Tory press the day after he made his comments. And if he reads the Unionist press at the present time, he will observe the extraordinary spectacle that, while all agree that preference of the Chamberlain order is a corpse, they are divided in opinion as to what to do with it. Half of them are in favour of burying it, while the other half—and the more stupid lot, I think—are in favour of hanging on to it.

I have not quite finished with the hon. gentleman's prophecies. They are interesting and are not altogether ancient history. At page 206 of this report which I have been quoting the hon. gentleman said:

I think that, as far as Canada is concerned, the day is considerably distant when we will propose, if it is not to our advantage somewhat, to give very great commercial advantages to the British Empire without receiving something in return.

After all, the imperialism of my hon. friend is of a somewhat windy variety; it is rather of the huckstering and bargaining variety; but I am dealing with him as a prophet for a moment. In three years, after he said the day was distant, there was a change of government—and the thing was done; and done with vast profit to the country and vast advantage to the imperial connection. I think it is rather shabby of him, with a record like that, when he had banned the birth of this child, when he had declared that the Fielding preference must not be born—'the day is far distant,' when we will do such a thing—to come to the House now and say, as he did to the Minister of Finance the other day: It is not your child. Why, he actually wants to confuse our minds, surely, as to the difference between the Fielding preference and the Chamberlain preference. Not having been able to get this wax doll of his to live, he wants to claim the Fielding child. The hon. gentleman has appeared in a great many roles in his time, but this is the first occasion, so far as I know, on which he has assumed the role of the political kidnapper.

The Chamberlain preference has died, and I think largely because of the unfulfilled prophecies which have been uttered in regard to it. But it died because, in its intrinsic nature, there was nothing in it. It is important to Canada to know what there is in this thing, and why we should expect something to live which has not in it the germ of life. The moment you examine the possibility of the old country giving preferences in a fair way as between the different portions of the empire, you would see the thing is impossible. In Australia more wool is produced than is necessary to supply the wants of the whole empire, and it is an element of political economy that you cannot give protection to an article if more is produced in it than the country requires. So the idea of giving a preference on wool in Australia is an economic impossibility. But my hon. friends say: We will get it on wheat. Well, how would that bind Australia to the British Crown? If I were an Australian, and my hon. friends opposite were Canadians, and Great Britain gave a preference in wheat and not give it on wool, would not I say that the old country was showing favouritism to Canada, while doing nothing for Australia? Would that help build up the British Empire?

What would be the effect of giving a preference on wheat? Clearly the moment you gave that preference you would concentrate the supplies of wheat in the outlying portions of the empire upon the British market, because you would raise the price of wheat in Britain. If it did not do that, it would be no good to Canada. You would raise the price in Britain, and you would raise the price of bread to the British workingman. Well, if I were a British workingman, how much do you think that would increase my love for Canadian preference? Flag waving won't fill a man's stomach. But that would only be the first effect of it. If a better price was given for wheat in Britain and the price was raised to the British workingman, it is clear that a secondary result would be a concentration of supplies there, because they always go where the highest price prevails. You would also raise the price of food to the workingman in Canada. It is an everyday truism that the price of wheat is made in Liverpool. Raise the price there and you inevitably raise it to the Canadian consumer. South Africa imports wheat. You would raise the price of wheat to the workingman in South Africa, who buys it in the world's market. And do hon. gentlemen think they would build a permanent empire by a system of preference which would raise the price of the commonest article of food in Britain, Canada and South Africa? Now, these are some of the considerations which were discussed again and again in the old country, and it was largely considerations of this kind that led Mr. Asquith, at the beginning of these discussions, to declare to a crowded audience: The thing is an economic impossibility. The idea has died, because there was no life in it, and it has been killed, so to speak, in successive general elections. A friend of mine was in conversation the other day with a nobleman having intimate associations with British politics, and he said to my friend: If Canada had offered free trade within the empire it would have been fruitless, because it would be impossible to shift the free trade sentiment of Britain in fifty years. This empire has grown up on the basis of absolute freedom of its component parts. Would you have us repeat the experiment that Great Britain tried with her American colonies, and which lost them to the empire? Was it not this very mistake of mixing up trade relations with politics? Was it not that which led George Washington to advise his countrymen so earnestly not to become entangled with the politics of foreign nations? Now, the rule in Britain is to make her own tariffs, and what is good for Britain is good enough for Canada. It is the only rule which works to the permanency of the empire.

The hon. member for North Toronto had a good deal to say about conservation. The

conservation question is a peculiar one. I am raising steers in the west, and my experience has been that I have had to keep my steers from spring to fall because I could put them into market, though not of recent years. I am bound to say I imagine the leader of the opposition, on learning of my difficulties, saying to me: What we have we hold. My reply would naturally be that if that refers to the farm I agree with you, but if it refers to the steers I don't agree with you. Annexation, Mr. Chairman, means revolution. Let us understand what this blessed word annexation means. There was an old lady in England who never got any good from a sermon unless several times the blessed word Mesopotamia was mentioned, and without that blessed word annexation what would our friends opposite have left to say?

Annexation means the dismantling of these buildings, it means the hauling down of our flag, it means going to Washington to hold our parliamentary sittings. Is there a man or a woman who believes in his heart of hearts that that is possible to come to pass in this country? Annexation means revolution and my little reading of history tells me that revolution has never taken place in this world except amongst a discontented people. When Charles the First drove things to a certain point there was a considerable revolution in Britain, ending in the cutting off of the King's head. A few years afterwards his son had a discontented people and was driven from the throne in the revolution of 1688. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) can tell the House far better than I can what was the condition of France before the great revolution in that country. In 1838-39 in this country of Canada the people were discontented and there was danger of revolution. In America itself, it was the discontent of the people with taxes and with the restriction of their rights to trade with other nations that led to revolution. But the argument of my hon. friend is that Canadians are of such a type that they will say: We have such freedom and prosperity under the red, white and blue that we will haul it down.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked the government how they dared do certain things. I should like to ask him how he dared use in the Canadian parliament and with the knowledge that his words would be read by the Canadian people, the words: Conquest by gifts. He said we could not be beaten but the conquest of Canada—he mentioned these words in the parliament of Canada—the conquest of Canada is to be brought about by gifts. If I had dared to use such words, the kindest friends I have on this side of the House would have taken me to the Atlantic at once and have deported me. We at least on this side of the House have not met the type of Canadians with whom he has been consorting. We on this side who represent and will represent for many a day, I think, a large majority of Canadian people, have been consorting with such Canadians that we know we have a people here who cannot be beaten and cannot be bought.

There is an interesting historic parallel between what happened in the House of representatives in a vote there a few days ago and the vote that took place on the repeal of the corn laws in Great Britain. A Conservative leader in Great Britain carried the repeal of the corn laws by a minority of his own followers but supported by the entire force almost of the Liberals of the House, and in the United States a great republican leader in the person of Mr. Taft was appointed I think also by a minority of his own followers but by almost the entire strength of the democratic party. I wonder if, when this reciprocity arrangement goes through in this House, there will be any break in the ranks I see opposite to me? I fear not, I fear that the darkness will be impenetrable and that the suitable wailing will be provided by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) and the gnashing of teeth in abundance by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) says there is an element of instability in this arrangement. We have been told on every hand there will be disturbance of trade. Well it is very likely that some one may be temporarily incommoded or hurt; that is always the case in the history of human progress in scientific invention as well as in politics. One remembers how the hand loom weavers of Lancashire tore down the first machinery put up to replace the work of the hand loom workers. They did not see that for each hand loom worker thrown out of occupation, twenty others would get work making the machine that was to displace their work. The great scientist Humboldt says that when travelling in the Andes in South America he found a place where men had a profitable business carrying passengers over certain passes in the mountains in baskets. A better government came into power and made good roads, and the basket carriers petitioned the government not to make the roads because it would hurt the business of the basket carriers. Of course the government went on with the mending of the roads. I suppose that when gas was first invented there were some dealers in candles who had a very large stock on hand and who might not be able to dispose of them so well with gas, but nobody proposed on that ground to go back to the use of farthing dips. Farthing dips might indeed be a fitting illuminant for

guiding the footsteps of some of the economic reasoners opposite in the primeval paths of protection, but we on this side believe in progress, and that progress can only be made in the broad sunlight and with the best possible illuminant.

Something has been said about doing as well as we can and letting well enough alone. That was all right under the National Policy but they did not even manage to do that because the trade of Canada was shrinking. That is what happens a people who let well enough alone. We all know that for a young organism, whether it be an individual or a nation, growth and progress are the absolute necessities of continued existence, and all progress implies change and change may bring, does bring temporary, discomfort and inconvenience to sections, but it ever works out for the benefit and the prosperity and the wealth of the masses of the people. We heard this afternoon something about some one being sick and ashamed. I am perfectly certain that in a few years' time my hon. friends opposite will be sick and ashamed of their attitude and their arguments in this discussion.

There can only be one result to this arrangement. The government would have been guilty of one of those blunders which are almost as bad as crimes if they had not received the advances of the United States and made this arrangement on the high ground of showing to the people of the world how two nations can live in friendship together, on the more material ground of promoting the prosperity of the country and on the ground of Canada being in the forefront of movements that are making for the real progress of the world. On all these grounds this is a splendid arrangement, and I have not the remotest doubt that, just as the extension of freedom of trade helped Canada in 1897, this will help us still more. It is a policy in keeping with the record of the right hon. gentleman who is at the head of the government of this country (Sir Wilfrid Laurier); it is a policy which makes for the prosperity of the country, it is a policy in accordance with the best traditions of that Liberalism which has built and maintained the British Empire, that Liberalism which spells freedom, freedom to buy and sell, and in a few years' time, those who have opposed it will be ashamed of the thoughts they have entertained.

Yet I doubt not thro' the ages, one increasing purpose runs.
And the thoughts of men are widen'd with the process of the suns.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). The House, I am sure, has been entertained by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) for the last half hour since eight o'clock, and for one hour prior to the recess for dinner.

The hon. gentleman has stated among various things that he does not know what the opposition would have done in this discussion had it not been for the word annexation, and if I wanted to be jocular with my hon. friend I might safely say that he had not the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto as a text there would have been very little left in his remarks. I am not unkind when I say that the hon. gentleman did not touch upon the question before the House at all, or did he make any suggestion of value from a Canadian standpoint. Of course, he told us all about free trade as they have it in England, and in that respect his remarks must have been directed more to the government than to the opposition. We have heard that same speech several times in this House. True, the hon. gentleman revamps it occasionally, but it is one and the same old story : I am a free trader, and as such I am alone in this House. But, if he is so eloquent in the House and so powerful in the country one would have thought he would have had a few converts by this time. However, he is still alone, and if I mistake not he will be alone in his free trade professions for a long time to come. We once had a free trader in this House supporting the government but he sought and found a place in the Senate, and may be my hon. friend from Red Deer is aiming that way. For several years the hon. gentleman has directed our attention to what he regards as a better fiscal policy for the Canadian people than that which they now have. For my part I would rather take the votes of the people of Canada on both sides of politics than the trade expressions of the member for Red Deer, when I seek a true index of the feeling of the people. What has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clark) done since he came here to perpetuate that policy which he says is dear to his heart, and which he advocates in the House and out of the House? Did he ever vote against this government upon a single item of the tariff?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). Does the hon. gentleman ask a question?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). In voting on the tariff in this House I only have a choice between—

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to be courteous, but I would prefer an answer and not a speech.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I can only vote two ways in this House, and having only that alternative I vote for freer trade in preference to protection.

Mr. BLAIN. The old story. It is well that the hon. gentleman has told the House that he only came to Canada in 1896, for everybody knows that the ques-

tion of our fiscal policy was settled by the Canadian people long before the hon. gentleman favoured us with his presence. I have asked the hon. gentleman whether he ever voted against the administration since he came here, although it is a protectionist government in the main, and you heard his answer. In all these years did he ever take advantage of his right to move or make an attempt to move to reduce any single item of the tariff? That after all is a test of a man's free trade principles in Canada ; I do not know what the test is in England whence he comes. And, I dare say that the hon. gentleman will continue to support the present administration. Of course he will, everybody knows that. And, I venture to say that the hon. gentleman is not only a lonely free trader but, as he has told us himself, he is the greatest theorist in the House.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I am sure my hon. friend does not wish to misrepresent me.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I said I had been called a theorist. There is surely a great difference between a man being called a theorist by others and calling himself a theorist.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, the appellation fitted him so well that he made the House believe he was the greatest theorist here. When a man comes into parliament to preach a new doctrine as it may be called ; when he comes here to preach free trade ; when the people of Canada give him a responsible position in parliament for several years, and he makes no attempt to reduce the tariff but gives a continued and enthusiastic support to a government which talked free trade out of power, and which adopted protection in power, what are we to think? But there are in Canada those whose opinions I would take in preference to that of my hon. friend as to what is best for Canada. I will not encumber 'Hansard' with too many extracts but I must read a resolution passed by the Montreal Board of Trade which is one of the largest commercial institutions in Canada.

Resolved, that we, the members of the Montreal Board of Trade, in annual meeting assembled, believe that the sober sense of the country as a whole is against any change in the trade policy under which Canada has grown to her present admitted state of prosperity;

That we consider it to be the bounden duty of every Canadian to resist to the last anything that might endanger our status as a component part of the British Empire, and that we fear such a treaty as proposed might easily prove to be the entering of a wedge that would eventually result in a separation of our interests from those of the mother land;

That we hereby record the unalterable opposition of this board to the proposed reciprocity treaty with the United States, which treaty would involve the country in dangers not yet fully realized, and we consider that the government should first ascertain the opinion of the whole country on this question, and receive a definite mandate thereon, before committing it to a change so revolutionary as this reversal of its entire policy, threatening not only the trade, but also the more vital interests of Canada as a nation;

That the Council of the Board, with the following other members, are hereby appointed a special committee, with power to add to its number, for the purpose of proceeding to Ottawa and presenting to the government the views of this board, as expressed in this resolution: Messrs. C. C. Ballantyne, Geo. Caverhill, E. B. Greenshields, A. J. Hodgson, Robert Meighen, Farquar Robertson.

These are gentlemen who have been in this country longer than since 1896. These gentlemen do not all belong to the Conservative party. Some of them are supporters of my right hon. friend and supporters of the policy which my hon. friend from Red Deer votes for, but not the policy he talks about in this House. These gentlemen ought to know something about what policy would be best suited to the people of Canada. These gentlemen have grown up with Canada's prosperity. They have witnessed one government in power and now another. They can trace the history of Canada for many years. They can go back to 1873 and find a Liberal government in power headed by a distinguished man, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. From 1873 to 1878 this trade question took shape in Canada. During those years, in this very chamber, the government of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, and the opposition headed by that distinguished statesman, Sir John Macdonald, discussed this trade question, not from a British standpoint particularly, though that was kept in view, but from a Canadian standpoint, and that is what the people of this country want on the present question. During those years the Liberal-Conservative party placed their policy as a party before the people of Canada by a resolution and a vote in this House. The right hon. leader of the government followed his leader at that time in a policy of low tariff for Canada. During the years that the Mackenzie administration was in power—I am not going to charge it to anybody—there were dull times in Canada, in the mercantile interests, in the agricultural interests, in the manufacturing interests. They all came to this parliament seeking for some redress from the condition of things that prevailed, and the Liberal-Conservative party laid down its policy as a protective tariff for this country. The government in power opposed that, and in

1878 appealed to the people. They gave the people an opportunity to consider the question, unlike my right hon. friend, who makes a bargain with the government of the United States without giving the people of this country an opportunity to say whether they want it or not. The Mackenzie government were beaten at the polls in 1878, the people of Canada expressing themselves in favour of a National Policy for this country, with protection for the agriculturist, for the mechanic, and for every man. The Liberal-Conservative party came into power. They had in opposition given pledges to the people of Canada, and thank God they were strong enough when they came into power to fulfil those pledges by putting on the statute-book the grand old National Policy that still lives to-day. From that moment the Liberal party in this House and out of this House made declarations; by resolutions, by speeches and by votes, against the National Policy, although it had been endorsed by a large majority of the people of Canada. I need not review the history of that policy. At once the people of Canada took on new life; at once they found employment; at once the manufacturing establishments began to grow up in every centre of population; at once the goods that were coming into Canada from the United States, that were manufactured by the United States people, were stopped, and the Canadian people commenced to manufacture those articles for themselves and to pay the wages to their own working people. My right hon. friend in those years had become leader of the opposition, and he went from platform to platform throughout this country denouncing the National Policy and calling upon the people of Canada to adopt the same old policy which the hon. member for Red Deer has been talking about to-night. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) took the platform, and, in the province of Ontario in particular, and the Toronto 'Globe,' with all its power, laid down a policy which I regard as one of the most dangerous ever advocated in Canada; that was the policy that the National Policy was against the interests of the farmers and was for the benefit of the manufacturers alone. I say that was a bad policy for any public man in Canada to advocate. It left its mark on the agriculturists of Canada. The mark is still there; but there is a new generation to-day, and when my right hon. friend appeals to the farming community, he will find a class of people who have lived under this National Policy, who have enjoyed under it a better price for their products, and he will find that no class in Canada will condemn this brand-new policy as the farmers will when they have an opportunity to vote upon it. That is the history very briefly of the trade policy as we have it in Canada, and have had it for the last few years. I may assume that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will be more interested in that than in being told about borax in the United States, and a large soap concern in England with branches all over the world as spoke by the hon. member for Red Deer.

I shall stop here to say a word or two to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), who has left the chamber. Let me read his words. He said:

> The leader of the opposition spoke for upwards of one hour on the resolution and did not touch the reciprocity question at all.

That requires no answer, because we know how able is the leader of the opposition to discuss this question, and how well his remarks were directed a few days ago to the resolution before the Chair.

What is the question which the right hon. gentleman has thrown into the arena of politics now. Our National Policy gave to the Canadian people of every class, the manufacturer and the farmer, protection to assist them in building up our manufacturing and agricultural industries. The right hon. gentleman has now made a division between the farmer and other classes in the proposition before the House. Let us see what that division is. With one stroke of the pen he and his Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), have taken away altogether almost every vestige of the protection given by the National Policy to our agriculturists. That is the charge which the farmers of this country have against the right hon. gentleman and his government. In schedule A of this agreement, which gives the free goods, we find the following: Live animals, cattle, horses and mules, swine, sheep, lambs, and all other live animals. There is to be no duty upon these. Poultry, dead and alive, wheat, rye, oats, barley, buckwheat, dried peas and beans, edible corn, sweet corn or maize, (except into Canada for distillation), hay, straw, extract of hemlock bark, fresh vegetables, potatoes, sweet potatoes, yams, turnips, onions, cabbage and all other vegetables in their natural state. Fresh fruit, apples, pears, peaches, grapes, cherries and all other edible fruits in their natural state. Dried fruits, apples, peaches, pears, apricots, dried or evaporated.

Dairy products: butter, cheese, fresh milk and cream, eggs, honey, flaxseed or linseed, cotton seed and other seeds. I shall not go through the whole list, but this list gives the products on which the Liberal-Conservative party had placed a duty in the interests of the Canadian farmers. But the present government

now proposes to take away every vestige of protection on these articles, and make them free between the United States and Canada and a good many other countries as well. That is the charge which the farmers of this country have against the right hon. gentleman and his government.

A very large deputation waited on the government a few days ago—a deputation representing hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in the fruit and vegetable growing industries of Canada. They came here with their policy, and they said that they had already placed that policy before the right hon. gentleman in a resolution many months before. They told him in a long telegram from their association which was meeting in Toronto, some months before, what they required from this government, should there be any changes in the tariff. But they pointed out that they did not want the tariff as it stands to-day, to be interfered with. When the delegation came down here, it filled this chamber, both the floor of the House and the gallery, and the right hon. gentleman, after hearing all their statements, said: Oh, it is a pity you did not come earlier, but you are too late now. I should like to know if that was a fair answer. Might I call attention to the question which I put the right hon. gentleman in this House before this large delegation came:

Mr. BLAIN. I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether or not serious consideration will be given to any special interest in Canada that may be affected by the proposed reciprocity arrangement should it become law? In the county I have the honour to represent there is a very strong feeling in respect to these matters. Throughout the western part of Ontario, at the present moment, large sums of money are being subscribed to send delegations to the government to explain the position of specific interests that will be affected if these tariff changes become law. Will the government give serious consideration to the representations of these interests if they are made? I may anticipate by saying that a general answer that the government will listen to all complaints of everybody will not be quite sufficient. I want to know if the government will give serious consideration to these matters, or whether it will be better for these gentlemen to stay at home on the ground that this proposal will not be changed?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will give most serious consideration to all the interests represented reserving our judgment.

Mr. BLAIN. I anticipated that.

I would ask the right hon. gentleman now, whether, if these men came before the government and presented their views, the government would have any consideration for them. My right hon. friend said in his genial way: Oh, yes, they can come down and present their case, and we will reserve judgment. Why did not the right hon. gentleman say in answer to my question: There is no use for any reconsideration, we have signed this agreement and it cannot be broken without the consent of President Taft, and the Congress at Washington. These gentlemen came to Ottawa and presented their views to the government and in reply the government said: Oh, no, this pact is made, and it cannot be altered. And the farmers of this country, the fruit men and vegetable growers of this country, will all feel that the right hon. gentleman did not deal fairly with them. He was not willing to listen to their statement at a time when these changes could be made, but he was willing to allow them to spend large sums of money to come to Ottawa to present their request to him at a time when he knew full well that, no matter what they stated, no changes would be made in this arrangement.

I wish to say a word to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) whom I do not see in his place. One would have thought that, with all this going on against the farmers of Canada, the Minister of Agriculture would have taken a hand in. We were told, when this government was formed, that we had a real farmer as Minister of Agriculture, an educated farmer. And our farmers were expecting that, when the government proposed to strike off every vestige of protection that the farmers had, at least the Minister of Agriculture would raise some protest and would have said to the government that if others are to have protection the farmers must get their share. The Minister of Agriculture, I presume did not do that. If he did, his voice was not heard, and the pact went on and will become law, I suppose, in the course of a few weeks or a few months

I wish now to show what the policy of the Liberal party has been with respect to the protection for the farmers. That is an important matter in this discussion. I have already given a partial list of the articles that have been robbed of their protection by this government, all of which are of interest to the farmers of Canada. Perhaps I may be permitted to read first a letter sent to me from the county I have the honour to represent :

Clarkson, Feb. 10, 1911

Richard Blain, Esq.,
Brampton.

Dear Sir,—The fruit and vegetable growers of the Clarkson and Lorne Park district, earnestly request of you as our representative to use all the influence you possibly can with the government, in reference to the carrying out of the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the United States, which is now under consideration.

If this agreement is carried out, it will mean a serious question to us as fruit and vegetable growers, more especially to the smaller growers; it will simply take from us our natural rights as citizens of Canada. Normally speaking, we have amply shown that we can supply our home market with

both lines of domestic fruit and vegetables both in season and out of season.

It is a well known fact, that, very often in business, a particular part is the most remunerative, and consequently the backbone of that particular business, the loss of which would be serious. It is this particular part, that reciprocity with the United States would take from us, simply because we are geographically handicapped.

The Fruit and Vegetable Growers,
Clarkson, Peel Co., Ontario.

Going back a little in the history of this parliament, I notice that in 1902, Mr. Leonard, who then represented Laval in this House, and who sat on this side, moved the following resolution :

That it is greatly in the interests of the market gardeners and the farmers that the duties on our Canadian garden products be so adjusted as to guarantee the Canadian farmer an effective protection against foreign competition.

And in the following year, the same gentleman moved exactly the same resolution. These two resolutions were voted down by the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his supporters. But the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), and every member on this side recorded their votes for better protection for the farming interests of Canada. I follow that a little further : in 1904 I had the honour of moving this resolution :

That a large and increasing quantity of farm and market garden products is being imported into Canada.

That our own country is fully capable of furnishing an ample supply of such products for our own market.

That under an adequately protective tariff such sufficient supply would always be produced and marketed in Canada.

And that such readjustment should include as far as practicable the imposition of specific instead of ad valorem duties.

That in the opinion of this House the duties upon the said products should be so readjusted during the present session as to secure the Canadian market to the Canadian producer.

Among the requests that the farmers and gardeners make to the government are the following: That duties be imposed as follows:

Asparagus	per pound	3 cents.
Cabbages	each	3 "
Cauliflowers	"	3 "
Celery	per doz.	25 "
Beans	bush.	45 "
Green cucumbers	per doz.	20 "
Onions	bush. of 56 lbs.	40 "
Tomatoes	per lb.	5 "
Watermelons	each	5 "
Musk melons, cantaloup	"	3 "
Spinach	per bush.	25 "

These were some of the requests that the market gardeners of the province of Ontario had made to the government for increase of duty. That resolution was voted down by the right hon. the Prime Minister and his supporters, but the leader of the opposition and hon. members on this side recorded their votes in favour of it. A little later, I find somebody on the other side of the House moving a similar resolution. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) moved :

That in the opinion of this House, so long as the Canadian tariff affords, incidentally or otherwise, a considerable degree of protection to manufacturers, some protection may fairly and properly be afforded by our tariff to Canadian agriculturists and stock raisers upon hogs, hog products, garden vegetables and such other items as it may appear possible to so protect with advantage to the agriculturist, and without undue injury to the Canadian consumer.

That resolution was supported by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Schell), whom I see in his place. In a speech of some length made in the interests of the farmer, he stated his opinion that the government should increase the duty on pork. I do not suppose my hon. friend has changed his mind now, but perhaps he has. I must not press that question too closely. The hon. gentleman gave us a very interesting speech in favour of that resolution. The resolution was not voted upon, because the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) requested that it should not be pressed to a vote, explaining that he was going to revise the tariff that year, suggesting to the people of Canada that the farmers' interest would be taken care of in the new revision of the tariff. We have that new revision now, and not only has the request been refused of an increased protection to the farmer, but almost every vestige of protection on articles except pork, on which there is a reduction of duty, has been swept away altogether by the Minister of Finance in the pact he has made with Mr. Taft. I would like to know what the hon. member for South Oxford thinks of that policy—whether he proposes to support it or not. I am saying this to show that after all there has always been in this House a special distinction between the two parties in respect to protection for the agriculturist. That fact was never so manifest as it is in this proposed arrangement. The government are now proposing to take away protection the farmers have had, and the opposition in this House say, no, that as long as there is protection in our tariff, the agriculturist should get a fair share of it. I will follow that up a little further by a quotation from a speech of the leader of the opposition. In the session of 1902-3 the leader of the opposition moved a resolution in the interest of more adequate protection to the farmers, and supported it by a very strong speech. Speaking on April 17 to the resolution for better protection to the farming interests and all other classes, he said :

I believe that upon many agricultural products the duty ought to be increased. I want to say that a country like Canada, possessing agricultural possibilities second to none in the world, should not be handicapped in competition with the United States, and should not be obliged to import from that country nearly $28,000,000 worth of agricultural and animal products. The farmer is protected in this country to a certain extent, he should be protected to a greater extent, and the Conservative party will be prepared, upon attaining power, to give him a further measure of protection which in its opinion the interests of the country demand.

I think that quotation is sufficient to prove to the country that there is a vast distinction between the policy of the government and the policy of the opposition with respect to the farming classes of Canada. I repeat that the farmers will be disappointed in the right hon. gentleman and in the Minister of Finance, when they consider the proposition which the government are asking us to accept, a proposition which involves the removal of almost every vestige of protection the farmer has on the products he raises upon his farm.

Now I want to look at the other side of the tariff. I want to point out that there are a large number of articles that the farmers require that are not touched by this new proposition. I want to point out that while this government have taken away protection on the products of the farmer, and reduced protection on some of the products they raise upon their farms, they have left a pretty strong tariff protection on the articles they require in their houses and the implements they use on their farms. When a farmer wants to buy a wagon, he finds there is a tariff of 22½ per cent upon it; a buggy, 35 per cent; a piano, 30 per cent; boots and shoes, 25 per cent and 30 per cent; furniture in his house, 30 per cent; harness for his horses, 30 per cent; whips, 30 per cent; gloves and mitts which the farmer wears, 30 per cent; braces and suspenders for his clothing, 35 per cent; collars and cuffs, 37½ per cent; scythes, forks, hoes, rakes, axes, all of which the farmer requires, 22½ per cent; self binders, 15 per cent; mowing machines, 15 per cent; sewing machines that his wife requires in the house, 30 per cent; field rollers, 25 per cent. I am only mentioning a few of the articles the farmer requires to use on his farm. The farmers of this country will, therefore, see that the government, while taking the duty off wheat, barley, oats, peas, vegetables and fruit, taking away the protection the farmers have, has at the same time, allowed protection to remain upon all these articles that he requires to use, and upon a few luxuries in which he may wish to indulge. That shows the difference between the two parties in respect to the tariff as it affects the farmer.

Now I want to say a word about trade conditions. For the fiscal year ending 30th March, 1910, our total purchases from the United States amounted to $223,501,809; their purchases from Canada amounted to $113,150,778, showing a difference of $110,351,031. For the past decade the returns, in round numbers, shows imports from the United States of $1,000,000,000 and exports to the United States of $500,000,000. In other words, 7,000,000 Canadians purchased twice as much from the United States as 90,000,000 people in the United States purchased from Canada. That is the position of the tariff at the present moment. Now let me consider the question of the tariff as it affects manufacturers. I am one of those who believe that there can be no tariff in Canada for the manufacturer, that does not help the farmer, and the mechanic, and every other man; and there can be no tariff upon farm products or upon animals of the farm, that is not in the interest of every other man in this country. Therefore, I say that a protective tariff which is a uniform tariff, and gives every class a fair field and an equal chance, must be the best policy for the people of this country. There is invested in the manufacturing establishments in Canada at this moment $1,200,000,000. They have an annual output of the value of $1,000,000,000; employing 435,000 working men, and paying in wages annually, $250,000,000. I declare here, as representing the people, that an interest so valuable should be taken care of by any government. The 'Monetary Times,' of Toronto, is responsible for these figures: There are at least 200 manufacturing establishments, branches of United States industries, now located and operating in Canada, with an investment of United States capital of $24,000,000. That is something worthy the consideration of the government and of the people of Canada. There is no doubt in the world, that had it not been for the protective policy inaugurated by the Conservatives, and generally speaking, continued by this government, not one of these establishments would be to-day in Canada, and the wages they pay, would be expended in the United States. Let me read what President Taft expects for the United States from this agreement. At page 8 of his message to Congress, he says:

The benefit to our widespread agricultural implement industry from the reduction of Canadian duties in the agreement is clear. Similarly, the new widely distributed and expanding motor vehicle industry of the United States is given access to the Dominion market on advantageous terms.

At page 9 of his message he says:

As an illustration, it has been found possible to obtain free entry into Canada for fresh fruit and vegetables, a matter of special value to the south and to the Pacific coast in disposing of their products in their season.

I commend to the fruit growers of Canada the opinion of President Taft on how the United States fruit industry will be benefited by finding a new market in Canada. If it could be said that this government had opened up a new market of 92,000,000 people who required what we produce, not having enough of these articles themselves, then they might expect to get the approval of the people. But, the fact is that Canada produces more farm products than Canada herself requires, and the United States is in exactly the same position. The United States is an exporter of these articles mentioned in the trade agreement just as Canada is, and I cannot understand what advantage it is to the Canadian people to have access to the markets of a country which manufactures more than it can consume, and which produces more farm products than is required for their own consumption. Surely it is manifest that such an arrangement can be of no value to the farmers of Canada. Some say that protection increases the cost of the manufactured article to the consumer, and as that question has been often discussed I shall not dwell upon it further than to point out that in 1879, when the National Policy was passed there was an establishment in this country which that year manufactured about 30 buggies, for which the farmers paid them from $100 to $170 each, but last year, in various kinds of wheeled vehicles the same company had an output of 15,000, and they sold to the farmer for $85 a better buggy than formerly he had to pay $100 to $170 for. In 1878 the price of sugar was 9 and 10 cents per pound retail, but to-day, under a protective policy, it is under 5 cents per pound. The best self-binder was sold, in 1878, at from $275 to $300, but to-day the farmer gets a lighter and more compact binder that will last longer for $125. In 1878 single reapers retailed in Ontario at from $100 to $105, but to-day the best reapers retail at from $60 to $65. And so I could go all down the list and give instances to show that after all where a protective tariff is placed on the statute-books in the interest of all the people, instead of increasing the price, it decreases the price to the consumer, and in addition our own people get the benefit of the wages at home and the farmers of Canada supply the wage-earners with their products. And now, as to the fruit and vegetable industry, I point out that we have at the present time large quantities of fruit coming into Canada free of duty, and it comes into competition with our native grown fruit. For the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1910, there were entered for home consumption in Canada the following:

Oranges and grape fruit.. ..	$2,135,943
Pineapples..	252,719
Lemons..	528,149
Bananas..	1,499,095
	$4,415,906

These fruits go into competition with fruits we raise upon our own farms, and for my part I think that the present protection should be left where it is, and that so long as these fruits that we cannot grow in our own country come in free of duty the consumer will not suffer by the protection that is given to the fruit and vegetable interests. Now, some remarks have been made in respect to the price of wheat under this new arrangement, and some of the farmers in the west think they will procure a higher price for their wheat, but let me refer them to this authority, which I quote from the Toronto 'Globe' of February 9 last:

The Right Hon. Sidney Charles Buxton, President of the Board of Trade, London, England, speaking:

Stated that the more Canadian wheat goes to the United States, the more will the United States send to Great Britain, with the result that the prices will decline.

That means, of course, and it seems quite logical, that the more Canadian wheat that is sent to the United States the more United States wheat there will be to ship to England, and the lower the price will be in the English market. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has told us that the price of wheat is fixed in England, and therefore, it cannot be expected that under this new tariff arrangement the natural course of trade will be changed and the price of wheat fixed by the United States market. Then as to the pork industry let me quote from a statement submitted to the government the other day by a large delegation representing that industry. Here is what they said:

The meat packers of Ontario and Quebec have in good faith invested large sums of money in fixed assets reported by their buildings and plant. They have had the courage to build and equip their houses in advance of the production of hogs necessary to their operation. They have to-day, as they have had for years past an aggregate capacity greatly exceeding the aggregate supply of hogs. They are, therefore, deeply concerned and have great anxiety as to the effect upon these investments if the proposed reciprocal trade relations are established between Canada and the United States.

These business men of Canada are deeply concerned and in great anxiety as to the effect upon their investment by the proposed reciprocal trade relations between

Canada and the United States. Further on, with respect to the price paid to the farmers, these gentlemen say:

Dnring the last 20 years the average price of hogs in Ontario and Quebec each year has exceeded the average price of hogs in the United States. We have not had the extreme range in values incident to United States' markets, hence we have not been as high in price during a period of extraordinary high levels, nor have we been as low in price during a period of extraordinary low levels, but the average price throughout any years with the exception of two years when the price was in favour of Buffalo has been higher to the farmers in Canada for their pork products.

I submit that statement for the mature consideration of Canadian farmers who are engaged in hog raising. I think I should put on 'Hansard' a statement made within the last few hours by Sir William Van Horne. This is it:

SICK AND ASHAMED.
SIR WILLIAM VAN HORNE ON THE RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT.

(Canadian Press Despatch).

Montreal, Feb. 22, 1910.—Sir William Van Horne has just returned from Cuba, highly disgusted at the proposal just put forward to carry through the Fielding-Paterson reciprocity measure. I am too much disgusted to talk about it, he said to-day. Just think of it. Our government returns show that the commerce per capita of the people of Canada is $97 per head, while the commerce per capita of the people of the United States is $33, and some odd cents per head. Naturally they look upon us with a covetous eye, and this proposal for reciprocity is the result. Now we are actually proposing to remove the mill dam, and you know what happens when the mill dam is removed the waters find a common level. It is humiliating and disgusting to find such a deal as this one proposed by Messrs. Fielding and Paterson being seriously entertained. I won't trust myself to say another word about it.

'Here just say that my opinions on the subject are summed up in the following,' and Sir William sat down at his desk and wrote:

'Re reciprocity agreement—

'I am sick and ashamed—too sick and too much ashamed to say anything about the subject.'

I quote that opinion from a business man of the standing of Sir William Van Horne against the opinion of my hon. friend from Red Deer as to what is the best for Canada, and I leave the people to draw their own conclusions. As to the linseed oil industry, a gentleman who had a seat in this House a few years ago, and who is engaged in the business writes me:

As soon as the new scheme becomes effective it will kill the linseed oil industry as dead as a mackerel.

That statement from a gentleman who has a good deal of money invested in the industry I commend to the government, and to the people of Canada. Now, the Finance Minister told us the other day that there has been no annexation feeling in Canada for the last 45 years, but the Toronto 'Globe' holds a different opinion, and I quote from its issue of February 9, last:

Twenty years ago there was quite a strong undercurrent of annexation sentiment in the country.

That was in 1891 when the Liberal party were advocating unrestricted reciprocity in Canada. Was that annexation feeling to be found in the ranks of the Conservative party? If so how does it come that in that year the Hon. Edward Blake stated over his own signature in a published letter, that the policy advocated by the Liberal party in 1891, of unrestricted reciprocity, would lead to annexation if it were carried into law. If there is any annexation talk in Canada it certainly is not traceable to the Conservative party. True, it is said, that many years ago certain Conservatives signed an annexation manifesto, but that document also bore the signatures of prominent Liberals of that day, and be that as it may, in after years when these men had a better understanding of our position and more faith in their country they repudiated the sentiments they earlier expressed. Whatever annexation talk there is in Canada is traceable to the policy advocated by the Liberals before they came into office and which at the time was repudiated by some of their best friends. And, Sir, to-day, there are prominent Liberals throughout Canada who declare that if this trade arrangement becomes law there are dangers surrounding it in respect to our nationhood. These gentlemen believe that possibly there may be some talk and some action in this House and in the United States with regard to annexation. I have in my hand a letter dated a few days ago from Aurora, Illinois, from a Canadian who lives in the United States, written to myself, and I will read one paragraph from it:

The view point over here can be summed up briefly. These Americans think they have slipped one over the Canadians. They openly admit and brag over the fact that they have secured a great deal for very little given in return. The Americans think that Canada is beginning to break away from England, and they think that this is the first step on the road to annexation later.

Evidently there is some talk on the other side of the line with respect to annexation. For my part I believe that the best policy for this country is the policy laid down many years ago by the Liberal-Conservative party, of protection for every interest in

Canada—a policy kept on the statute-book by this government until every class of people in Canada are satisfied with present conditions. Our trade is expanding, our natural resources are being developed by our own energy, and with the assistance that we get from the United States and from England in particular in the shape of large investments of money. The policy that has made Canada the admiration of the world is the policy that in my opinion ought to be continued, and that policy is Canada for the Canadians, not Canada for the United States people.

Mr. JOHN P. MOLLOY (Provencher). Mr. Chairman, I have listened with pleasure to the remarks of the hon. member who has just taken his seat. They were in line with what we would naturally expect from him as a strong protectionist. I am not a strong protectionist—quite the opposite. On this question I propose to speak from the point of view of a Manitoba man as well as a Canadian, and I believe I shall have the support of every man from the province of Manitoba. The great majority of course are Conservatives; but before I came to this House, every once in a while the Conservative newspaper in Winnipeg, the 'Telegram,' told us of the many things that the three Conservative members were anxious and willing to do for the farmers of Manitoba. My good friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) never forgets to remind this House that he moved for a reduction of the duty on agricultural implements to 10 per cent. At the same time, he cannot forget that he voted for the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that this reciprocity agreement be delayed—that in 40 years the Canadian people have not had time to give it that consideration which it deserves. Every member of this House from the province of Manitoba with the exception of myself voted for that motion. But this question is a question of vital importance to the farmers of Manitoba, and every one of us, including the hon. member for Winnipeg, who in reality represents a rural county. If it were not for the rural counties in the province of Manitoba there would be no Winnipeg; and, as I believe that this agreement is in the interest of the producer in the province of Manitoba, it should receive the support of all the hon. members from that province. They must do one of two things: they must either support it—and that I am sure will be the wish of their constituents—or they must oppose it. They cannot stand for one thing and vote for another, if they do not support it they class themselves with the black princes of protection who when it suits them wear the spurs of free traders. For my part, I am going to vote for the agreement, the whole agreement, and nothing but the agreement, and I hope for the early ratification of the same. So far as I am concerned, and I believe the people I represent, we are not too well pleased with the amount of reduction in the duty on agricultural implements. It might have been greater, but still there is a reduction of from 2½ to 5 per cent. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) in a very able speech, to which he must have given a great deal of thought and time, moved that the reduction of the duty on agricultural implements be substantial. From that day to this we have not heard from the hon. member regarding this reduction. We have not heard from either that hon. gentleman or any other member from the province of Manitoba about the various articles which have been put on the free list. We have not heard whether they favour free wheat, free oats or free barley. I will vote for this agreement for this reason, if for no other, that it has lowered the duties on many articles and that it has not increased the duty on a single article and made many things free. I say that it is in the interest not only of the producer, but of the consumer, and, therefore, I will support it. I profess to speak only for the part of western Canada which I represent. On the day that this agreement was placed before the House, the 26th of January, I took care to put myself in touch with the people I represent. I wrote to a number of the ablest and most level-headed men of the county of Provencher, and the first reply I received was to this effect: The reciprocity agreement known as the Taft-Fielding agreement, has many friends in the district, the people believing it to be the greatest and most popular thing this government has done for the people of Canada. The next letter I received was worded something like this: In that portion of the county in which I live, I have made it my business to inquire, and the only man I have found opposed to this agreement is a gentleman who is the president of the Conservative Association of the county. Therefore, I believe that I shall be justified in voting for this agreement in toto. I am convinced that it will develop, not alone the province of Manitoba, but every province in the Dominion. I was informed not later than the night before last by one of the most prosperous farmers in Manitoba, known very well to my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples)——

Mr. STAPLES. Who is he?

Mr. MOLLOY. Mr. James Riddell, my hon. friend's opponent in 1904. I made the statement some time ago that I believed this agreement would increase in value at

least $5 per acre land in Manitoba, and the other western provinces and he thought it would increase a great deal more.

Mr. STAPLES. Did Mr. Riddell tell you his opinion which he gathered abroad? Did he tell you what feeling existed in the old country regarding this reciprocity measure? Did he tell you that in his opinion conditions were quite satisfactory in this country, and this government would be very foolish to disturb them?

Mr. MOLLOY. I would like to inform my hon. friend that he told me just exactly the opposite. He told me that it would benefit, not only the people of Manitoba, but of all western Canada, and that the people were only getting what the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Staples) has told us he had fought for ever since he has been a member of this House.

It is well known that this year was an unfavourable year for Manitoba, and yet we raised in that province 96,000,000 bushels of grain, of which 40,000,000 bushels were wheat. That was raised from an acreage of 3,110,000 acres, with the small average of 13½ bushels per acre. Now, there are at least 25,000,000 acres of land arable in the province of Manitoba alone. Last year the United Kingdom imported 163,000,000 bushels of wheat, and that 25,000,000 acres of land, which is deemed to be arable in Manitoba alone would yield 325,000,000 bushels of wheat at 13 bushels per acre. The question with which I am concerned is this: We know that in western Canada there will be some day from 175,000,000 to 200,000,000 acres of land under development, and I would ask where will the people of western Canada go to sell their surplus wheat, oats and barley when that day comes?

Mr. STAPLES. Does the hon. gentleman think they will find it in the United States, which is an exporting country to-day?

Mr. MOLLOY. Yes, it is an exporting country to-day, and will be, perhaps, for a short time, but only for a very short time, and the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite that if we had waited the United States would have taken down their tariff barriers, is not really an argument against this agreement, because by this agreement these barriers are being taken down. I do not pretend that it will increase the price of wheat to the Canadian producer, but I say it will maintain the present prices. There are those who say it will increase the price 2 cents or 3 cents per bushel, but I shall be well satisfied if the present prices are maintained, because at the prices of to-day the raising of wheat is one of the best paying businesses in the Dominion. Instead of having only a home market and the British market, we shall have the United States market as well, and can any one doubt that with three markets at his command instead of two the producer will benefit? Say, for instance, that the price of No. 1 Northern is 76 cents, and of No. 2 Northern 70 cents. It is well known that there may be but a very slight degree of difference between the two, and that if that grain is sampled what may be refused as No. 1 Northern may bring 75 cents.

So far as the western farmer is concerned we know that this agreement must be a good thing for him if we judge it from the American point of view, because we know that the ablest men connected with the farming industry in the United States are opposing it on the ground that the United States government have maintained protection for the manufacturers and have made the tillers of the soil free traders. In proof of this, let me read an extract from a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Wilson from former Governor Nahum J. Bachelder, of Concord, N.H.:

> In reply to our statement that the pending Bill was one-sided and unfair to the farmers, in that it makes no material reduction in duties on manufactured articles used by them, you attempt to defend the continuance of a high tariff for manufacturers along with free trade for the farmers, by claiming that it is the protected workers who furnish the farmers with their chief market.
>
> We would respectfully submit that you are simply repeating the pet argument of the domestic manufacturer and that in asserting that the prosperity of the farmer depends on the workers in protected industries, you are claiming what is exactly the reverse of actual conditions. It is on the prosperity of the farmers that the welfare of all other classes—manufacturers, merchants, transportation interests and factory workers, depends, and we cannot understand how at this late day you should be found repeating the stale and exploded theory that the farmers exist by the grace of protected manufacturers, or any one else on earth.

I say, therefore, that when men in the position to make such a statement as whose letter I have just read, who is at the head of the National Grange and chairman of the Patrons of Industry, are in a position to make such a statement as that, this reciprocity must be a good thing for our western farmer, and if it be good for them it will benefit the whole Dominion.

Some time ago we were all struck with an article which appeared on the front page of the Montreal 'Star,' in which that paper appealed to Sir Wilfrid Laurier as the only man who could save Canada. Well, we on this side believe that he has been the only man for a generation, who has done that which is best for Canada, and who will continue to do so as long as God spares him, regardless of the fact that it was a paid advertisement, regardless of the fact

that it was paid for by the manufacturers, and vested interests as against the masses of this country. But an article appeared in the Montreal 'Star,' which was copied by the Winnipeg 'Tribune,' in which they took up the side of the farmer. That was like some gentlemen on the other side, who before the reciprocity agreement had been entered into, and while they believed it was impossible to secure reciprocity in natural products, advocated such reciprocity, but when such an arrangement was actually made, they found an excuse to get out. The Montreal 'Star' found a way to get out. But what they now say, will not go down with the masses of this country, because the farmers represent 63 per cent of the population of Canada, and they must, and will be heard. And nobody will hear them more plainly than the men who represent rural counties in western Canada, when the tocsin is sounded for the next election. For my part, I believe it to be my duty to stand for that for which the people elected me. If I could not support this agreement conscientiously and fairly and honestly, it would be my duty, as a man, to get out and let some one else take my place who is more closely in touch with the people I represent. However, I will read this article in which the Montreal 'Star' stood up for the farmers. My western friends will notice that it is pretty pointed. Whether correct or incorrect, there are facts in it that it will be pretty hard for them to get over:

Where the tariff burdens the farmer, that item is immediately put on trial for its life. This country can stand a burden anywhere else more easily. Agriculture is our hope. It is the splendid agricultural opportunities of the west which are drawing to that section such excellent settlers. A mere chance to make a living will attract all the less desirable sort of immigrants we can stand—and probably far more. But after all, it is not so much population we want as fellow citizens up to the Canadian standard; and we can only secure this high grade of immigrant by making farming conditions superlatively attractive. New York can boast of its brokers and London can boast of its Lords; but Canada must be in a position to boast of its farmers. That is our prize product—our compelling lure to the best of the best nations.

And again they say:

Where they find railway or other corporations inclined to side-track their interests or ignore their just demands, they must tell any government that sits or ever shall sit at Ottawa that its only title to continued existence is its instant readiness to compel the possessors of public franchises to recognize that the public is the controlling partner in their business. The farmers are the masters of the situation; and, if they fail, the blame is theirs.

Mr. MOLLOY.

As I said a moment ago, the farmers represent 63 per cent of our population, and I do not believe that, organized, as they are, any corporate interest or any wildcat talk of annexation—which is the only defence offered by hon. gentlemen opposite—will sway the farmers from protecting and helping their own families, or cause them to vote for men who are diametrically opposed to their interests. Now, speaking of the grain of western Canada—

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. gentleman permit me a question? Did I understand him to make the statement that the article of the Montreal 'Star,' as it is found in other newspapers in Canada, was paid for, as an advertisement by the Manufacturers' Association?

Mr. MOLLOY. By members, by interests, opposed to a reciprocity agreement between Canada and the United States

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Molloy), be good enough to name——

Mr. MOLLOY. No, I will not

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh

Mr. MOLLOY. I do not wish any hon. member to feel that I am discourteous, and if I have hurt the hon. member's feelings, I apologize. But so far, I have never risen in this House to make a statement, except once, when I rose to a question of personal explanation, without being baited by hon. gentlemen on the other side. And I have never yet interrupted any speaker on that side of the House. I took a vow the first day I came here that, as long as I had a seat in this House, I would not interrupt any hon. member who was speaking.

Mr. STAPLES. I rise to a question of order. The hon. member (Mr. Molloy), said that he never rose to give offence or insult to hon. gentlemen on this side Now, with his permission, I will ask him a question——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is not a point of order, and unless the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples) has a point of order, I cannot hear him.

Mr. STAPLES. I can only say that, if the hon. gentleman takes offence, I am very sorry. I did not mean it in that way.

Mr. MOLLOY. I have endeavoured to point out from the farmers' point of view the desirability of an enlarged market for the western farmers' wheat. But there are other grains raised in western Canada besides wheat,—for example, oats. Last year, 42,000,000 bushels of oats were raised. But owing to the drought in western Canada, the crop was less on the average than for some years. The western oats are better,

stronger and heavier oats than the American, and will command on the American market higher prices, owing to their milling properties. In spite of the fact that the staple crop of Canada, up to the present time, has been wheat, there is nothing in this agreement so beneficial to the western farmer, as making barley free. We all knows that under the old reciprocity agreement, of from 1854 to 1866, the staple crop of eastern Canada was barley, and we also know that, at the present time, the price of barley, on the American side, with the duty of 30 cents equals, and in some cases, even exceeds, the price of wheat on the Canadian side. I made it my business, the other day, to inquire into the value of barley on the American side and on the Canadian side. And I say that if barley alone, had been put on the free list by this agreement, it would be my duty, in the interests of the western farmer, to vote for the agreement.

On February 18, the highest price paid for barley in Winnipeg was 56 cents, and the lowest price 38 cents. In Chicago on February 19, the highest price paid for barley was 94 cents, and the lowest price 75 cents one day between. In other words, the difference between the highest price paid in Winnipeg and the highest price paid in Chicago was 38 cents, and the difference between the lowest prices was 37 cents. That was for feed barley. But that is not all. It must be admitted, it is admitted, there is no use trying to deny it, that in decreased in the province of Manitoba toba, which is the oldest agricultural province in the west, many sections of the country have been overrun by weeds. We know that the crop of barley has decreased in the province of Manitoba for the simple reason that it does not pay. For instance, in 1908 there were 18,000,000 bushels raised; in 1909, 16,000,000 bushels; in 1910; 12,000,000 bushels, showing a decrease for the simple reason that it does not pay. There will be this advantage, that the farmer of western Canada, and the Manitoba farmer particularly, as the oldest agricultural district west of the lakes, will be able to grow barley at a paying price, getting in the neighbourhood of what they are getting for wheat at the present time, with the additional benefit that they will have an opportunity of cleaning their land. They will have the use of the land which would otherwise be less useful. Therefore, so far as the western farmer is concerned, putting barley on the free list is the best thing that has been done for him. It will give him a paying crop, as the yield per acre will be about double. This year the yield per acre is 20·75 bushels for barley, and for wheat only 13·47, on account of the drought. If he can receive two-thirds the price that he receives for his wheat, he will make more money raising barley, and cleaning up his farm, which has become overrun with weeds in some districts.

Another reason for which I shall vote for this agreement is that it will furnish a better market. Where are the people of western Canada to get a good market for the future? The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) in his speech the other night, and it certainly was an able speech, asked: What will happen when there are a million farmers in western Canada? I say, What will happen when there are twenty-five million farmers in western Canada, and what will happen when there are 200 million acres of land cultivated in western Canada? We know the time will come when there will be 80 millions of people living between the Great Lakes and the Pacific ocean. They must have a market somewhere. The western farmer asks for a fair, square deal. He says he is prepared to meet anybody, or any interest on a fair, equal footing, and the more markets he gets the better it will be for him and the better for the whole Canadian people.

There is another question I wish to touch upon, that is the question of transportation. It has been argued that if this agreement goes into effect trade will go south, and that the millions and millions that have been spent by the people of Canada on railways will be, in a sense, wasted. My argument is this, the time is near when all the existing lines we have at the present time, and when the other two now in course of construction, are completed within five years, they cannot handle the output of western Canada. I have the statement of a railway man who was in close touch with the Canadian Northern railway, and he said to me frankly, the Canadian Northern railway have the lowest fixed charges of any railway in the world of its size. It owns its own lake steamers, it owns its own ocean steamers, and if they cannot compete with their American competitors let them go out of business.

An hon. MEMBER. May I ask the name of the hon. gentleman's informant?

Mr. MOLLOY. I cannot give the names publicly, but I will give it to the hon. gentleman privately. There is one thing in regard to transportation which this government must be very careful about, and that is that the handling of grain by the elevator companies and railway companies particularly, must be such as to guard the interest of the producer. First and foremost the interest of the producer must be considered. If competition by American roads tends to lower the freight rate in this country, I am sure and I know, that nothing will be more popular in Canada. The

people of Canada will then know that for once they are in a position to control the railway rates, to some extent. If you can by this agreement induce American competition and lower the freight rates to the grain growers of Canada, to the stock raisers of Canada, to the miners of Canada, and to the fishermen of Canada, it will be welcomed by them, because it will be in the interest of the whole people. If this agreement tends to lower freight rates, which I hope it will do, that alone will be an enormous benefit. We all remember, those of us who live in Manitoba, years ago when the Canadian Pacific railway held the people by the throat, when that great company dictated their terms, dictated their rates, dictated when you should ship your grain.

Mr. BELAND. Was Sir William Van Horne then connected with that road?

Mr. MOLLOY. He was president. It is now possible for the people to get relief; they believe that this agreement will tend to a reduction of freight rates, and, therefore, it will be welcome to the people of this great and growing country. It is no wonder that Sir William Van Horne is opposed to this agreement, for in a short time the Canadian Pacific railway will not be able to dictate to our free people as they have done in the past. Now the statement is made that all the grain will go south. We must remember that part of it has already been going south. It may surprise you, and it did surprise me, to learn that half of our wheat crop for the last three years in western Canada has gone out by southern routes. I have a statement to that effect from the Department of Trade and Commerce, showing the quantity of wheat exported from the Dominion of Canada in three crop years ending August 31. In 1908 there were 39,000,000 bushels, in round figures; in 1909, 45,000,000 bushels; in 1910, 52,000,000 bushels. How much of that wheat was exported through the United States? In 1908, 19,000,000 bushels, in round figures, went through by American routes; in 1909, 23,000,000 bushels; in 1910, 27,000,000 bushels. The Minister of Customs pointed out in his speech that from Port Arthur and Fort William alone there were 19,000,000 bushels exported by American routes. Now if you compare the figures you will find that in 1908, 1909 and 1910, half of our exports of wheat went by American routes. You may think it went in bond but the fact remains that freight rates were paid on it over American roads.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. In 1910, 100,000,000 bushels of wheat went through Port Arthur and Fort William, and only 1,000,000 bushels did not go that far on Canadian roads.

Mr. MOLLOY. My statement was that half the grain went by American routes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. But it came east to be exported.

Mr. MOLLOY. Partly, but not entirely.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. All except 1,000,000 bushels.

Mr. MOLLOY. I was struck by an article written by Dr. Andrew McPhail in the Montreal 'Witness' under date February 21. We have heard a great deal of the howl sent up by vested interests in this country, and I notice that the strongest opponents of this agreement are the moneyed men of Canada. The common people, apparently, are not to be considered or consulted if some people are to have their way, but there are those who are prepared to take up their cause and fight it out for them, and I am one of them. The blue ruin predicted by hon. gentlemen opposite and some of their press, with its accompaniment of falling stocks, financial stringency, tying up of corporations and unwillingness of the banks to lend money, is hardly borne out by the facts as here set forth. This article is as follows:

TEST OF PUBLIC OPINION.

There is only one method of testing public opinion upon the effect which any proposal will have in industrial values, and that is by appealing to the record of prices which the public is willing to pay. The Montreal Stock Exchange will yield those quotations. The schedules were brought down on January 27——

Bear in mind that was the day after the Finance Minister made his statement.

—or 'thrown on the table,' as the saying is. Let us now compare the prices which prevailed at the close of the market on the day previous to the event with those which are recorded for February 14. There are 49 stocks listed, for which quotations are given for both days, and the average values increased by 2·22 per cent. Let us compare the values of stocks in those industries, about which the greatest clamour has been raised. The Canadian Pacific railway, on January 26, closed at 207½ bid; on February 14 it had advanced to 212⅝ bid. Grand Trunks in London on January 26, closed at 106¾ for firsts, 95¾ for seconds, and 54 to 54⅞ on actual sales of thirds. On February 14, the closing figures were: firsts 108, thirds 54⅞, there being no quotations for seconds. Ogilvie Milling Company closed at 129⅛ and 129 respectively; Lake of the Woods at 142 and 141½; Steel Company at 57⅞ and 58⅛. Even 'farmers' may be trusted to see the significance of those figures, and to test by them the sincerity of the 'business men' who are crying out that they have been betrayed.

The railways have come in for especial commiseration. The railways may be trusted to take care of themselves if we adhere to the sound principle of minding our own business, and let the American railways mind theirs.

Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, Mr. Hays, and the proprietors of the Canadian Northern, are quite competent to protect their east and west haul, if only their hands are not tied by an International Railway Commission. That is the trap we have to fear. But all railways on the American continent run east and west, and always will. With the exception of the Illinois Central, there is not a road in America which ever made any profit by north and south traffic alone.

Therefore, I say that so far as the railway interests are concerned, no statement has been made by any railway man who is in active railway business to-day against this agreement, although we have, on the other side, the statements of Sir Donald Mann and Sir William Mackenzie in its favour. If it lowers the freight rates of the Canadian railways, I shall welcome the agreement more and more in the interests of the people, knowing and believing that they have paid more than their just share in the past, and I am sure the people of the country will take the same view.

The only argument left to the opposition is the flag, the old, the dear old, the good old flag. I wonder how it has stood the racket so long; it must be great stuff. Whenever the poor old, dear old, good old Tory party gets in a hole they appeal to the dear old, good old flag to help them out. It has stood the test not only in this country, in which we are proud to live, in which we will always live and will always defend, but in other parts of the world. In this country the only thing the flag is up against is the political attacks made upon it to suit the purposes of the Conservative party. When they fail everywhere else, then they appeal to the flag. I will tell hon. gentlemen that they must have something else than that racket for the future. It has worked, I admit, pretty well in the past, but the people are getting next; they are getting wise. You have got to have something else. Just in the same way you can go on talking graft until the crack of doom, but you have to give the people a policy, and do not raise the flag and give us the flag in the place of a policy. The people want something and are bound to have it, and we, the Liberal party, are bound to give it to them. The people of this country are loyal, they always have been, and they always will be. If there is any difference in loyalty, if you can measure it in that way, the people in Canada to-day are more loyal than they ever were before, because they are better satisfied with conditions than they ever were before. Therefore, they have every reason to be satisfied. You create conditions whereby the people suffer an injury, starve the people and they will soon forget the flag, they will think of their stomachs only; men on the other side of the House would do that just as those on this side. Some of them on the other side seem to have no consciences, but I suppose they all have stomachs.

As for the railway companies in this country, as I said, they have taken care of themselves. They do not hesitate to cross the international boundary to extend their systems in the United States, not one of them, and the bankers in this country who are raising such a row do not forget to send their money to New York if they can get a good percentage. They are out for their pockets, we all are, legitimately. Therefore, I say that the annexation cry and the disloyalty cry will not work out for the simple reason that the Canadian people are intelligent, and, therefore, they know better than to be deceived by such cries. You will have to give them something else that will appeal to them, to their sense of honesty and intelligence in addition to any ribald cry that you wore out yourselves many, many years ago. As to the statement that Americans are flocking into Canada, I say it is a good thing, and that they are welcome to Canada. There is no man who comes into Canada to-day who is a more up-to-date, a more loyal, or a more progressive citizen than the naturalized American. You meet them at every turn in western Canada.

There are many of them in my own constituency that I know personally, and if you talk to these men they will admit that they have a protection and justice in this country that they did not get in the land of their birth. Some of these men are born Americans and in other cases they are Canadians who have come back. One word in conclusion. We heard to-day of a resolution passed by the Winnipeg Board of Trade, and they did not forget to tell us that Mr. D. C. Cameron seconded that motion. Mr. Cameron has a perfect right to do as he sees fit. He is an intelligent, honourable, upright man, and a good citizen. I have no fault to find with him, but I have a certain amount of fault to find with a bunch of men who palm themselves off as Toronto Grits. We are told there are 18 Grits in Toronto ; I was not aware there were that many. If you look over the list of these 18 you will find it starts with Sir Edmund Walker, banker, and the next man is a financier, and the next man is a financier, and the next man is a financier, and so on and so forth, and the next man is the manager of a bank, and they come together and they say that this arrangement is a bad thing. I would not be afraid to wager, and I am going to tell the farmers of my constituency, that these 18 Grits of Toronto who went to that meeting went in automobiles costing from $5,000 to $10,000 each, to lay down a policy for the farmers of Canada. They either went in their own automobiles or their own carriages, or in the automobiles and carriages

of their friends, and they met there, and they said the country is going to the bowwows. Their position is simply this, and they know it, that they have had the best time they ever had since the Laurier government came into power, and since then the country has experienced unexampled prosperity. But, as a western man I want to tell you that so far as annexation is concerned, there could have been created a movement for annexation in western Canada in the days when the Conservative government entered into a contract with the Canadian Pacific railway which perpetrated a gross injustice to the people of the west. The producers of this country who number 63 per cent of the people including the farmers of the west, will not submit for one moment to being dictated to by any 18 Liberals in Toronto, or, for that matter any 18 Conservatives in Winnipeg. It is all right for these men when they have reaped their riches at the expense of the sweat of the brow of the farmer in western Canada, these gentlemen with their palaces in the city, and their seaside homes who travel in their automobiles, and spend their wealth most extravagantly throughout the length and breadth of the land ; it is all right for such men to talk, but I tell them that the people of western Canada who have made them what they are, will not be dictated to by any such bunch. As a rule the farmer of Manitoba does not travel in an automobile.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). May I ask the hon. gentleman if he does not canvass his own electors in his own automobile?

Mr. MOLLOY. I did not hear the question.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). Does the hon. member (Mr. Molloy) not canvass the electors of Provencher in his own automobile or that of his brother?

Mr. MOLLOY. I have been asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) if I did not canvass the electors of Provencher in my own automobile or my brothers, and I want to make the statement here, and now, and by the time this House meets to-morrow I am prepared to prove it, that I was never in any automobile during my canvass in Provencher in 1908, my brother's or anybody else's and if that is not true I will leave this House. I will admit that my brother, of whom I am very proud, and who is a member of the Manitoba legislature, canvassed in his automobile, and he was elected by only 9 majority, and the last party he brought to the poll just numbered 9. However, that has no reference to my case. I may tell the hon. member (Mr. Haggart) that I do not need an automobile at all ; the people come up and vote for me without being driven in an automobile; they would ride in Red River carts if they had to. I can tell the hon. member further that I won't need an automoblie next election. And, without wishing to hurt the feelings of anybody I will just mention that the Conservative party in the constituency I represent are scarce of candidates, and if there is any hon. member in this House from the province of Manitoba who wishes to try his luck in Provencher I will welcome him as my opponent ; and I think I will be able to defeat him on this or any other question of the policy of the Laurier government. I am going to vote for this agreement, believing it is in the interests of the people, believing it is in the interest of the land in which I was born, and believing that the gentlemen who oppose it to-day, and whose opinions I respect, will in time come round to my way of thinking, that it is an agreement which is in the interests of the whole people of Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the committee rises, I would like to make myself clear to my hon. friend from Red Deer, who thought I was wrong on some question of fact. I stated the other day that according to my information the United States was the greatest manufacturing country in the world and the greatest agricultural country in the world. I still think I am correct so far as the statistics show. If my hon. friend (Mr. Clark) would name any other country that is a greater manufacturing country or a greater agricultural country than the United States, I would be very glad to be corrected. My hon. friend (Mr. Clark) said I had not, as usual, buttressed my statements by facts. I suppose he regarded them as unsupported facts and, therefore, no facts at all. I have looked into the point, and I would tell my hon. friend from Red Deer that according to the best information I can get—which is to be found in the Statesman's Year-book for the year 1908, being the last edition in the library, a publication well recognized in all English-speaking countries—the manufactures of the United States amounted to $16,866,706,985. I do not think that record of value is equalled by any other country in the world. If I am wrong I should be glad to have my hon. friend correct me. As to agricultural products, the information I have is not quite so late; it only comes down to 1900. According to the same authority, the agricultural products of the United States in that year amounted to $4,717,069,973. In another publication, an American one, the Standard Dictionary of Facts, which professes to give the latest statistics, I find that the United States leads the whole world in agricultural products of the following kinds: in wheat, in oats, in corn—four or five times as much as all the rest of the world—and in cotton---nearly twice as much as all the rest

of the world. Therefore, subject to correction, I still think that the statement I made on that point in the House a few days ago was quite correct.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I think my hon. friend will agree with me that the question of agricultural products does not come into dispute between us, because I did not refer to that part of his statement at all. It would be too much to expect that a country about the size of Alberta would equal one-half of this continent in agricultural products. The hon. member has not given any comparative figures. He has stated the gross figures of the United States for 1905. I think he will agree with me that it is an extremely difficult line of comparison. There is the difficulty as to what really are manufactures. For instance, in the statement of manufactures in the old country, ships are for some reason excluded, although it could be reasonably argued that ship-building is a line of manufacture, a ship being a highly-finished product. I certainly think that the comparative figures which I gave with regard to the export of manufactures rather bore out my side of the case. But in matters of trade I am cosmopolitan. I look for the time when the United States and Canada must of necessity overtake and pass Great Britain, just as a son outgrows his father. It is not a very important point, but I think it is as well to state it before it actually comes to pass.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would be inclined to think that it has come to pass already. I do not think the manufactured product of Great Britain at the present time approaches anything like the figures which I have given. It is true, as my hon. friend says, that it is a little difficult to get the statistics for Great Britain in the same way as they are given for the United States. But I find that the cotton, linen and woollen industries of every kind form a very large part of the production of Great Britain, and their product does not begin to approach in value the figures to which I have just called attention. According to this year-book, it amounts to about £200,000,000, which would be about one-sixteenth or one-seventeenth of the total manufactured products of the United States. Of course, that does not include the iron production. Therefore, I have come to the conclusion that the manufactured product of Great Britain at the present time does not begin to approach the product of the United States; but, as we have not the figures for the purpose of exact comparison, as my hon. friend says, there may be some room for difference of opinion. I may possibly be able to get more satisfactory statistics; but in the limited time at my disposal since my hon. friend called my attention to them, I have been able to get only these. Yet I am quite satisfied that they substantially and essentially bear out the statement I made a few evenings ago.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 10.54 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 24, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

BAGGAGE SMASHING.

Mr. LEWIS moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 129) respecting Baggage Smashing. He said: This Bill deals with a grievance affecting a great number of people in Canada. I find by statistics in the library, that the number of passengers carried in the year 1910 by the railways, was 35,894,575; and that the freight carried during that time was 74,000,000 tons. According to the computation I have made, there would be about 5,000,000 tons of baggage carried. I wish to state, and I believe it is a fact, that there is more damage done by the railways in carrying that 5,000,000 tons of baggage, than is done in carrying that 74,000,000 tons of freight. A number of cases have happened in my own experience and others have been related to me, where people prefer to pay freight on their valuable trunks and baggage, and to send them as freight, instead of risking the damage that would happen to them in transit as baggage. The cause of the trouble is either the carelessness of the employees in handling the baggage or want of sufficient men. Since the Canadian people have attained to such a degree of comfort and affluence, they delight in their personal belongings, and they carry many valuable articles in their baggage; but very few will allow a small piece of baggage, a valise or suit case, to be taken into the baggage car. Consequently, people who travel, are under the discomfort of tumbling over trunks and valises in the car. If a person has a valuable trunk worth $50, the chances are that in travelling from Ottawa to Toronto, he may suffer damages to that trunk to the extent of $25. The object of my Bill is not to impose penalties, it is more as a detriment. I will read the Bill:

1 This Act may be cited as The Baggage Smashing Act.

2. Every one is guilty of an offence and liable, on summary conviction before a magistrate, stipendiary magistrate or any one justice of the peace having the power to do alone

such acts as are usually required to be done by two or more justices, to a penalty not exceeding fifty dollars over and above the value of the baggage destroyed or damaged or to one month's imprisonment with or without hard labour, or to both, who wilfully or through negligence destroys or damages any trunk, valise, satchel, box or other baggage when handling such baggage for transportation by railway, vessel, vehicle or any other means of conveyance used by common carriers.

3. When the person found guilty of a violation of the provisions of section 2 of this Act is an employee of any corporation or company, the magistrate, stipendiary magistrate or justice, may convict such corporation or company of the offence and find it liable for the actual damages caused; the employee, in such case, being held liable only for the penalty.

4. This Act shall come into force by proclamation of the Governor in Council.

Now it is a well known fact that those who have travelled in the old land are aware that no such trouble occurs, the baggage is handled properly. This baggage smashing, which is the term now used in this country, may be of some benefit to the large manufacturing concerns, who make the trunks, and may help to make more millionaires in Canada. But I stand here on behalf of the plain people who travel, and who want this thing to be put a stop to. I ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), to look into this matter, and if this Bill does not cover the point, I hope he will himself, take hold of the difficulty, and see that baggage smashing is put an end to, at present the only remedy is by civil action, ordinary citizens cannot afford law suits with corporations.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would ask the Minister of Railways, if there is not a law on the Railway Act that covers this very thing.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Railway Act makes the railway company liable for damage to baggage to any amount they carry. My hon. friend speaks of handling baggage in the old land. As a matter of fact, most of that is carried in the railway compartment, because when they send it as baggage, they have to pay for it, while in Canada, a certain amount is carried free. Some of us have noticed that when Englishmen are travelling in Canada, they have a habit of carrying nearly all their baggage in the trains with them. I am afraid if we were to follow their example, instead of having fewer valises in the aisles of the cars, we would have more. However, I have no objection to the first reading of the Bill. As the members of the House are now not allowed any more trunks, those of us who travel hereafter, will probably carry handbags.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. LEWIS.

LEASE OF RAILWAY IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. GRAHAM. I move that on Tuesday next the House do go into Committee of the Whole, for consideration of the following resolution, which stands in my name. I may add that His Excellency has been apprised of the subject matter of this resolution, and has given his assent thereto:

Resolved, that, whereas by legislation enacted at the session thereof held in the year A.D. 1910, the legislature of the province of New Brunswick authorized and empowered the Lieutenant Governor in Council for the said province to guarantee the principal and interest of the bonds of any railway company which would build a line of railway from a point on the line of the National Transcontinental railway at Grand Falls in the county of Victoria, to the city of St. John, in the said province of New Brunswick, a distance of about two hundred and twenty miles, to the extent of twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) per mile, upon certain conditions therein set forth, one of such conditions being that no such agreement should be entered into with any company or corporation for the construction of the said line of railway or for the guaranteeing of the said bonds unless and until the parliament of Canada should enact legislation authorizing the entering by the government of Canada into an agreement with such company or with the government of the province of New Brunswick, for the leasing of the said line of railway when completed, with its appurtenances and rolling stock, and for the operation, maintenance, upkeep and repair by the said government of Canada, as a part of the government railway system of Canada for a period of ninety-nine years and for the payment by the government of Canada to the said province of New Brunswick, or the government thereof, each year during the said term of ninety-nine years of forty per centum per annum of the gross earnings of the said railway, as or in the nature of rental therefor; the amount of such rental to be applied in payment of the interest of the bonds so to be guaranteed and the surplus, if any, to be paid to the said company;

Now, therefore, it is expedient that His Excellency the Governor in Council be authorized to enter into a contract with any such railroad company and the government of the province of New Brunswick as aforesaid, for the leasing of the said line of railway with its appurtenances and rolling stock, when completed and equipped with rolling stock, and for the operation, maintenance, upkeep and repair by the said government of Canada, as a part of the government railway system of Canada, for a period of ninety-nine years, and for the payment by the government of Canada to the said province of New Brunswick, or the said company, each year during the said term of ninety-nine years, of the forty per centum per annum of the gross earnings of the said railway, as or in the nature of rental therefor;

Provided, however, that the said contract shall be entered into only upon the condition that the said railway be constructed upon plans and specifications to be approved of

by the Governor in Council upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and shall be up to the general standard of the said National Transcontinental railway through the said province;

Provided, further, that His Excellency the Governor in Council shall be authorized to enter into a contract as aforesaid, for the operation of the said road in sections, when completed, and equipped as follows:

1 From Fredericton to Woodstock.

2. From Fredericton south a distance of fifty miles.

3 Each twenty-five miles thereafter, until the line be completed and equipped from Grand Falls to St. John.

Motion agreed to.

REGULATION OF FISHERIES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BRODEUR. I move that on Tuesday next the House do go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution. His Excellency has been apprised of the subject matter of this resolution, and has given his assent to it.

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Fisheries Act, chapter 45 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, be amended by enacting that in the province of British Columbia no one shall engage in the manufacture of oil or other commercial products from sea lions, hair seals, sharks or dogfish, nor operate a salmon cannery or salmon curing establishment, except under license from the minister; that the site of reduction works must be approved by the minister; that operations must proceed within one year from issue of the license for which annual fees shall be required; that the annual fee for a lobster fishing license be increased and based on the total number of pounds of canned lobsters; that the annual returns to the minister by the owner or manager of a lobster factory, through the inspector of fisheries of the district, shall furnish more details and be submitted not later than the 31st day of May, each year, and penalties for failure to make such returns shall be imposed; and that licenses must be obtained for maintaining lobster pounds, with an annual fee for the same.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Two Mountains). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I rise to a question of privilege which is of concern to myself as a member of this House, but which is also, I believe, of concern to the House as a whole.

For over eight years I have had the honour of being chairman of the Committee on Private Bills. On the 23rd February instant, my action as chairman of that committee was made the occasion of some unfair, misleading and uncalled for criticisms. Reference was made to the stand taken by me at a meeting of the said committee, on April 22, 1909, and remarks purporting to have been made by me were quoted and put in print. I wish to contradict these statements, and am anxious to apprise the House of their utter lack of foundation.

The statements to which I take exception were made in a manner which I might term incongruous and unworthy of the position occupied by the person who uttered them. I refer to Senator Kirchhoffer, chairman of the Divorce Committee of the Senate, who has thought fit to make the following public statement:

> The Divorce Committee of the Senate has been often accused by a member of the House of Commons, named Ethier, who is, or used to be the chairman of the Private Bills Committee in that House, of granting divorces on evidence——

If I wished to give him a Roland for his Oliver, I might refer to the honourable senator as 'the man named Kirchhoffer,' but I prefer acting in a more courteous and proper way. Then he continues:

> —on evidence you would not hang a cat upon. I think that is the favourite expression used . . . Of course, the reporter is anxious to announce that Mr. Ethier, in the Commons, and the Hon. Mr. Cloran, in the Senate, make the above remarks—I mean those original remarks about the hanging of a cat on the evidence; but you are entirely mistaken, because you will find thousands of people believe anything they see in the paper, no matter how thick the head or slimy the tongue that gives utterance to it.

There can be no mistake as to whom he is aiming at, for a little further on, he says:

> I shall allude to him as the member for Two Mountains.

And again:

> Mr. Ethier made use of the very remark which he quoted. I have no doubt he originated it. I think he is deserving of a great deal of censure.

I humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, that this statement, as I have already stated, is false, uncalled for and without foundation. I never uttered such words neither in 1909 or any other time, and I may quote, for the information of the honourable senator, who may judge for himself, the report which the organ of his own party, the Ottawa 'Citizen,' published of what I said in reference to those relief Bills which are sent down to the Committee on Private Bills after going through the Senate. That paper published the following on April 23rd, 1909:

> The matter in which the Senate has been granting divorces this session caused some very pointed remarks by Chairman Ethier in the Private Bills Committee of Commons yesterday morning. The Bill called was that divorcing Mildred G. Wendolyn Patterson, now of Toronto, from Charles Colebrooke Patterson, of Ottawa. 'We have 21 of these

relief Bills from the Senate this session, said Mr. Ethier ; 'I think the situation is most serious, most unusual. For six years I have presided over this committee and for thirteen years been a member of it, and while we are accustomed to have half a dozen each session, the limit is reached this time. I think it amounts to an abuse. I do not want to criticise the action of the Senate, but I cannot escape from the idea that this is going too far. In the different provinces we have laws regarding separation and even in them the judges are very careful. In these cases we have asked to authorize absolute divorce. Those of us who are fathers of families, should think of the great social evil that is involved and not do in this country as they do in the States. The committee should assert its right to see if the proof given in the Senate is proper. I have looked over the evidence in several cases and do not hesitate to say that it does not justify the report save as to separation. The Senate is granting divorces in cases where a court would not give separation. If you prove a man is a drunkard or a gambler, it is not sufficient to justify divorce. I am not speaking as a Catholic, but on the general principles involved in these cases.'

As will be observed, that was far from asserting that the Senate granted relief on evidence insufficient to hang a cat upon.

Let the hon. senator read the article and he will be satisfied, through the testimony of his own organ, that the charge he made against me with the object of inducing the Senate to censure me, is false and that his statements regarding me on that occasion were without foundation; that he showed undue haste and spoke before securing the requisite information. The 'Citizen's' report, which I have just quoted, is a truthful account of what I said on April 22nd, 1909.

In yesterday's number of that same paper, I notice an account of what that hon. gentleman stated in his report to the House; it is as follows:

On moving the adoption of the committee report in the Robertson divorce case, Senator Kirchhoffer sketched the history of divorce in Canada. He said the committee has been criticised by Senator Cloran and Mr. Ethier, M.P., and it has been declared that divorces were granted on evidence insufficient to 'hang a cat.'

That is another erroneous statement emanating from the hon. senator. Instead of attempting to induce the Senate to censure a member of the House of Commons, who is unable to vindicate himself on the floor of the Senate, why does he not, if he thinks I should be censured, read the words uttered by the hon. leader of the opposition when a Bill was introduced for the relief of John Denison Smith, on May 10th, 1909, page 6070, volume 4, of 'Hansard?'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Chairman of the Committee on Private Bills, I believe, called attention in connection with one of these Bills, to a tendency towards acting on evidence of a more or less loose character in considering these Bills for divorce. I have already taken occasion of informing him privately that I entirely concur with the view he expressed.

So the hon. senator should in all fairness censure the leader of the opposition who held views similar to those given expression by me before the Committee on Private Bills. The hon. leader of the opposition goes on:

Every one who is familiar with the proceedings in courts with regard to such matters is aware that there are some precautions observed in court which do not seem to have received very much attention in the proceedings of the Senate.

At the same sitting of the House, the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) stated in answer to the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean):

I have had some experience in connection with divorce courts in the province of New Brunswick and have read the reports of the Divorce Committee in the Senate. In the latter it seems to me divorces have been granted on evidence which would be laughed at in any ordinary court.

* * * * * * *

I have read the reports and have seen cases in which the question was never even asked as to whether there was any collusion between the parties, and divorces have been granted in cases which were the absolute result of collusion. That would be impossible in proceedings before an ordinary court such as we have in our province.

Here is another hon. member which that hon. senator should get the Senate to censure. I may mention another one.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member when rising to a question of privilege may refer only to what concerns himself and not to any matter in connection with other hon. members.

Mr. ETHIER (Translation). I was about to close, Mr. Speaker, but before resuming my seat I was anxious to quote the opinion of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller). However, I shall abide by your decision.

In conclusion, I submit to the House that no senator should be allowed to cast aspersions, in the way Senator Kirchhoffer has done, on a member of the House of Commons whose work is carried on in conjunction with that of the Senate, and I think the language he used should be condemned. I repudiate all he said. I repudiate the uncalled for statements which he made to the effect that I had censured the Senate; never have I done so, as he stated at the sitting of February 23rd instant.

QUEBEC BRIDGE.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of

Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) whether or not the contract for the construction of the Quebec bridge has been let and, if not, how soon is it expected that will be accomplished. I would like to ask whether there is any truth in the rumour that the chairman of the Quebec Bridge Commission has resigned, and, if so, what is the cause of his resignation?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contract for the Quebec bridge has not yet been let. The chief engineer has resigned. For a year or more he has intimated to me that he intended to resign not later than when the contract was let. He gave several reasons. He has been for the past three months, or for several weeks, at least, quite ill, and he has been pressing upon me more strongly than ever that he must resign. Finally, he, a few days ago, formally handed in his resignation. I regretted very much to accept his resignation. I had been endeavouring for months at different times to prevail upon him to remain on the board and take charge of the work until it was completed. I expect in a very short time to have the contract for the Quebec bridge superstructure signed. When that is done I will be pleased to bring down all the correspondence with reference to it as well as the correspondence concerning the resignation of the chief engineer.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY AND GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY ARBITRATION.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to trouble the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) a little. On the 16th February, last, the minister answered a question which I had put with reference to the commission appointed to settle the differences between the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk railway, but I am sorry to say I did not get much information from that. I asked amongst other things, what were the matters in dispute. And then :

2. What were the points to be determined?
3. What have so far been settled and how?

Answer No. 2 reads in this way :

2. Questions arising under agreement of the 1st February, 1898, confirmed by statutes of 1899, chapter 5, and brought into force on September 26, 1899, in the matter of issue of bills of lading, routeing of freight, diversion of traffic, disputed accounts. The several matters were submitted for arbitration under the provisions of the said agreement, either at the initiation of the Crown or of the company and disposed of by the arbitrators, some in favour of the Crown and others adversely and were practically questions of interpretation of the provisions of said agreement as applying to matters from time to time arising in connection with the operation of the respective railways, subject to the agreement. Other questions submitted were not disposed of by the board of arbitrators, owing to the death of the then chairman, the late Judge Killam, and are now for the consideration of the board of arbitrators as at present constituted.

My question asking how they were settled, the minister states, is answered by No. 2. In answer to the fourth question he says that :

Amount paid by Intercolonial railway to date is $49,737.97.

That is not what I wanted to get at. I would like to get, if it is possible without too much trouble, just a statement of what were the questions in dispute, and as to how each one of these has been settled. I think there was some money question, or some question involving payments to one side or the other, according to the disposition made by the commissioners, and I would like to know how these have been settled, what amounts have been paid to us or what we have had to pay to them? We seem to have incurred a cost of $49,737.97. That is a pretty good sized item—what did we get for all that? Is it possible for the minister to have a full statement prepared which will show what I want to know without giving him too much trouble?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a harder thing to do than the question would seem to indicate.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be.

Mr. GRAHAM. The agreement made, I think, in 1897, in the first place if I remember rightly—

Mr. FOSTER. 1898.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think there were supplementals afterwards. The main agreement was made—

Mr. FOSTER. 1st February, 1898.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the main agreement was before that, and then there were two supplementary agreements. These dealt mostly with such questions as this : How much traffic should be handed over? There is a money consideration but it is difficult to tell just what it is because traffic is given under a certain decision that without the decision we would not have got. It is not a question altogether of dollars and cents as it is a question as to whether the Grand Trunk should hand to us certain traffic at certain places—St. Rosalie, Chaudière Junction and Montreal. There was some dispute as to the traffic to be handed over at one or the other of these points. According as the judgment was in favour of the government road or against it, it would mean traffic for us or not. I had my traffic manager here, and I asked him to get something more in detail for the hon. member for North Toronto. He seems

unable to get it down to detail, and he says that it is just a general decision giving us the right to have traffic handed to us at certain points. It is very hard to bring it down to dollars and cents. I will make further inquiry and see whether I can possibly get it into more concrete shape because it is something more general in its nature than concrete.

Mr. FOSTER. I judge from that that the minister does not see any way by which he can satisfy my thirst for information.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will take 'Hansard' of what my hon. friend has said to-day, wire it to my traffic manager, and see whether I can get something more definite. Some of these things are open yet, and we cannot tell just what they will amount to.

CONFERENCE AT WASHINGTON—FISHERIES REGULATIONS.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) a question with reference to the conference at Washington about the fisheries, the old regulations, and the new regulations, the information in regard to which he will remember he laid on the table of the House at my request, and which was to have been printed. The House passed an order, and I would like to know if it has yet been printed. I thought that the papers would have been printed, and distributed to the members of the House, but all I have seen is this paper which I hold in my hand, and that is not much.

Mr. BRODEUR. The return should have been printed before to-day. We passed an order some weeks ago to the effect that all these papers should be printed. I took occasion to give a list to the clerk of the House including all the papers which we wanted to have printed, and I shall make inquiries and let my hon. friend know.

MANITOBA FISHERIES COMMISSION.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) when we may expect the report of the commission appointed to inquire into the question of the Manitoba fisheries?

Mr. BRODEUR. Professor Prince showed me the report a few days ago. It was to be sent west to be signed by the members of the commission, I suppose he has sent it, and we must expect it in a few days.

Mr. BRADBURY. Will it be laid on the table?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, as soon as it is printed.

FISHERIES PROTECTION SERVICE.

Mr. JAMESON. Mr. Speaker, I drew the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fsheries (Mr. Brodeur) yesterday to a report which stated that the cruiser 'Rainbow' had seized a vessel fishing within the three-mile limit, and I asked if he would be able to give us some information with regard to it. He was not able to do so then, and I would like to ask if he is able to state now whether this reported seizure has actually taken place, what is the nationality of the vessel and what action the department has taken?

Mr. BRODEUR. I intended to give my hon. friend the information, but yesterday when the question was put to me I was not in possession of the official information which I could convey to the House. The 'Rainbow' proceeding along Cape Scott found the 'Edric,' which I presume is an American vessel, because it comes from Seattle, within the three-mile limit.

Mr. HUGHES. Did she catch it?

Mr. BRODEUR. She caught it, yes.

Mr. HUGHES. Good.

Mr. BRODEUR. The commander was instructed to hand over the seized vessel to the inspector of fisheries in the New Westminster district. This has been done as is shown by the following telegram which reached the department yesterday afternoon:

> Have delivered fishing boat to proper authorities. Instructions are requested as to future programme of movements.

The 'Rainbow' has been ordered to continue her cruise and proceedings will immediately be taken under the law to deal with the ship which has been seized.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did the 'Rainbow' overtake the other vessel while the latter was at anchor?

Mr. BRODEUR. She was engaged in fishing operation.

MARKEY FISHING LEASE.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Has what is called the Markey lease on the Nelson river, which runs out of Lake Winnipeg, been cancelled?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is in the hands of the Department of Justice.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How long has it been in charge of that department?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think proceedings are being taken before the courts to have the lease cancelled, and I suppose the case is contested.

Mr. CAMPBELL. At whose instance are proceedings being taken with regard to the cancellation of the lease?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. No proceedings have as yet been instituted in any court. The matter has been one of careful consideration, because it presents features of a very unusual character, and I have not only consulted with Mr. Shepley of Toronto as an advising counsel in the matter, but have put the whole case into his hands for consideration and advice as to the course which ought to be taken. About three months ago Mr. Shepley was suddenly seized with very serious illness, from which he has not yet recovered altogether, and which has made it entirely impossible for him to give any attention to business matters during that time and in consequence no further steps have been taken in regard to this matter. I have thought that if there was any prospect that within any reasonable time Mr. Shepley would be able to give his personal attention to the case it would be more in the public interest that it should remain in its present situation than that anything should be undertaken with regard to it without the advantage of his counsel in the matter.

NORTH ATLANTIC COLLIERIES BOARD.

Mr. MADDIN. Has the Minister of Labour received a protest on behalf of the employees of the North Atlantic Collieries Company in Cape Breton county in regard to the nominee of the company to a proposed board of conciliation under the Industrial Disputes Act. I gather from a newspaper report that such a protest was entered on the ground that Mr. C. O. McDonald, who was nominated by the company, is one of the directors of the company. I would like to know if such a protest has been received by the minister and what course he intends to pursue?

Mr. KING. Such a protest was received. I took immediate steps to ascertain whether the facts as represented were correct. I found they were and we asked the company under the circumstances to kindly nominate another man as I could not accept the recommendation they had made. They did not care to do so, so I named another man, the present Mayor of Sydney Mines.

VENTILATION OF THE CHAMBER.

Mr. HUGHES. I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the ventilation of this chamber. I notice that on some days the members on both sides are alert and bright, while on other days nearly everybody is yawning. To-day happens to be one of the yawning days. I think there must be something wrong with the atmosphere of this chamber. Does the minister keep the exhaust fans as well as the supply fans going at full speed all the time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It might enlighten the House if the hon. gentleman stated where he spent last evening.

Mr. HUGHES. That is a very serious reflection on the minister himself, and in fact on almost every one on the front benches, because four out of the six of them were asleep before I spoke a short time ago. I happen to be one of those who were all right last night.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With these preliminary remarks, I will say to my hon. friend that the rule is, and I think it is strictly observed, to have all the fans going continuously for two and a half hours before the daily sittings of the House and during the sittings.

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

House went into Committee of Ways and Means and adopted a resolution granting $180,000 out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1911.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 128) for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1911.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—DAMMING OF THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. HUGHES. Some time ago I noticed by press reports that the proposition now before the United States Congress to dam the St. Lawrence river had been defeated in the House of Representatives. I noticed subsequently that it had been reintroduced into the Senate and there are rumours to the effect that it is about to be forced through in the hurried work at the close of this session when everything is going through Congress very rapidly. Has the First Minister any information bearing on the matter and have any steps been taken by this government to induce the American Congress not to pass that legislation?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have received no information at all upon the subject. We have taken certain action with respect to this matter which will be brought down to the House as soon as the correspondence is completed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not wish to have any state secrets from the First Min-

ister, but there has been a feeling throughout the Dominion that this is a very important matter. The Prime Minister has never yet intimated whether there has been a protest by the Canadian government on behalf of the Canadian people concerning this matter. The public undoubtedly believe that this is violating the Ashburton Treaty. I am surprised that the Prime Minister will not give the public information as to whether a formal protest has ever been made. It is all well enough to let the matter drift through Congress, but if the First Minister will inform the public that he has entered a formal protest to Washington that this Bill is violating the Ashburton Treaty, then if Congress pass it they are doing it in direct opposition to the protest made by the Prime Minister of Canada on behalf of Canada. In every reply made by the Prime Minister there has been hesitation as to expressing that fact. I cannot see for the life of me why there should be any hesitation. It is quite plain in the Ashburton treaty——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot discuss the question on the orders of the day.

Mr. REID. I simply wish to ask whether the Prime Minister has definitely protested to the President of the United States through Ambassador Bryce, against that Bill going through in violation of the Ashburton Treaty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have nothing to add to the information which I have given already. We have made representations to Mr. Bryce to convey to the American government. We have no intention of withdrawing what we have done, the report has been prepared and will be laid on the table of the House at a very early date, perhaps on Monday.

Mr. HUGHES. There is an understanding in some minds that article 7 of the Ashburton Treaty has been overridden by the legislation in connection with the Waterways Commission. Is the government in a position to give us any information in that regard?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I want to draw the Prime Minister's attention to the fact that Congress will sit only for a few days longer, and one day next week is a holiday. The Prime Minister tells us that he will bring the papers down on Monday, perhaps. That does not mean that we are going to have them on Monday, and we have only a couple of days next week to consider the matter before Congress adjourns. There is no doubt that there never was a more important Bill brought before Congress in so far as the relations between Canada and the United States are concerned, and I cannot understand why the right hon. the Prime Minister should not tell us what instructions he really gave the British ambassador, Mr. Bryce. No doubt these instructions are in the report, and it is only a question of bringing down the report and laying it on the table. If we had the information that the right hon. gentleman had instructed Mr. Bryce to notify the President that the passage of such a measure would be a violation of the Ashburton Treaty, that would be quite satisfactory, but we certainly should have information on that point. This is not the first time that the United States have not lived up to their treaty obligations towards Canada, and we therefore have reason to doubt that they might possibly fail to carry out the reciprocity arrangements now before this House, according to its spirit, if that arrangement should be adopted. If instances were wanting to prove my assertion that the United States government have not always kept faith with Canada, I could easily supply them.

Let me give one or two to show that the United States government have not kept faith with this country, although we have always kept faith with them. Some years ago a treaty was made providing for a reciprocal use of the canals by the two countries. Canada has lived up to that treaty. For instance, a vessel can load at New York, go through the Erie canal and down through the Welland and thence to Ottawa, going through all our canals, and no one questions its right. But I have yet to learn that a Canadian vessel, laden in a Canadian port, has ever been allowed to go through to New York through the Erie canal. I challenge the right hon. the Prime Minister to point to one instance of a Canadian vessel laden in Canada being allowed to go through an American canal. I am informed by marine men that when a Canadian vessel gets to the dividing line, she must unload and transfer her cargo to an American bottom. The reason given by the American government for this breach of faith is that the American canals are owned by separate states. A Canadian vessel is not allowed to go from St. John's to New York through the Erie canal because that canal belongs to the state of New York. Thus by simply transferring their canals to the several states, the United States evade the provisions of a treaty made with Canada. Let me give another instance. According to treaty, no war vessels of either country are to be allowed on the Great Lakes. But what do we find? When the United States government applied for permission for war vessels to go through our canals, they told us that if we did not give that permission they would abrogate the treaty; and rather than have the treaty abrogated, our government allowed these vessels the use of our canals, although of course without

guns. Let me cite still another instance. When the Canadian government said to the United States: You are violating treaty obligations by putting your war vessels on the lakes and thus giving you an advantage over us in case of war, the reply sent by Washington was this. They said: It is not we who are doing this, it is being done by the state of New York; these are training ships which we have given to the states of New York and Minnesota simply to be used for training purposes, and if you do not allow these vessels through your canals, each state will build its own training ships. Thus they fall back on state rights, which are equivalent to our provincial rights. In this way our American cousins evade their treaty obligations, and I could cite other instances. I might refer to the fisheries, but I am not going into any more detail. All I wish to point out is that while Canada has kept faith, the United States have not.

As respects the particular case which I have brought to the attention of the House, it is as plain as possible that a similar evasion is sought to be practised. The Ashburton Treaty shows exactly what was agreed to between the two countries. In that connection a question has been raised about the dam built at Sheik island. Well, I have seen the maps and plans, and that part where Sheik island dam was built is not in the international arrangement at all. In fact the Ashburton Treaty was made after that dam was built, and, therefore, does not apply to it. The very fact that the President of the United States would allow Congress to pass a Bill which is in direct violation of the treaty, would show bad faith on the part of the United States. We are now about to make an arrangement on this reciprocity question. I remember years ago when the United States put up barriers to prevent the carrying out of the arrangement then in force for letting our farm products go in free. By establishing United States consuls at the different points, to whom our people had to pay heavy consul fees, they managed to evade the agreement.

I cannot for one moment believe that when the Bill for the construction of this dam came before Congress, the right hon. the Prime Minister did not immediately wire Ambassador Bryce to notify the President of the United States that such a measure was a violation of the Ashburton Treaty. If the right hon. gentleman did that, he was doing his duty and his people would be satisfied. But if he did it, what objection has he to letting us know? He hesitates, however, and will not give a direct answer, and that causes me to suspect that there is something concealed, something behind, which he does not wish to divulge. We know that some of the strongest friends of the Prime Minister, some of his strongest supporters, are shoving this Bill through at Washington and here.

Mr. HUGHES. Any doubt about that?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Not the slightest, the Prime Minister knows it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Well, he knows that the chief solicitor of this company is Mr. Leighton McCarthy, who sat in parliament here at one time, who is one of the right hon. gentleman's supporters, and helped to keep him in office.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As a lawyer, he does it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He is doing it as a lawyer, and he has got thousands and thousands out of it already. He is here doing his best to shove this through the House, and as he is doing it as a lawyer, no one can blame him for doing it in that way. I am not finding fault with him for performing that duty, because that is a part of his profession as a lawyer. I do not wish to reflect upon him. At the same time, there is no doubt that he is putting pressure upon the minister and his supporters to try to get this Bill through. So, I would like the Prime Minister to give us this information without hesitation. There is no reason why he should hesitate. Should this matter turn out in the way I hope it will not turn out, and should it be found that the Prime Minister has hesitated to defend Canada's rights, even to the extent of asking the President of the United States to see to it that that treaty is carried out, we on this side, and I believe many hon. members on the other side as well, will feel very sorry that that should be the position.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have only to repeat what I said. The government have made representations to Mr. Bryce to be conveyed to the American authorities. I have no hesitation in bringing down the papers. I said they would be brought down. In fact, I may inform the hon. gentleman that I hope to bring them down on Monday. The clerk of the Privy Council handed them to me, and I have them in my desk, but on looking through them I find that some later despatches are not among them. I hope to have these papers added, and to bring the whole down on Monday. And I hope that I shall not lose the goodly opinion of my hon. friend (Mr. Reid, Grenville) when he has had an opportunity to read the papers.

Mr. HUGHES. I have a word to say to the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham). He is one of the ministers who blushed—

Mr. FOSTER. What, what?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes, I reaffirm it—blushed—when the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) was stating that certain gentlemen on this side of the boundary and supporters of the Prime Minister were interested in pushing this thing through. Some strange things develop sometimes—

Mr. GRAHAM. So we see.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not know whether the evidence brought out before the committees at Washington might tend to throw light on this subject or not, but I think the First Minister might properly interest himself in studying some of the evidence which has been brought out before those committees on this very matter. It would prove very interesting reading to the public of Canada. There is a powerful organization behind this concern. Money has been spent, not in thousands or tens of thousands, but in hundreds of thousands—

Mr. REID (Grenville). Millions.

Mr. GRAHAM. Make it billions.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not say that all this has come to this side of the line, but a good deal of it has.

Mr. CARVELL. Who got it?

Mr. HUGHES. Read the evidence as far as it has gone. It will all be produced.

Mr. GRAHAM. Did you say 'Read' the evidence?

Mr. HUGHES. The point I wish to impress on the First Minister is that there is no use locking the stable door after the horse is stolen. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Before that Bill passes the American Congress is the time for this parliament to take action. The government has been notified that legislation has been going on there, promoted by a private company, to interfere with waterways of Canada, in which we have a vital interest. The excuse is made, as I understand it, that the Ashburton Treaty gives them the right to do this. And the instance is cited of the little dam between Sheik island and the Canadian shore. But who will pretend that this is on a par with a dam between Long Sault island or Barnhart island and the American shore? The Ashburton Treaty distinctly states that the channels on each side of Long Sault island and on each side of Barnhart island are inviolable, but it never mentions, directly or indirectly, the little channel between Sheik island and the Canadian shore. These important channels mentioned in the treaty are being interfered with by this proposition at Ottawa. The proposition is to dam the channel between Long Sault island and the American shore, to dam the channel between Barnhart island and Long Sault island, and then to dam the channel between Barnhart island and the Canadian shore. (Yes, as a friend near me suggests, it is a doubly damned institution.) Under this proposition 95 per cent—yes, 97 per cent, I am told—of the electric power will be on the American side. It is mere child's play for any minister of the Crown to tell us that if this legislation is passed at Washington and if these dams are made they will see to it that half the power is reserved for the Canadian side. If power is wanted there is any amount of power available where it will not interfere with navigation. Let them go down to the Coteau, the Cedars, or the Cascades. If they want power, and if you want to make a deal with them let them take the power where there is no navigation, but let them not interfere with the Long Sault channel. I saw by the press the other day that it was reported that already the ice at Cornwall has raised the waters to the extent of 14 feet. If this proposed dam were built the ice floating down from the rapids above would accumulate, and there is no saying what harm might be done. We know what these ice jams and bursts have caused in other parts of the world, and there is no reason to doubt that the disaster caused at this point might be tremendous. But aside from that, there is the interference with the navigation of the river. This is an international channel, and should be preserved as it is. I am surprised that any minister of the Crown of the Dominion of Canada, any responsible person under the British flag, can be found dickering, or even for an instant considering, the question of closing that waterway. This is an important matter, and I would suggest to the Prime Minister—I suppose it would come within his department—to take the matter up, and not only protest against this action going further, but also get copies of the evidence before the committee in Washington and look into the matter. My faith in him is such that I believe that if he had that evidence before him now he would put his foot down and settle the question. Now is the time to stop it. In the United States such Bills as this are slipped through sometimes, just as they are here, without much attention being paid to them. However, so far as we are concerned, we are on our guard. We have had the warning of a certain Bill which was passed through this House. But we are on our guard, and I think that, for the next few years at all events, until suspicion is lulled, there will be pretty close watch kept on the legislation affecting matters along the border. Knowing the danger, it is certainly the duty of this government to protest and to protest in most emphatic language, against the reintroduction of this Bill before the Congress at Washington.

Mr. GRAHAM. I presume that when the correspondence is brought down my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) will see that even his visit to Washington was not necessary to protect the rights of Canada. He let slip one word very significant to me, that there were other water-powers available in that vicinity. I know there are, and we in eastern Ontario hope to get power from some source even if the Sault is never developed. So far as his reference to me is concerned, I am not alarmed about that. But I rose mainly to say a word in answer to my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid). I think that he is in error as to the United States not giving us reciprocal treatment in the use of their canals. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley), I think it was, brought this matter up, discussing correspondence he had had with the State Department, if I remember correctly. At his suggestion, I wrote to the head of the canal department of the state of New York. Speaking from memory, that authority assured me that the canals were free and open to the vessels of Canada, if they desired to use them, as much as to their own vessels, and that the authorities never charged any canal dues on Canadian vessels. I want to make that statement, because I believe it is fair to the United States and to the state of New York.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Do I understand now, that a Canadian vessel can load at a Canadian port and go directly to New York with a cargo of freight? I suppose these little fishing yachts are allowed to go through, I do not refer to them. Am I right in understanding now that there is no doubt that a vessel can load at Ottawa, for instance, go through the Welland canal, on down through the Erie canal to New York, without breaking cargo, so long as the cargo is consigned from Ottawa direct to New York? I ask that question, because one of the largest marine men told me that their vessels were compelled to unload. If that is not the case, then I will inform this marine man, who told me, that he is entirely in error, and I will give the reply of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. GRAHAM. The information, as I remember it, which I received last year from the head of the canal department of the state of New York, is that Canadian vessels have the same free access to their canals as their own vessels.

Mr. HUGHES. They have under federal law, but not under state law.

ICE ON LAKE WINNIPEG.

Mr. BRADBURY. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), to a matter of very serious importance to the navigation of Lake Winnipeg. Last year, owing to an early frost, all the vessels, except one, were frozen in on Lake Winnipeg. This was a very serious matter, and has entailed great loss to owners of steamboats, and endangered the lives of a great many men employed on these boats. The remedy would be for the government to have a boat sufficiently strong at Selkirk, or at the mouth of the river, to keep the river open. I have a resolution here from the Board of Trade at Selkirk, which I wish to place on record. I understand it has already been placed in the hands of the Minister of Public Works:

Whereas all vessels of draught operating upon the waters of Lake Winnipeg require to and do frequently enter the mouth and travel upon the waters of the Red river in order to reach the town of Selkirk, which is the chief harbour and port of entry for Lake Winnipeg, and where all the vessels of the lake have their winter berth and repair station; and

Whereas, owing to the geographical configuration of this portion of the American continent, the Red river of the north will always continue to be the navigable highway and avenue of approach to and exit from Lake Winnipeg for vessels of draught; and

Whereas the navigation of Lake Winnipeg, and the shipping industry of the lake are vast enterprises, having invested therein great sums of money and giving employment to many hundreds of people; and that this industry, and its relative importance to Canada is undoubtedly to greatly increase in the future; and

Whereas the government of the Dominion of Canada has in its wisdom recognized the importance of the navigation of trade and commerce on this lake and its connecting river, and through its Department of Public Works has appropriated and expended great sums of money, and has employed pronounced engineering skill upon the task of maintaining, improving and extending and rendering less hazardous the navigation of this body of water, and does now maintain at Selkirk an important depot of the Department of Public Works for such purpose; and

Whereas all vessels engaged in the fishing industry or in providing for the wants and necessities of those engaged in that industry are compelled, by the very nature of their calling, to ply the lake as late as possible in the fall; this necessity applying especially to the men and vessel or vessels engaged in the collection of spawn for the charging of the fish hatcheries maintained by the government for the perpetuity of the species; and

Whereas the Red river freezes and bocomes closed to navigation some time before the waters of the lake freezes and becomes closed, and that by this circumstance the vessels plying upon the lake are, some years, and especially this year, prevented by ice from entering the Red river, and are compelled to make shift as best they can for the winter upon the open lake, thereby causing great delay, inconvenience and hazard and direct loss; and

Whereas the situation at present upon the lake is that vessels of steam draught, including the government tug, 'Lady of the Lake,' and including all the steam vessels engaged

in the regular traffic of Lake Winnipeg are in the lake and will be compelled to so remain until summer, and that the leading vessel of the lake fleet, the ss. 'Wolverine,' and others, are, and their officers, men, passengers and cargo, at large and its whereabouts unknown at the present moment.

This resolution, I may state, was drawn up before they found out where the 'Wolverine' was:

And whereas this situation is bound to result in great pecuniary loss, and delay, and injury, and possible tragedy to life; and

Whereas a greater portion of this uncertainty and loss and delay and inconvenience and hazard could have been entirely obviated by the presence and action of a vessel suitable for breaking a limited coat of ice and of keeping the Red river and its harbour open for navigation for only a few days; then

Be it hereby resolved that this board extend their thanks and acknowledgment of obligation to the government for the service it has and is rendering to the improvement of navigation in Lake Winnipeg and on the Red river; and that they humbly and earnestly petition the government, in view of the circumstances recited, and other circumstances that may not be recited, but may come, through investigation and inquiry, to its ears; to provide at Selkirk a vessel properly constructed to break the accumulation of early ice that is apt to impede navigation of the Red river, and to keep same plying in said river so long as possible and practicable in the fall and as early as practicable in the spring.

That this board point to and reiterate the prayer in the same matter made November 13, 1905, a copy of which resolution at that time being duly forwarded to the honourable the Minister of Public Works.

And thus your petitioners shall ever pray.

Passed November 15, 1910.

This is signed by the secretary of the Board of Trade. I have also in my hands a letter written to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, by the secretary of the Board of Trade of Winnipeg. It is inclosed in a letter written to myself, which I will just read:

I inclose to you herewith a copy of a letter addressed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (a copy of which has been sent to the hon. the Minister of Public Works) relating to the necessity of having some provision made for a vessel, preferably one belonging to the Dominion government, that is fitted up with steel sheeting or otherwise, to break ordinary ice forming in the late fall on the lower Red river.

This board will be pleased to have you take an interest in this matter and discuss the same with the two ministers.

I am also sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Alexander Haggart, M.P., with whom you might kindly confer.

Here is the letter I referred to addressed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

Mr. BRADBURY.

Winnipeg, January 20, 1911.

The Honourable
The Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—I am instructed by this board to urge that the application of the Selkirk Board of Trade in re provision for the breaking of ice on the lower Red river in the fall season be approved and carried out by your department.

This board strongly urges that some vessel, preferably one owned and operated by a Dominion government department, be suitably reinforced and steel sheeted where necessary, for breaking a reasonable thickness of ice in order to protect the shipping interests of the Red river and Lake Winnipeg when occasion may require; last autumn serious loss was caused to the shipping interests by the early and unexpected freezing up of the river, which prevented vessels out on the lake from reaching their winter quarters at Selkirk.

This board is fully aware of the valuable service rendered to shipping at Fort William and Port Arthur by the tug 'Whelan,' which while used in the ordinary course of business throughout the summer, by its construction and bow protection is enabled to break in ordinary ice in the spring and fall; and there can be no doubt but that the services of this tug, which it is understood is secured by your department, has rendered invaluable aid to shipping, indeed with consequences very far reaching not only to shipping but to grain dealers and the farming community, as well as the general trade of the western country.

Last fall when the Red river froze a number of vessels were still on the lake, and when they came to the mouth of the river they found the channel closed. Anybody who knows anything about the mouth of the Red river will realize the importance of having the channel open. The mouth of the Red river is about 25 miles across, there are different channels and when the mouths of these channels are frozen it is a very hazardous position for vessels to be placed in when they reach the river. It is not impossible, but it is a very great risk, for a vessel to attempt to retrace its course and get back into the open water after it has once entered the channel. There is a channel which has been dredged by the government for many years running for a distance of two miles, and once a vessel enters that channel it is almost impossible to turn and get back again into the open water. The consequence is that last year nearly all of the craft that attempted to navigate that channel had very great difficulty in getting back to deep water. The steamer 'Mikado,' a large boat, the property of one of the big fishing firms on the lake and having something like sixty or seventy men on board, was met by a fierce storm at Swamp island, after failing to get into the river, and in attempting to make the harbour was blown on the rocks. The vessel sank in water

not sufficiently deep to cover it, but sufficiently deep to entail a serious loss of supplies and to the boat itself. The same fate befel the 'Wolverine' in attempting to make harbour. That vessel was also sunk. She was one of the biggest boats on the lake, the boat that His Excellency used when crossing the lake to make that famous trip of his to Hudson bay. I want to impress upon the minister the importance of taking the matter up and providing what the board of trade asks, which is a very reasonable request—a boat so equipped that she can break this ice. I do not think there is any doubt that the tug which is operating in connection with the dredging at the mouth of the Red river —if it is a proper tug, although I do not know what condition it is in—could be sheeted with steel and strengthened in the bow this winter so as to fit her to do that work. This would entail a very small expense. I understand that the government have in contemplation the building of a new boat. If that is so I would strongly urge upon the minister to arrange that this boat shall be constructed so as to be capable of keeping the Red river open at a reasonable expense. I do not ask the government to provide a regular ice-breaker to break ice eight or ten inches thick; all I ask is a boat to break four or five inches of ice. Our present boats cannot go through three or four inches of ice without having their planking torn and the boat likely sunk.

In connection with this matter I would like to urge upon the minister also to provide better harbours nearer the mouth of the river than we have at the present time. I drew the attention of the minister last year to the question of extending Gimli dock about 100 feet. This would entail the expenditure of $8,000 or $10,000 at the outside, a sum sufficient to provide for the extension of the harbour and do all the dredging that would be necessary to make a first-class harbour at that point should be provided this session. This is a very important harbour and occupies a very important position on Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question of building wharfs on Lake Winnipeg has been referred to the Committee of Supply. I should think that my hon. friend would be out of order in discussing this matter now.

Mr. BRADBURY. Well, I was just referring to this in connection with the other matter. Of course, if I am out of order——

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will have ample opportunity when we come to those items.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would like to urge the minister——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume he will have an opportunity again in Supply.

Mr. BRADBURY. I presume I will if I am in the House, but I would like to urge upon the minister the necessity of making provision for these urgent improvements, and if he is not in a position to make a definite statement to the House to-day I trust he will do so when the time comes to discuss the estimates. I thought I had his pledge last year, but it was not carried out.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some time ago the petition of which my hon. friend has read a copy, was sent to me from the Board of Trade of Selkirk, and I also received a request from the secretary of the Board of Trade of Winnipeg urging that an ice-breaker should be provided for the purpose of breaking the ice at the mouth of the Red river and also at Lake Winnipeg. As the matter of employing tugs for ice-breaking purposes in other sections of Canada had been attended to by the Department of Marine and Fisheries and not by the Department of Public Works I referred the petition to my colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and advised the Selkirk Board of Trade and also the secretary of the Board of Trade of Winnipeg that the matter was one which did not appertain, in my opinion, to my department but appertained to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The tug 'Whelan,' which is employed for breaking the ice in the harbour of Port Arthur and Fort William and perhaps at other points on Lake Superior, is employed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries and not by the Department of Public Works, and so it is with regard to ice-breaking upon the St Lawrence. The matter rests entirely with the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I have referred the matter to my colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; he is not in his place at the present moment, but I have no doubt the question will receive his very careful consideration. I shall take occasion to call his attention to the remarks which my hon. friend has made and which will appear in 'Hansard' where he will have an opportunity of seeing them. I think that on his behalf I can say to my hon. friend that the matter will receive very careful consideration. We all recognize the great importance of the Red river between the city of Winnipeg and its mouth and also the great importance of Lake Winnipeg and also the importance of doing what we reasonably can to assist the navigation of the lake and the Red river and of making navigation as safe as possible. Therefore, I am sure my hon. friend can rely upon the request of the Selkirk people receiving very careful consideration.

Mr. BRADBURY. I notice the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) in his place now. I was just drawing the attention of the House to the matter of providing a boat for keeping the Red river

open. I understand that the chief engineer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries was sent up to investigate and the word that I got from Selkirk was that he stated that it was a matter for the Public Works Department. That is why I referred my remarks to the Minister of Public Works to-day. There is a very urgent request and resolution and I would like to know if the minister can give me any encouragement that that boat will be provided for that important work.

Mr. BRODEUR. No report has yet been made to me with regard to this ice breaker When the question was brought to my attention some time ago I gave immediate instructions to have a report made. That report has not yet reached me. As soon as I get it I shall communicate it to my hon. friend.

WESTERN ONTARIO DAIRYMEN AND RECIPROCITY.

Mr. LALOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a letter which I received yesterday, and which reads:

Cambro, Ont., Feb. 21, 1911.

Mr. F. R. Lalor, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Lalor,—When I wrote you yesterday I had not read the report of the debate—

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman can refer to that now because we are going into Supply, while the subject to which the letter refers has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. I think it would be irregular now to read the letter.

Mr. LALOR. It is a correction about a statement made in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. As a correction of a statement I presume it would be admissible.

Mr. LALOR. The letter reads:

When I wrote you yesterday I had not read the report of the debate in the House regarding reciprocity, and I notice on page 3826 that the hon. Mr. Paterson replying to Mr. Armstrong states 'that the Dairy Association of Eastern and Western Ontario unanimously desired that this treaty should go into affect.'

This statement is absolutely incorrect in so far as the Dairymens' Association of Western Ontario is concerned. I am a director of that association and have been for over twenty years. I was present in Stratford when this question was introduced. The facts are as follows: After the convention was opened a couple of farmers came to myself and one or two others, asking that we put this question on our programme to be discussed during the convention, before deciding in regard to the advisability of doing so. We consulted every director and officer of the association and we unanimously agreed not to permit the question to go on the programme of the convention for discussion. As there was not one man on the board who believed the measure would be in the best interest of the dairy industry of this province, we told these men that if they wished to discuss this question they would have to do so altogether independent of the association. They then asked permission to bring this question up at the close of the afternoon session of the first day of the convention, this was granted and after the session of the convention was closed, a gentleman on the floor of the convention hall moved and another seconded his resolution, that Mr. Scott our president act as chairman while those present would discuss the question of reciprocity. Mr. Scott was accordingly elected chairman of the meeting, when these two men, Mr. Behn of Oxford county and Mr. Rice of Norfolk county, introduced a resolution that they believed it would be in the best interests of the dairy industry of this country, to have reciprocity between the United States and Canada. In the discussion of this question there was not one word spoken by any officer of the Dairymens' Association of Western Ontario in favour of it, and there was not one who voted for the resolution, in fact there was less than twenty in the entire audience who voted for the resolution.

I thought I would give you these facts, so that if the opportunity presented itself you could put the Minister of Customs right in regard to the attitude of the Dairymens' Association of Western Ontario.

Sincerely yours,
J. N. PAGET.

INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE AT HAWKESBURY.

Mr. PERLEY. On the 7th of December last, I asked a question with regard to the proposed highway bridge between Hawkesbury, Ontario, and Grenville, Quebec. In reply the minister said:

With reference to the bridge across the Ottawa river at Hawkesbury, Ont., the delay in this matter has been on account of the approach to the bridge on the Ontario side.

He went on to say that this was the natural place for the crossing to be made and afterwards said:

Although I do not think there is anything in writing, it has been understood all along, or at least expected, that the town of Hawkesbury would arrange with the Hawkesbury Lumber Company for a right of way through their property giving an approcah to the bridge and, I may say, it is the custom for municipalities to do this.

The minister explained there was some trouble between the town of Hawkesbury and the Hawkesbury Lumber Company in regard to their assessment, and that was probably the reason why nothing had been done. There is a special and peculiar need for a bridge across the Ottawa at this particular point. There is no highway bridge across the Ottawa river below the city of Ottawa and the consequence is that the people up and down the Ottawa river on both sides would use this bridge if it were built. In the summer they get along very well

with ferries, and in the middle of winter by using the ice, but between seasons, in the fall and spring, there is always a longer or shorter period when it is impossible for any one to cross the Ottawa with safety. The consequence is that there have been a great many accidents in the fall and spring and people have lost their lives in attempting to cross the river. This matter was all laid before the minister I think twice and all these reasons given, and the minister stated he believed it was in the public iinterest that this bridge should be built. I submit that the reason given by the minister in this answer for not going on with the building of the bridge is a poor one. He states that it is the custom for the municipalities to arrange for the right of way for such bridges.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, for the highway to the bridge, the approach to the bridge.

Mr. PERLEY. For the right of way to the bridge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is to connect with the main highway.

Mr. PERLEY. For the right of way to the bridge. I doubt very much whether there is any such custom, and I do not think the minister can show that there is in cases of this kind. If it is in the public interest that the bridge should be built the authorities who are to build the bridge must surely provide the approaches to the bridge as well as the bridge itself. I am surprised at the minister giving a reason of that kind, when I remember what he has stated in this House several times with reference to the public buildings which he is putting up in this country. Not long ago when a public building was being discussed the minister stated with great emphasis that he would never think of asking a municipality to provide a site for the building, and surely there is more reason why the government should provide the approaches to a bridge which is evidently in the public interest.

Mr. SPROULE. Why not build one like the Disraeli bridge?

Mr. PERLEY. I leave that to the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is hardly courageous to do that. Why does not the hon. gentleman reply to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule)?

Mr. PERLEY. The minister is well able to take care of himself, and the kind of bridge provided at Disraeli did not throw any credit on the minister's department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for East Grey is trying to throw ridicule on this bridge and the member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) should resent that.

Mr. PERLEY. Not at all, the hon. member for East Grey is bringing to the attention of the minister the fact that he built a bridge for a municipality and called it a wharf, he showed himself willing to do that in Disraeli even although it did not come within his proper scope.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister did not happen to do that.

Mr. PERLEY. If the land belonging to the Hawkesbury Lumber Company should be expropriated for this bridge, it seems to me the minister should go on and take the necessary proceedings to expropriate. If, on the contrary, it is considered best that the bridge should be put somewhere else under the circumstances, to serve the people of these two counties, I have a map of that section of the river and there are other places where a bridge could be built. I think something should be done about that. The bridge is a great necessity, it is not a matter of politics at all, it has been taken up by all sections of the people, and has been agreed to by the minister. I want to urge on the minister to take steps to get this bridge built as soon as possible and I will ask him if he will not do so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is quite true that this bridge has been decided upon. It is to be built at the joint expense of the governments of Quebec, Ontario and the Dominion, the Dominion contributing the lion's share. When this matter was urged upon me, as it was very strongly, by the hon. gentleman who represents the constituency on the Quebec side with the hon. member for the county of Prescott, I was led to understand that the municipality would be likely to provide the highway, giving the approach to the bridge. I rather inferred also that the Hawkesbury Lumber company were likely to give a right of way through their property, either free or at a low cost, Since that time, some difficulty has arisen between the Hawkesbury Lumber company and the town of Hawkesbury. I believe the assessment of the company's property has been considerably raised, and they have not towards the town council, the same good feeling which they had when this bridge was originally proposed. My own view is, that it is not at all unreasonable, when the three governments are undertaking, at a large expense, to build a bridge for the accommodation of the people of the locality that the municipality should provide a highway that would give the approach to the bridge from the main highway. That has been done in other cases. However, I am not without hope that the previously friendly relations between the company and the town may be restored, and that the arrangement, as originally proposed, may be carried out. If in the coming spring that appears unlikely to take place, then it will be my duty to consider the question of obtaining another

location for the bridge. I hesitate about expropriating a right of way through the company's property without its consent. This might involve the Crown in an expense away beyond what we had anticipated the bridge would cost us. I intend to take the matter up in the spring or early summer, in the hope that a satisfactory arrangement may be arrived at.

Mr. PERLEY. I may say that I was at two meetings, and I never noticed that there was any arrangement, express or implied, by which the Hawkesbury Lumber company would give a free right of way or a right of way at a low cost. Is the minister quite sure that there was such an understanding ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps the hon. member for Prescott, who is familiar with the details of the matter, can give some information with regard to it.

Mr. PROULX. I understand that the Hawkesbury Lumber company have never promised a right of way, but we had hoped that the town council would arrange with the company to get a right of way. Last year the town had a lawsuit with the company about the assessment, and the company were not disposed to grant the right of way. They told the Hawkesbury Bridge Committee that if they wanted the right of way, they would have to expropriate. I think it is still their intention that the government or the town will have to expropriate the right of way.

Mr. PERLEY. Then the Hawkesbury Lumber company's refusal to grant the right of way had nothing to do with the dispute between them and the town regarding taxes ?

Mr. PROULX. No. The assessment of the company was increased before there was a request made to it by the town.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BRADBURY. I notice in the Ottawa 'Free Press,' of this date, the following reference to myself:

> In the House of Commons yesterday, Dr. Clark secured from Mr. Bradbury, the Conservative member for Selkirk, an admission that he was opposed to reciprocity and a declaration that the men who had organized the grain growers' deputation in December last were members of a 'political machine.'

I want to say that this is a misconstruction of what I said. What I did say was, that the Grain Growers' organization was the political end of the grain growers' of Manitoba. The article goes on to say:

> Now, human memory is often erratic, but it comes to our mind that when the great grain growers' delegation was nearing Ottawa to demand reciprocity, a deputation of western Conservative M.P.'s went 'up the line' to meet them, and to extend the hand of co-operation against 'the tariff tyranny of the Liberal government's tariff. There were eight of them and they may have included George Bradbury. They certainly included the other leaders of Conservative opinion west of the lakes, and as there are only a dozen of them all told, it is a fair presumption that George Bradbury was one of the contingent. He was certainly active enough when the delegates were down here in endeavouring to impress upon them the opinion that he was heart and soul in sympathy with their demands.

Now, I just want to say that when the delegation were here, their demand was not for reciprocity, but for a reduction of duties, and I was in hearty sympathy with that demand.

> What has happened since to change his views? Has the word come from the twin bosses of Manitoba, Rogers and Roblin, that the grain growers are to be thrown to the wolves and are to be represented as a body of disloyal annexationists?

I want to say just a word regarding my attitude when the delegation was here. I was in hearty sympathy with the demand of the Grain Growers' Association when they were asking this government for a reduction of the duty on farm implements, which is something that every man from Manitoba on this side of the House supports. The question of reciprocity is another question. I did not say that I was opposed to reciprocity. I stated that I was opposed to reciprocity, as proposed by the present government. I am absolutely opposed to it, and I want my constituents to know it. I want my constituents to know it, for I am not going behind doors. My opposition is open and above board.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What kind of reciprocity?

Mr. BRADBURY. I will tell you when the time comes. What I want to do is to set the 'Free Press' right, which I am sure has no intention of misrepresenting me or putting a false construction on my attitude. There is no man from the west, Manitoba or the territories, who has stood out more firmly for the rights of the farmers than I have. When a resolution was before the Chair asking for what the farmers require more than reciprocity, namely, government-owned and operated terminal elevators, the Conservative members were found standing by my hon friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) and endeavouring to induce the government to adopt the resolution moved by him. They have also been found standing by the farmers in other matters, which are more important to the agriculturists of Manitoba and the west than this question of reciprocity as proposed by this government. I have no hesitation in saying that this proposition

of the government is simply a gold brick offered the farmers of the northwest, and it will not be my fault if they do not find it out before it is too late.

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

SUPPLY.

Conciliation and labour, including publication, printing, binding and distribution of the 'Labour Gazette,' and allowance to correspondents, $27,300.

Mr. GOODEVE. I would ask the Minister of Labour if he has had any communication asking for certain amendments to the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act of 1907?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). I received yesterday from one of the hon. members of this House a communication transmitting some proposed amendment. That is the only one I have received this session to that effect.

Mr. GOODEVE. I have received a communication from the Moyie Miners' Union No. 71 with regard to clause 56 of the Act. They suggest that this clause should be amended to read as follows:

Provided, that it shall be unlawful for any employer, incorporated company or corporation to close down their industries and then resume operations under changed conditions of employment, without first giving prominent notice in the local newspaper at least thirty days prior to the resumption of operations.

The object of this is to prevent an evasion of the Act. Under clause 56 it is unlawful to have a lockout, but the same thing has been brought about in another way. An employer may, for instance, close down his works, without giving any particular reason or possibly for some reason entirely outside the matter in dispute, and then, when it suits him, reopen it under changed conditions. Has the attention of the minister been called to that particular weakness in the Act?

Mr. KING. The same proposition came in the communication I received from the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell). I shall certainly consider it very carefully. My impression at the moment is that if action of that kind were taken the company would be liable, under the Act as it stands. If my contention be right there is no need to amend the Act, but that is a matter on which I should like to have the opinion of the Justice Department.

Mr. GOODEVE. I agree that the object of the Act is to prevent any such violation, but evidently the labour organizations have not found it altogether effective. Possibly the minister, after considering the wording of the Act, may deem it necessary to amend it in the way suggested. I am very glad that he is taking the question up with the Justice Department, and trust that if he finds what is pointed out is really the case he will make the necessary amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. How many copies of the 'Labour Gazette' are printed, and to whom are they sent? How many correspondents are there, and how are they paid? Where is the 'Labour Gazette' printed and bound and what does the printing and binding cost?

Mr. KING. In the vicinity of 16,000 copies are published every month. There is a paid subscription list of nearly 10,000. A distribution is made to members of both Houses, copies are sent out occasionally for the purpose of getting other subscriptions, free copies are also sent to departments of government in other countries and to newspapers in exchange for their publications; also to the public libraries educational institutions, labour organizations and Boards of Trade.

Mr. DANIEL. Are they sent to every newspaper in the country?

Mr. KING. Yes. The number of correspondents is 52, and they are paid $100 each per year. They are occasionally called upon to make special reports. For example, the department may be collecting information as to prices and the cost of living. This is in the nature of additional work to their regular duties, and, in such cases, an extra allowance is made to these correspondents of $25 for the work done in that connection through the year. I do not recollect if there were any other questions—

Mr. DANIEL. What revenue does the government receive from those who subscribe to the 'Labour Gazette?'

Mr. KING. Last year, the revenue from this source was $1,547.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the subscription price $1 a year?

Mr. KING. No, 20 cents a year.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I understood there were 16,000 copies issued. The figures would indicate that about 10,000 copies were paid for, leaving 6,000 free.

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I hardly think the explanation the minister has given would account for these 6,000 copies.

Mr. KING. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) understands that there are copies kept in the department for purposes of binding and to meet future demands. There are also some 1,800 labour organizations in the country, and many newspapers. There is also a large exchange,

list. I might say the 'Labour Gazette' is sent to the different statistical bureaus of European countries, and other countries throughout the world.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I suppose the minister could state the numbers used in these ways?

Mr. KING. I have the figures here. Last year the exchange list of departments of government, including federal, provincial and British and foreign governments numbered 509; trade papers and labour journals 167; public libraries and libraries of educational institutions 125; members of the House of Commons, 221; members of the Senate, 87; boards of trade, 276; newspapers, 1,075; labour organizations—Nova Scotia, 160; Prince Edward Island, 11; New Brunswick, 83, Quebec (copies sent both in English and in French) 610; Ontario, 770; Manitoba, 106; Saskatchewan, 14; Alberta, 131; British Columbia, 222; a total of labour organizations, 2,174. This is a larger number than I thought.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like the minister to give the House some information as to the object of this 'Labour Gazette.' What is its purpose?

Mr. DANIEL. Before the minister goes on with that, I would like him to finish answering the questions I asked. I asked where the 'Labour Gazette' was printed, and whether the work was done by tender or not, how many copies were printed, and the cost of printing?

Mr. KING. That question, I am afraid I would have to refer to the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy). The department of labour makes its contract with the government Printing Bureau for the printing of the 'Labour Gazette.' Accounts are sent by the Printing Bureau to the Labour Department, and paid by the department. I understand that the 'Labour Gazette' is printed at the 'Free Press' printing office in this city, but that is by arrangement which the King's Printer has made in accordane with rules made at the Bureau.

The sitting of the committee was suspended.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the secretary of His Excellency the Governor General the following communication:

Ottawa, February 24, 1911.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the right hon. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick acting as deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber this afternoon at five o'clock, for the purpose of giving assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and the House of Commons during the present session.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

C. J. JONES,

Assistant Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable,

The Speaker of the House of Commons.

A message was received from His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General by the gentleman usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of your honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate chamber.

The House having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that when this House did attend His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, His Honour was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal assent to the following Bill:

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1911.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Mr. KING. I have here the figures of the cost of printing the 'Labour Gazette' for the last fiscal year. The 'Labour Gazette' is printed in both English and French. The printing of the English edition cost $11,544.80, of the French edition $5,704.16. In addition to printing the 'Gazette,' at the end of each year the 'Gazette' is bound, and an index is prepared for the use of subscribers, and this costs $190.07. That cost includes the paper.

Mr. DANIEL. So the cost per volume of these twelve copies for the year is $1.20 for printing, and as the minister gives it to subscribers for 20 cents a year, subscribers get off pretty cheap under those circumstances. Perhaps it is the intention that the 'Labour Gazette' should not be self-supporting?

Mr. KING. I may say that in some countries similar publications are distributed free of charge. The purpose in fixing any amount is not to bring in a revenue at all; it is simply to insure the fact that whoever asks for the 'Gazette' is likely to have some real desire for it.

Mr. DANIEL. Who makes terms with the 'Free Press,' or whatever concern prints it?

Mr. KING. I understand the King's Printer fixes the terms in accordance with

a rule he adopts at the Government Printing Bureau. There is a rule governing all printing which is done outside, and the King's Printer follows this rule with regard to the 'Labour Gazette.'

Mr. HENDERSON. I must congratulate the Minister of Labour on his extreme liberality. I wish some other departments would take this leaf out of his book. I had occasion a few days ago to ask the Minister of Agriculture for a copy of the bulletin with respect to seeds in Canada, and I received from him a very courteous reply —I do not complain of it at all—telling me that I had had three copies before, and if I would send a dollar down to the King's Printer I could get another copy. I asked it for a friend, perhaps that was the reason why he suggested that I should pay a dollar for it. If I had not mentioned that probably he might have given it. But I wanted it for a student at the Guelph Agricultural College, who desired to make use of it in preparing for his examination. I put it that way to the Minister of Agriculture, thinking, perhaps, I would appeal to his generosity. But he appears to have no respect for students at agricultural colleges, at any rate he does not treat them in the same way that the Minister of Labour treats his friends. I merely make mention of this in the House to give it all the publicity I can, because I think it was a very small matter on the part of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Would the Minister of Labour please tell us some of the purposes that this 'Labour Gazette' is intended to subserve?

Mr. KING. The main purpose is to gather information in regard to the industrial and labour conditions of the Dominion, and in respect to all matters likely to be of concern to employers and employees. This information is gathered by means of correspondents, who send in monthly reports. These correspondents are located in different cities of the Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The trade journals and the press are carefully reviewed, and any items that appear to have a bearing upon labour conditions are carefully classified and compiled in the department. Statistics are also collected by special investigation, these are made up in the form of tabular statements. For example, each month the 'Labour Gazette' contains a review of the industrial and labour conditions of the particular industries, agriculture, mining, lumbering and the like. Then it takes up the conditions in different trades, and this information is prepared in accordance with general form, beginning at the Atlantic and running across the continent. Then there is information of a special nature; for example, industrial accidents, statistics gathered and classified, and at the end of the year a statement is made up showing the total number of these accidents and the causes in each case. A similar method is followed in regard to strikes and lockouts. Also, changes in rates of wages and changes in hours of labour, formation of employers labour organizations, so far as is possible to get them, are mentioned and classified and compiled, also, legal decisions affecting labour, &c. All data of this kind is so shaped at the outset that at the end of the year it may be possible to make statistical tables that will show the trend of industrial development for that year. Then, over a period of years the intention is to classify still further, in some cases in the form of charts, and these charts are printed in the annual report, or in special publications. I have in my hand the bound volume of the 'Labour Gazette' from July, 1909, to 1910. It is a volume of 1,500 pages with a carefully prepared index. To show the scope of the work, I might read some of the subjects in the index: Industrial accidents, adulteration of foods, arbitration, annuities, meetings of labour associations, building trades, accidents, changes in wages, hours of labour, &c. That is the nature of the information. The department has in mind, in gathering and compiling this information, to furnish the country with what would serve as a basis of an industrial history of the Dominion. There is no attempt to express opinions in the 'Gazette'; it is simply a compilation of data, which can be used by persons who desire it for reference.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I understand that the reports are sent in by agents all over the country, and these are edited in the department, and the department sends out what they see fit, and suppresses what they see fit. I think any one who reads the 'Labour Gazette' must come to the conclusion that one of the chief objects of its existence is to advertise the department.

Mr. KING. I would not like to take issue with my hon. friend except as regards one of his expressions, when he suggests that the department is 'suppressing' information. I may say that the practice has been followed in the department carefully to edit the reports sent in by correspondents, and to see that they do not contain grammatical errors, or items that it would not be proper to print. But in the department the original reports sent in are kept, and any members of the House who desire to see any of the reports sent in during the previous year can do so; they are all available to members for investigation. There is no intention to suppress any information.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Or to advertise the department?

Mr. KING. There is no intention to advertise the department. There is a desire to have the department's work known to the country. It would be of very little service to the community if the community knew nothing about it. To that extent, I suppose, the department follows the practice of any other organization.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would like to ask the minister what principle is followed in the selection of the places to be served by correspondents ?

Mr. KING. The department has tried to follow a general rule and confine the appointment of correspondents to localities that are either incorporated cities, or that have a population of 10,000 or more, and in some cases, where it has appeared that there are large industrial interests that could not be covered in that way, a district has been mapped out and a correspondent has been appointed for that particular district.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Would the minister say whether he has a correspondent at Prince Rupert, and if not, whether he thinks a correspondent there would give useful service.

Mr. KING. The department has no correspondent at the present time at Prince Rupert, but I think the suggestion that my hon. friend makes, if he intends it as a suggestion, is one worthy of careful consideration. Prince Rupert promises to be an important centre, and I think I might say to my hon. friend that if he cares to recommend the appointment of a correspondent there, I would be prepared to appoint one.

Mr. TAYLOR. (New Westminster). As Prince Rupert is in the district represented by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman), it might come with rather bad grace on my part to make any recommendation——

Mr. KING. I would be prepared to accept it.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster)—— but certainly it is a point where, I think, there should be a correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette,' because there are a great many problems connected with labour constantly demanding attention and, although an officer of the labour department went to Prince Rupert during last year and made a very interesting report on conditions there, I think it would be well to supplement that report with regular monthly reports from a correspondent, because at Prince Rupert conditions are in a formative state, and they are not so well regulated as they are in older communities. It seems to me that this is one point where the services of a correspondent ought to be more valuable than at general points.

Mr. CROSBY. I notice that the 'Labour Gazette' bears the union label.

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. Is it printed in a union shop ?

Mr. KING. I cannot say offhand whether the shop that prints it is a union shop or not, as I have not inquired into the question.

Mr. CROSBY. What authority would you have to put the union label on, if it were not printed in a union shop ?

Mr. KING. I understand that the conditions that prevail at the bureau are conditions that the union regard as satisfactory, or as coming up the standard.

Mr. CROSBY. The Minister of Labour certainly understands what I mean by asking if this is a union shop. I want to know if every man who works in this shop, is a union man and whether this label is rightly put on the 'Gazette' or whether it is put on in some irregular way, to indicate that it comes from a union shop when, as a matter of fact, it may not.

Mr. KING. As I understand, the union label is controlled by the Allied Printing Trades, and they allow its use by shops that comply with the conditions. I presume the shop that prints the 'Labour Gazette' must comply with those conditions, or those who control the label would not have permitted it to be used by that shop.

Mr. CROSBY. Then they would have the consent of the Allied Printing Trades ?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. This item also refers to the conciliation of labour, and I would like to ask a few questions with reference to that. I think it has already been stated in connection with some of the strikes in Nova Scotia that the only difficulty about their settlement is, that the companys have decided that they will not hire men who happen to be members of a certain organization and that they will not employ them unless they belong to some other organization that they may designate. To make my meaning plain, I understand that the United Mine Workers' Association is the association which prevails in Springhill, Nova Scotia, and that a large number of men in the county of Cape Breton also belong to that organization. I understand that the management of the Springhill company have decided that they will not employ men who are members of the United Mine Workers' Association.

Mr. KING. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Crosby) is mistaken in that view of it. At least I have been informed by Mr. Butler, who is the present manager of the Springhill mines, that he has no objection to the men belonging to whatever organization they please. They may belong to the United Mine Workers' Association if they wish to do so, but he is not prepared to deal with them as union men. He allows them the privilege of belonging to the union if they wish to do so, but he refuses to enter into an agreement with the union as a union. That is the position as Mr. Butler stated it to me only a few weeks ago.

Mr. CROSBY. That being the case, has Mr. Butler, or Mr. Anybody Else, any right to dictate to the workingmen as to what organization they may belong to so long as the organization does not conflict with the interests of, or become a nuisance to, the employers of labour? Would they be acceptable to him if they belonged to the Provincial Workingmen's Association?

Mr. KING. As I understand it, Mr. Butler does not raise the question, in taking a man into his employ, whether he belongs to the Provincial Workingmen's Association or the United Mine Workers' Association. He stated that it was a matter of indifference to him whether the men were members of a Provincial Workingman's Association or of the United Mine Workers' Association; the contract he would make with them would be a contract irrespective of the organization to which they belonged. He would allow every workingman to join whatever organization he pleased, but he did not propose to confine his own liberty in the matter of taking men into employment to taking men belonging to any particular organization, and refusing to take men who might belong to another organization.

Mr. CROSBY. It is evident from the information I have received from the minister that the whole thing hinges on this small, miserable question of whether a man belongs to this organization or to another organization, and that Mr. Butler, at the head of the Springhill mines will not treat with some men because they belong to a workingman's association headed by some letters instead of an organization headed by some other letters. I appeal to the Minister of Labour to exercise some influence with these men. It must be remembered that the coal mined by the Springhill company is owned by the people of the province of Nova Scotia, and is worked by that company under lease for a certain time under certain conditions. It is true that these conditions are made by our local legislature, but it must be remembered that we have in the Dominion government a Department of Labour whose duty it is to deal with matters affecting the interests of labour. I was very pleased when that department was established and a special minister with full cabinet rank, placed at its head. The more you can do to improve the conditions of labour and of labouring men, the better it is for the country in which those men reside. It seems to me very petty for a company receiving a charter and a lease under which it mines this coal, to declare what is practically a lockout on the question of what labour union or organization the men shall belong to. Since the amalgamation of the Dominion Coal Company with the Springhill Company it is necessary for the men to combine together in such a way that they may be able to off set that great combination of capital. It has been said by Mr. Butler, the new manager, for whom I have a great respect, that he considers this question of whether the men do or do not belong to the United Mine Workers, a childish one. If it is childish why should this great financial combination say so and say to the men: Go to work. Then we will have the men at work instead of being locked out with a constant continuation of strife existing in one of the most prosperous districts of Nova Scotia. The late manager, Mr. Cowan, stated when the strike was brought on that the company was quite pleased to have it as they were not making money and were glad to have the mines closed, but that apparently was not altogether correct because the company concluded they must get the mine going and they commenced to get labour and carry on the work. I appeal to the minister to get this thing settled. I have personal knowledge that the only question in the way is this one of the men belonging to the United Mine Workers' Association, and it is a mere quibble to say that that is sufficient to justify the continuation of the strike. We have really had more trouble since the inauguration of the Labour Department than before. I am sorry to have to say that, but it is true and I do hope that the minister of Labour will make very strenuous efforts to bring about a settlement. There have been a number of boards of conciliation on this strike, but apparently it has not been possible to act on or enforce the report of any one of these boards. If that is the case, then the boards were simply a means of spending money. The men would have as much right to object to the amalgamation of the two coal companies as the coal companies have to say to what labour organization the men should belong.

Mr. McCRANEY. Would it not be perfectly proper for the employee to say that because these two companies have amalgamated he would not work for either of them.

Mr. CROSBY. The workingmen are not saying that. My statement is that the coal being mined by these companies belongs to the province of Nova Scotia, that under the terms of their lease they are to carry on mining under certain conditions; therefore it is more or less like a public franchise, and I say that the miner or workingman would have as much right to say that there should be no combination of companies, as the companies have a right to say to these men, because you have formed yourselves into an organization for the protection of yourselves, your homes and your families, we will not treat with you as an organization, and you must disband and separate yourselves from it before we will treat with you at all. To my mind that is a miserable quibble which no self-respecting company should use; but if the companies say that, it is up to the government of the province of Nova Scotia and the government of the Dominion of Canada to see to it that the people who are assisting these companies to make the money which pays the dividends on many millions of watered stock, shall get their rights; and the only way they can get their rights as workingmen is to be returned to their work in the mines. It is only a quibble to object to their organization being headed by the letters United Mine Workers or Provincial Workingmen's Association or any other letters, so long as the organization is open to the public. I have every hope that before many days are over the Minister of Labour will be able to tell us that the men have returned to work, or give us some reason why they have not, because after all the boards that have sat on this question there should be some decision by this time. If the Minister of Labour finds that it is essential for him to communicate with the government of the province of Nova Scotia on this matter, I hope that within a very short time the influence of the two governments will result in our people being put back to work. If it does, it will be an advantage not only to the province of Nova Scotia, but to the Dominion of Canada at large.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

ALL RED STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the All Red Steamship Company.—Mr. McKenzie.

On section 9, as amended, expropriation powers.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In cases of expropriation under this Act, how will values be arrived at? I suppose that the company can expropriate only private property and not government property?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Railway Act provides the machinery. They file expropriation plans, and values are fixed by arbitration. This is a pretty wide power of expropriation given to this company.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the first time I have seen the Bill. This seems to be merely a shipping company, and I think the expropriation powers here proposed are unusually wide—the company may expropriate docks, wharfs, piers, elevators.

Mr. GRAHAM. Only in case they are 'required in connection with the construction of its docks, piers, wharfs and other works.'

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not aware of any other similar company having been given such powers. I do not see the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) who has charge of the Bill in his place. For my part, I would rather have the consideration of the Bill deferred.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I agree with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). I do not wish to do anything to prevent the Bill going through. But my reason for calling attention to the matter was that it seemed to me these powers were very wide. I do not see any objection to the company taking necessary land by expropriation, but these powers to expropriate wharfs, piers, elevators and so on may involve hardships to others. The company might cause great trouble in Montreal, for instance. I do not know whether, even under this clause, they could expropriate the government elevator, or even the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Canadian Pacific Railway elevators. But, apparently, in the case of a private individual or company operating an elevator or other work of that kind, this company could step in and take it over under expropriation powers with the value fixed under arbitration. As the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill is not present, I would move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. GRAHAM. We might put through the other clauses, and then let the Bill stand. That would save time.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then, the minister (Mr. Graham), I suppose, will take up this expropriation question with the promoter of the Bill and try to get that clause in better shape.

Mr. GRAHAM. This Bill came before the Private Bills Committee, not the Railway Committee. And in committee they have inserted these words relating to elevators and so on, these not being in the

original Bill. Perhaps the promoter of the Bill could give the reasons for these changes if he were here. I hardly think the Bill means what has been suggested by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid). It refers to property in connection with the construction of its docks, piers and other works. Better let that clause stand and go on with the others.

On section 11,

Mr. REID (Grenville). This section provides that the company may issue debentures on their land not exceeding the cost of the properties mortgaged. No money at all, therefore, might be put in by the company in so far as the stock is concerned. It seems to me that the company itself should put some money into the concern, as otherwise it might give a fictitious value to its property in order to get the full amount of capital in the issue of bonds.

Mr. NESBITT. That is a provision often put in other Bills. No doubt the purchasers of debentures will inquire into their value before buying them.

Progress reported.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 43) respecting a patent of Conduits Company.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 119) respecting the Ontario Northern and Timagami Railway Company.—Mr. Proulx.

Bill (No. 120) respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—Mr. Carvell.

Bill (No. 123) to incorporate La Banque du Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). When the committee rose we had under consideration the matter of the action or inaction of the Board of Conciliation in connection with the Springhill strike. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Crosby) was laying down a principle as to which, I think we ought to hear from the Minister of Labour.

Mr. KING. The subject of the Springhill strike was brought up the other day, when we were in committee, and has already been discussed three times.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). At Springhill, as I understand it, the matter at issue was the recognition of a union and the question raised by the hon. member for Halifax was whether or not this department had made any endeavour to secure recognition of the union by the proprietors of the mine where the trouble occurred or whether the department took the opposite view and stood behind the mine owners in declining to treat with the men ; on that basis I think we ought to hear from the minister with regard to that point.

Mr. KING. I have no hesitation in stating that the recognition or non-recognition of a union is something to be entirely left to the parties themselves. The department would not be justified in asking the employers to recognize the union any more than in asking the employees to take any particular stand against the employers who failed to recognize the union. That is a matter to be left to the parties themselves. I said once before that I did not know anything short of a law which would make it illegal for men to strike because of the non-recognition of a union, or for employers to lock out because of men joining a union that could meet such a situation. I do not think the House would enact such a law.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I did not suggest the enactment of the law. What I asked was merely the principle upon which the department proceeds, because if the department is really wedded to the idea that employers should not recognize unions, then its services would be of no value at all to the men in disputes such as have been referred to. If, on the other hand the department were of the opinion that a recognition of the unions is in the interest of the workingmen, and would give friendly advice in a general way to the corporations brought before the Board of Conciliation, it might be of great service indeed to the mass of the people, and I take it that this department has been organized for the special protection of the mass of the people against more powerful influences that do not need the services of any department to protect them. I would ask the minister whether he accepts it as part of his duty to endeavour to influence corporations generally to recognize the unions, or whether he stands for the non-recognition of unions on the part of corporations.

Mr. KING. Every case depends on the circumstances surrounding it. In some cases it might be advisable to try to persuade a corporation to recognize the union as a means of helping to settle industrial disputes ; in other cases it might not be expedient. It is not a matter upon which one can generalize.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Then it is safe to say that as a general rule the minister does not lend his influence to secure the recognition of unions by employers. Am I correct?

Mr. KING. I do not know that the hon. gentleman can draw that inference ; my remarks I think do not necessarily imply that.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I think when we are voting large sums of money for the purpose of conciliation, we should know from the minister upon what principle we proceed.

Mr. KING. Everything depends on the circumstances of each case.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). There is nothing to be ashamed of. There are many very worthy citizens adverse to the recognition of the unions, and on the other hand there is a large body of people who think that it is the proper principle to follow. But I think we are entitled to some expression of opinion from the Department of Labour. The hon. gentleman ought to be an expert on this subject.

Mr. KING. Possibly I might make my views still clearer if I were to say that when I have actively intervened in the settlement of strikes, in some cases I have tried to get the employers to see the wisdom of recognizing the union. But everything depends on the circumstances of the case; it is not possible to lay down a general rule.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I have in mind a case in which the minister might set an excellent example to employers generally, that is, to use his influence on the government of which he is a member to recognize the union whenever circumstances of employment offered by that government makes it possible. This afternoon, for instance, an hon. member asked about the union label, and why it appeared upon the 'Labour Gazette.' The answer, as I understand it, was that the minister did not know how it came to appear, but he thought it appeared there because conditions in the government Printing Bureau were satisfactory to the labour unions. It seems to me, under the circumstances, that there is another reason, and that is that the 'Gazette' is not printed at the government Bureau at all, but is, as the minister stated before recess, sent outside to an office which is a union office, which does recognize the union, and is, therefore, entitled to use the union label which appears there.

Mr. KING. The 'Labour Gazette,' I understand, was at the outset printed in the Printing Bureau, then the Bureau became too crowded with work, and decided to have it printed outside. But the 'Gazette' used the union label from the outset.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Now that we learn from the minister that this union label was attached to the 'Labour Gazette' when it was printed at the Printing Bureau, I might ask if it is not permissible to put the union label on all government work? If it is not permissible for instance, to put it on this volume of estimates, and upon all government work? Now, it occurs to me that if the minister would follow out his idea already stated in this House, that the government should be a model employer of labour, here is an excellent chance to set a good example, and to show to employers generally that this model employer of labour, the government, recognizes the work of the labour unions, far as I can see, in acknowledging the in the interest of workingmen generally, and that in token of that recognition, the department desires the union label to be placed upon all printing emanating from the government printing office. We have already been told that conditions there are entirely satisfactory to the union, so there can be no great difficulty involved, as far as I can see, in acknowledging the union, since the conditions have been made entirely satisfactory to them. I would ask the minister whether it would not have a great effect upon other employers, and be an encouragement to them to concede this point to their men, and if the minister will use his influence with the government of which he is a member to have the printers' union acknowledged in connection with the government printing, and put the union label on all works issued from the government Bureau. I would like to ask the minister whether he has ever taken that up with his colleagues, and whether or not he thinks the government should have the union label represented on all government printing?

Mr. KING. I recognize that there are a good many views in the country as to the propriety of using the union label. It might be that to use the union label on the 'Labour Gazette' would be about as far as we can go at present, in view of the differences of opinion prevailing on that subject.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is not answering the question.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I think it is answering the question so far as the minister cares to go on record. But it is unsatisfactory to those who believe in the recognition of the unions. I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that he takes a great responsibility in the course he is pursuing, because he stands directly behind the employer who refuses to recognize the union, and therefore makes it impossible to have the conciliation which the department is organized to secure.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It looks to me as though the Minister of Labour is working for the employer instead of the men. That has been instanced in cases before this. In those strikes down east, as far as I can judge from the newspapers, the minister stood by the employer to the

injury of the man. The men always seemed to come out second best. The same thing applies to the Grand Trunk strike. In that case the minister wanted to show the employees of the Grand Trunk what a great thing he was doing for them, and the impression that went all through the country was that the interest of the men had been served by the minister, that they were all to be reinstated, that everything was to be lovely, and that the Grand Trunk had been brought to time. But you see from the reports afterwards that it turns out the very opposite; the men are the ones that are turned down. As I understood, the Department of Labour was formed for the protection of the men. It was always understood that the employers could look after themselves, but it was the men that this Department of Labour was being organized for. In all these great strikes that have occurred for some years the whole difficulty, as I understood it from hon. gentlemen in this House, and from ministers when they wanted to organize this great Labour Department, was that the men had not any protection, and that if we had a Minister of Labour there would be no trouble at all because he could always force the employer to come to terms. I was certainly led to believe that, and if I had not been so led to believe it I would not have agreed to this large expenditure each year. It was only going to be $7,000 or $8,000 when it started, but I venture to say that in a year or two it will be rolled up, like that of the Department of Militia, while the Department of Agriculture will be allowed to remain as it is. The Minister of Labour cannot prove to this House one instance where he has helped the men out, the very thing that he was expected to do when he was put in that position. In every case he has gone to the employer, made a deal with him, and the men have always come out second best. I would like to ask the Minister of Labour what he considers to be the duty of the department in cases of this kind. Is the department there for the purpose of assisting the men, working particularly in the interests of the men to prevent strikes, and get them reinstated in case of a strike, or is the department there for the sole purpose of taking the side of the employer to the detriment of the men?

Mr. KING. I do not think it the duty of the Department of Labour to champion the case of either side. The position of the Department of Labour is the same as that of any other department of the government, the duty being to consider the general good of the community, and to see that justice is done in every way possible as between employers and employees. I think that is all the working classes expect of any one acting on their behalf expect. They do not want coddling or protecting. All they are asking is that the government shall see that there is fair play and that is what the Department of Labour has endeavoured to secure.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is what I think the Department of Labour should be for. At the same time the weak side is that of the men because the employers have capital and can stop the fight. The men have no capital and the minute a strike takes place they have no protection. They must have something to keep their families and they are the weak side. If any help is to be given, the men should get help from the department. Why I mention this is that in so far as I can see in any strikes that I have read about as being settled, the whole trouble is that the employer has got the better of the men. For instance, take the Grand Trunk strike; if you travel by the Grand Trunk to-day you will find that the men are not all put back, and the minister certainly will not deny this statement. He assured the public that every man was to be taken back, and that within three months. If there is any doubt about that I would like the minister to say so now. Was not that the understanding? He was trying to let the men understand that he had done them a great service, but the result is that the men were not taken back as he led them to believe they would be, and they are not back to-day. Whenever the Department of Labour, over which he presides, do take any part, they certainly should see to it that whatever arrangement they make is carried out. They did not in that case and they did not in the case of the strikes down in Nova Scotia. In those cases they did not act properly in so far as the men were concerned. I would like the minister now to give me one case where the men were all taken back, put in their positions just as they were before, perfectly satisfied, and that the minister has done what was right in so far as they were concerned.

Mr. KING. I should like, in answering my hon. friend, to let the statements of the workingmen speak for themselves rather than that I should speak on behalf of the department. I read to the House the other evening the expressions of opinion given by the leaders of the Grand Trunk strike as to the service that had been rendered by the Department of Labour, and if my hon. friend would like to hear these opinions again I should be very glad to repeat them.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to hear who the leaders are.

Mr. KING. There was a communication from Mr. A. B. Garretson, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Conductors, one of the organizations involved in the strike. On the 10th August I received the following letter.

Mr. REID (Grenville). August when?

Mr. KING. 1910. The strike was settled on the 2nd of August.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, that is right.

Mr. KING. (Reading):

Cedar Rapids, Iowa,
August 10,1910.

Hon. William L. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—I take this opportunity of expressing to you on behalf of not only myself and my associate officers, but of the organization at large and the more especially the Canadian membership thereof, the profound obligation under which we lie for the services of yourself and your associate minister in connection with the settlement of the strike upon the Grand Trunk and the Central Vermont railways. The ready recognition by you of the justification for the claims of the men on those properties and the exercise of personal and governmental influence toward securing a termination of the strike on those properties will not be forgotten by our membership and I sincerely trust that those most directly affected, namely, our Canadian citizens, will, in the future, make that appreciation thoroughly apparent.

In conclusion, kindly accept my expressions of highest personal regard, and believe me,

Sincerely and gratefully yours,
(Signed) A. B. GARRETSON,
President.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Did you ever hear from him again?

Mr. KING. Yes, I have had other communications from him. Then, there have been other communications in magazines published by these organizations much of the same nature. I have here a pamphlet issued by Mr. W. G. Lee, president of the Railroad Trainmen, the other organization involved in this strike. At page 10 of this pamphlet, which is issued to the members of the organization, Mr. Lee states:

The ministers of the Crown and particularly the hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Minister of Labour, and Sir Frederick Borden, Minister of Militia, were largely instrumental in bringing about a settlement of the strike. They kept in close touch with the strike, throughout its duration and made the most of every opportunity to bring the two parties together. They are due high praise for their interest in the welfare of the striking employees and of those affected by the interruption of the company's traffic. Their efforts on behalf of the men are appreciated by both organizations and by officers and individual members of the brotherhood.

There have been several other communications of a like kind, received from members of both organizations, and the men themselves, I may say, have taken strong exception to the endeavour on the part of some, to hold the government responsible for any delinquency on the part of the Grand Trunk company in carrying out in all particulars, as they understand, the terms of the agreement. The position of the parties in regard to that strike was this. The government intervened with a view of helping to terminate the strike, the strike was terminated through government intervention, by an agreement signed by each of the two parties. That agreement was brought about through the good offices of the government. The carrying out of the terms of that agreement is a matter of contract between the parties, and if the agreement has not been carried out in the manner which some would like to have seen it, it is in no way the fault of the government, but rather a delinquency on the part of one of the parties in carrying out the obligation which they have signed. That is the view taken by the men themselves.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I shall not speak at length as this matter will come before the House in another form, but I desire to make two or three further statements to complement what the minister has stated. Without in the slightest, contradicting the minister's statement that he received some communication of a eulogistic nature about the 10th of August. He was not so good however, as to read some later communication from the same gentlemen or from equally high leaders of the workmen, that if something was not done and done speedily, they would put the men back in the same position as before the 10th of August, and the men claim they were betrayed by the Minister of Labour (Mr. King).

Mr. KING. I challenge the hon. gentleman to point out where any workingman has charged that he was betrayed by the Minister of Labour.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am talking of leaders of the strike.

Mr. KING. I challenge him to produce any communication to that effect.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I shall be very happy at the stage to which I have referred to bring down the letters. If the minister looks through his correspondence, he will find a letter from one of these leaders, written months after the 10th of August, in which that leader finding fault with the way in which the agreement was carried out, says they would put the men back where they were before the 10th of August. I will undertake to produce such a letter. The minister spoke of the desire of the government to see justice done. That is what the men complain, that the government were so anxious to sit by and see justice done, that they did nothing to compel it to be done. The minister says that there

was an agreement between the men and the Grand Trunk by which the strike was settled. Is that statement the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? Does he not know that when the agreement was made, the men objected to having such indefinite words in it, as that they would be taken back 'as soon as possible'; they refused to accept the agreement with these indefinite terms, because the expression might mean the day of judgment. The men left the conference, and subsequently the minister of labour notified the men that the Grand Trunk company had given as an interpretation of the words 'as soon as possible,' at the outside, 90 days. On the strength of that notification that agreement read that they would be put back within 90 days and the strike was called off. I would ask the minister if, from the day he notified the men that they would be put back in 90 days, he did a single thing to see that that agreement was carried out? He read a letter to the House in which Mr. Hays repudiated the agreement, and said there was no undertaking to put the men back in 90 days, that the Grand Trunk must be the sole judges of who were proper men to be in their employ. The Grand Trunk wilfully violated the agreement. These men appealed to the Minister of Labour and if ever there was a time when a powerful minister, with a desire to do justice to labour, had the opportunity to do so, that was the time. Surely all the minister had to do with the Grand Trunk, which is so intertwined with the affairs of this country, was to say: I was a party to that agreement, Sir Frederick Borden and I were present when the agreement was made, the men were not there at all, but you made a promise, and I, acting in good faith on your promise, had the strike called off; now we insist on the Grand Trunk standing by the agreement. If the minister for once had ventured to address the corporation, which many people consider the master of the government, in those terms, there is not the slightest doubt in the world that the unfortunate men, who, evidently wrongfully, since many of them have since been reinstated, were deprived of their positions, would have been put back within 90 days. Therefore, the minister can hardly claim that he was acting impartially between the two parties to that agreement. The agreement was wilfully violated by the president of the Grand Trunk, it was not a case of conflict of evidence; the minister has the agreement and the letter, both signed by Charles M. Hays, as diametrically contradictory as any two statements could be. It would not have been hard for the minister to say to Mr. Hays: You may say one thing at one time, and another at another time to some people, but so far as this government is concerned, when you make a bargain with us, you have to keep it. Instead of that, the minister did not say a single word for the men, but he wrote to them, saying that he was no party to the agreement, only a witness thereto, and the best advice he could give them was, that Mr. Hays had the power in his hand, and perhaps the best thing they could do, was to accept the situation as it was. Surely in the fact of that, the minister can hardly claim that he did all he could to do justice to the labouring men.

Mr. KING. I do not desire to go into a discussion of the Grand Trunk strike. The contract was signed between the parties. It is quite true, as my hon. friend has said, the Grand Trunk Company stated that by 'as soon as possible' would be meant not more than 90 days. That was not put in writing at the time, as one of the parties to the contract did not wish to have anything stated on that point one way or the other, and the other party, by way of compromise, gave it as their view that they would be satisfied if an assurance were given in a form which could be vouched for, and on that consideration they would not insist on it going into the contract. The assurance was given that by 'as soon as possible' was meant 90 days. That part has never been disputed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, as I understand. If it had been I would have stated here that that was the assurance and I have always stood prepared to say that it was. The difficulty that has arisen, as I understand, is over the interpretation which the company has put upon the words 'found guilty of acts of violence or disorderly conduct.' The company claim that the men who have not been taken back have been guilty of disorderly conduct. If some men have not been reinstated who should have been, the responsibility is on the company for the manner in which they have interpreted that part of the contract. Personally, I think the company has taken a very narrow view of its obligations under this contract, and I have not hesitated to say so very frankly to the company. As the hon. gentleman knows, Judge Barron is at the present time inquiring into the cases of the men who were not taken back. He is doing that at the instance of the Grand Trunk as a result of the pressure brought to bear on the company by the government for that purpose, and if any of these men have been reinstated since who were not taken back at the end of the ninety days, it is the result of that pressure. The government has all along insisted that the company should interpret this clause in as generous a way as it is possible to do.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The minister has just stated in as many words that in as much

as Judge Barron is adjudicating on these cases under the pay of the Grand Trunk company, so far as that is concerned, he sits, not as a judge of any Canadian court, but as a Grand Trunk employee.

Mr. KING. I think Judge Barron's own letter in reply to the request of the Grand Trunk Company to investigate these cases is, perhaps, the best answer that can be given to my hon. friend. Judge Barron said that he would not accept the position unless he were allowed an absolutely free hand to decide the cases on their merits, and I am told by the leaders of some of the men who appeared before Judge Barron that they feel perfectly satisfied with the manner in which he is conducting the investigation, and will have full confidence in the justice of his findings. If I understand my hon. friend rightly, he is endeavouring to hold the government responsible for the non-reinstatement of some of these employees.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Certainly. The government acted for them, and did not get them back.

Mr KING. I would point out to my hon. friend that these men do not take the position of my hon. friend with regard to the carrying out of this obligation, but take the only position which any one looking at the matter with absolute impartiality will take, namely, that if there has been any failure in carrying out the terms of the contract, the party who is responsible for that failure is the delinquent. I have a letter from Mr. Murdock, vice-president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, addressed to myself, and inclosing a copy of an answer which was sent to my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). I am sorry he is not in his seat at the moment, because I rather hesitate to read a communication which introduces his name in his absence. But the letter sent to me is a formal letter, and after receiving it I took care to inquire whether it was a public communication, and was informed that it was, and, as it answers my hon. friend, I will venture to read it to the committee. The hon. member for South Simcoe asked me in the House the other day some questions which I answered categorically. It appears that my hon. friend had communicated with both the representative of the trainmen and the representative of the conductors, submitting the same questions to them, and asking for their views in reply. When he did so these gentlemen communicated with me, as they have done all through, informing me of their action and of the communications which they have received. The letter to me is as follows:

Mr. NORTHRUP.

Grand Union Hotel,
Montreal, February 20, 1911.

Hon. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I inclose herewith copy of letter this day written to Mr. Houghton Lennox, M.P., in answer to a letter that he sent me under date of February 7, requesting certain information, in the form of the following questions:

Questions re settlement of Grand Trunk strike.

Was the settlement of 31st July last, between the Grand Trunk railway and its employees in train and yard service:

(a) Intended and understood to put an end to all then existing disputes and difficulties?

(b) Was it understood that the men would be put back in the positions they held previous to the strike?

(c) Was it understood that the men would be reinstated or were they only to be taken back as new men?

It occurs to me that you might be interested in reading these questions which, I presume, you have heard heretofore, and that you might also like to see the answer that I have made to the questions as asked.

I remain, with high personal regards,
Yours very truly,
JAMES MURDOCK,
Vice-president B. of R. T.

The following is the communication inclosed:

Grand Union Hotel,
Montreal, February 20, 1911.

Mr. Houghton Lennox, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Your letter of February 7, with which was inclosed three questions relative to the settlement of the Grand Trunk strike, has only just reached me, hence the delay in my replying.

I will answer your questions in the order given.

(a) Yes, most positively hoped for and understood.

(b) Yes, without reservation it was expected that the understanding that Mr. Hays gave to ministers of the Crown on August 2 as to his intended application of paragraph 1 of the agreement made on July 31, contemplated that all men who had gone on strike and who had not been guilty of the commission of overt acts would be returned to their former positions, runs, seniority, standing, &c.

(c) Is answered in the reply given to (b).

I am indeed glad to know that yourself and other eminent and representative members of the Dominion parliament are taking such a commendable interest in the welfare of Grand Trunk employees who have not yet been returned to service, or who having been returned to service, have not been conceded their positions or runs

The question of pensions or of conserving the pension rights of the employees who had been on strike and who were by the settlement to be returned to service was not even considered as a factor in determining the basis of settlement. Representatives of labour and labouring men, generally, recognize the fact that pension schemes, provident fund ar-

rangements and relief associations, inaugurated, fostered and maintained by railroad companies or large employers of labour, without the employee's co-operative sanction to the formation of such concerns, are usually found to be nothing more or less than a prearranged and contemplated outlay or investment on the part of the employer to test the loyalty of the men to themselves, as individuals, and to each other, in the event of just such trying negotiations as preceded the strike of July 18 last.

Organizations of labour in train and yard service have not considered it as a part of their legitimate sphere of effort to make representations to railroad companies or railroad officials as to the basis upon which pension allowances should be inaugurated or maintained, and in the case of the Grand Trunk strike and settlement the question was not given serious consideration by the employees. Any action that the Grand Trunk Railway Company saw fit to take in reference to pension rights of employees, prior to the Grand Trunk strike, they had an absolute right to take and maintain, and they are apparently disposed to exercise the same rights and privileges that they formerly enjoyed in this respect.

From every consistent and logical standpoint upon which the question of pension might be considered, it should surely be recognized that the mere fact of an employee leaving the service for a period of two weeks and thereby breaking a continued service of many years, should not be sufficient to debar him from all rights to a pension fund, if that pension fund had been inaugurated and was maintained for the purpose of conserving in old age the rights of an employee who had given to the company many years of faithful service.

The Grand Trunk Railway Company's present attitude demonstrates conclusively that the estimate placed on the average railroad company's pension fund has been well-founded.

In conclusion I would suggest that the present attitude of Grand Trunk officials, who have violated indiscriminately the first two articles of the terms of settlement, is deplorable. But if I might be permitted to do so I would suggest that some of the honourable gentlemen at Ottawa who are taking such an apparently deep interest in this situation, are to use the expression attributed to you on page 3480 of 'Hansard' under date of February 10, 'barking up the wrong tree.'

The agreement made when strike was called off was under the circumstances equitable, and amply sufficient to conserve the rights and interests of all concerned, public, employer and employee. The deplorable conditions that have existed and that exist at the present time, are wholly and solely chargeable to Grand Trunk officials' disregard for contract obligations except as expediency suggests.

I trust that the information given above will be looked upon as satisfactorily answering the questions asked in your letter of February 7, at least to some extent.

In conclusion it might not be amiss for me to advise you in case I should be looked upon as politically biased, that I was raised in a family Liberal in politics, always, but that I have personally voted for the past 18 years as opportunity offered with the Conservative party. I believe, however, in giving credit where credit is due, and have been deeply disappointed to find that many eminent gentlemen, like yourself, are apparently disposed to place the responsibility for the failure of Grand Trunk officials to carry out their agreements, on the shoulders of some one else.

I remain,

Yours very truly,

JAMES MURDOCK,
Vice-president,
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen,
49 Melbourne Av., Toronto, Ont.

I think that letter should be a sufficient answer to those who criticise the attitude taken by the government. It shows what course the men involvd in the strike felt should be taken by the department, and it shows that they realize that everything possible was done to bring about a settlement of the strike. The terms of the settlement are as fair as could be desired and calculated to secure the rights of all concerned. If these rights have not all been secured, the fault is with one of the parties principally interested and not with any party who intervened to assist one way or the other. As stated in this letter, these attacks by hon. gentlemen opposite are regarded by the men simply as party politics and an attempt to put the obligation on shoulders where it ought not to be and take it from shoulders where it ought to rest.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not think the minister has proved that he has succeeded yet in making any settlement which has been in the interests of the men. Of course, Mr. Murdock knows well that it would never do to quarrel with the Minister of Labour, because he is the only one who could help the men out, and for that reason the men called him in. The Minister went down and made that settlement on behalf of the men, and the minister knows that if he had not given his word, and if the men had not felt that they had the government at their back, they never would have had agreed to that settlement.

Mr. KING. What then would have happened?

Mr. REID (Grenville). The men would have stayed out a week or two longer and the Grand Trunk railway would have had to come to time. There can be no question about that. The people along the line would not stand it. My hon. friend knows that if he had not got a settlement made, there were important men on his own side of the House who could have brought such a pressure on him that he would have been forced to make a settlement. The whole country was in an uproar over this strike, and the Grand Trunk railway would

have been forced to settle it within a week or two, in any event, and so they got the Minister of Labour to come to their rescue.

Mr. KING. The hon. gentleman cannot show that from the correspondence.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have read what was in the newspapers at the time.

Mr. KING. I am afraid my hon. friend has been reading the wrong papers. If he will take the facts as they are, he will see that a telegram was sent to me at Ottawa by Mr. Murdock asking me to go to Montreal to intervene. In that telegram it was distinctly stated that Mr. Garretson and Mr. Lee had been endeavouring to get an interview with Mr. Hays but found it impossible, and they asked me to come down and do my best to obtain a settlement. In this connection I would like to correct what I said the other evening. I then said that Mr. Murdock and Mr. Berry had tried to get a conference with Mr. Hays before Mr. Garretson and Mr. Lee had a conference with him. In that I was wrong. Mr. Murdock and Mr. Berry had not had any conference with Mr. Hays. The parties were apart, the difficulty was to get them together, and Messrs. Garretson and Lee came to this country to obtain an interview with Mr. Hays and see if they could not terminate the difficulty. It was when they found they could not succeed in doing this that the Canadian leaders sent a telegram to Ottawa asking me to intervene. It was, therefore, only at the request of the men that I went to Montreal, because I had no communication with the company whatever. In fact my chief difficulty was to get the company to allow me to intervene; and were it not for the assistance of my hon. colleague the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) it might have been impossible for me to get even that opportunity.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That was probably at the first, but not later, because later on the Grand Trunk railway wanted the strike settled.

Mr. KING. The company never wanted it settled. So far as the Grand Trunk railway were concerned, it was impossible for me to understand their position. I believe they were prepared to keep up the strike for a month, even if thereby they should ruin the whole concern. That was the difficulty in bringing about a settlement. The Grand Trunk railway wished to effectively defeat the men and their organization if it were at all possible to do it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). No doubt that was the case until the president of the Grand Trunk railway started for Canada.

Mr. KING. The president of the Grand Trunk railway?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I mean the chairman of the Grand Trunk railway in England. The strike was settled about two days before he landed in New York.

Mr. KING. Throughout the whole trouble the difficulty was to get the Grand Trunk railway to settle at all, and it was only after the greatest possible pressure that the company was brought to consent to a settlement in the end. I have no hesitation in saying that Mr. Hays, had he not been forced to feel that he owed some obligation to the country, would have kept up that strike until he had succeeded in worsting both organizations, even if he destroyed the property of the company in so doing.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I admit that such was the case until within a week or so before the strike was settled. But the position of the company then compelled it to settle. With its securities going down in England, it could not have allowed that strike to continue much longer. Supposing we take it for granted that the minister went down on behalf of the men, the men trusted him, they placed their case absolutely in his hands, and they felt they had the government at their back when the minister made that settlement.

Mr. KING. And they were perfectly satisfied.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, because they expected that the settlement which the minister had made would be carried out, but they were afterwards sadly disappointed. The minister knows that the company is not carrying it out. At the end of the 90 days, very few men were taken back, and those who were taken back were not reinstated in their former positions, and are not in those positions to-day. They are on the road but not in such good positions. What I cannot understand is this. The Minister of Labour knows that the labouring men look to him in his official position to see to their interests. It was in their interests mainly that the labour department was established. Great corporations, of course, have occasionally difficulties with their men and the men look to the Department of Labour to help them in these difficulties. The minister settled this strike, and the men relied on the company living up to the terms of the settlement. In this they have been disappointed and there is now no possible way of their grievances being removed and their difficulties straightened out because once they have gone back you can hardly expect them to strike again. The result is a great deal of suffering to-day among a number of the Grand Trunk railway employees due to

the fact that the Minister of Labour did not see that the agreement was carried out to the letter.

Mr. KING. And how much suffering does the hon. gentleman think there would have been if the strike had not been settled ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). There would not have been another week's trouble, and the men would all have been taken back.

Mr. NESBITT. Who says so ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I say so. And the hon. member (Mr. Nesbitt) himself knows that it would have been settled in another week.

Mr. NESBITT. I do not believe it would ever have been settled, if it had not been for the Minister of Labour. I have as good a right to prophesy as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid, Grenville), and I believe that I know just as much about the matter as he does. I am free to say that I think that the Grand Trunk would have won out, if it had been gone on with.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. member has a right to his opinion. But from the information that I got along the line, I believe the Grand Trunk would have settled the strike in a very short time But the question I asked the minister at the start, was whether he could name an instance of a strike being settled by him in a way satisfactory to the men and the employers. He mentioned this Grand Trunk case, and I think that the discussion shows that that settlement was not satisfactory. If this is the only case he can name, I cannot see much use for the department.

Mr. KING. I have here the issue of September 10, last of the official monthly publication of the Brotherhod of Railroad Trainmen. It gives a statement of this case from the point of view of the men themselves. At page 797, the following appears:

> The company, however, was able to secure enough strike breakers to enable it to run 148 freight trains within the twenty-four hours ending at 6 p.m., August 2, handling an average of twenty-two cars per train. While this average of trains run was far below normal conditions, a start had been made in the freight service, and it was only a question of time when the entire service would be resumed.

There is the statement as to the freight situation. This publication goes on:

> Passenger service on the main line was but slightly impaired at any time during the strike, while the branch passenger line service was demoralized for about a week.

I think that statement is absolutely correct—that it was only a question of time. But, in my opinion, it would have been a long time. Meantime, the country would have suffered irreparable loss and injury, to say nothing of the possible loss of life and the loss of property to individuals, and certainly whatever the outcome the men would have fared pretty badly.

Mr REID (Grenville). Who wrote that article ?

Mr. KING. This is called 'The Railroad Trainman,' and it is published monthly at Cleveland, Ohio, by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. T. L. Cease is given as editor and manager. This is the official publication of the Brotherhood interested in this strike. The men who were most concerned and who had first-hand knowledge of the facts, recognized the service rendered in terminating that strike, and getting a contract which secured the reinstatement of the men, with the exception of the few who are still out. I think the number involved was about 4,500, while the number still out, are in the vicinity, I understand, of 200. What was secured was an agreement that they should go back into the company's employment, and it may be that even those who are still out will be returned to the service. I hope they will. Their representative states, under date February 20:

> The agreement made when the strike was called off was, under the circumstances, equitable and amply sufficient to conserve the rights and interests of all concerned, public, employer and employee.

If there has been any difficulty since, the parties who are responsible, and who are being held responsible by the men, are the Grand Trunk officials, who have not played, perhaps, as generous a part as I think the country would, on the whole, have expected them to play. I am free to say that if I had been manager of the Grand Trunk I would have acted in a very different manner from the way in which the Grand Trunk has acted. But one must concede that, every man has a right to manage his own business as he thinks best, and must be responsible for the outcome.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The difference between my hon. friend (Mr. Reid, Grenville) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), seems to narrow down to a small point. This letter from Mr. Murdock proves, what everybody knew, that the settlement made between the men and the Grand Trunk, as a settlement, was satisfactory. The representatives of the men had done their duty, and we assume that Mr. Hays had done his duty, acting for the Grand Trunk,

Mr. KING. And has the government done its duty ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I was just coming to that. The government intervened at that

time to give a definition of three or four words, and the strike was called off solely by virtue of the definition of the words given by the government. The whole difficulty since has arisen over the interpretation——

Mr. KING. No, my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) is mistaken. The government's part in the work was really getting these parties to meet. That was the great difficulty. Mr. Hays took the position—that there should be no dealing between them, and the men had tried to get an interview and could not. It took a good deal of persuasion to bring about an interview in the first instance. And when the interview did take place, it took a good deal more persuasion to prevent the parties flying off at a tangent and making matters practically worse than before. For three or four days, it took as strenuous work, I believe, as any two men could perform, and as much patience as a man could possess, to keep these two parties together and hold them together, despite the feeling between them, until a contract was drawn up which each was prepared to sign. That was the service of the government, and it was rendered, according to statements of the company and the men alike, in such a way as to bring about a contract which was absolutely equitable and fair.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The hon. gentleman (Mr. King) does not wish the House to understand that the government dictated the terms of the settlement. The settlement, I take it, was come to between the men and the Grand Trunk, however they were brought together.

Mr. KING. Quite so. The parties were the ones who agreed upon the terms, after having debated the matter back and forth. It may interest my hon. friend to know how the proceedings were conducted. The representatives of the men sat on one side of the table and the representatives of the company on the other. Sir Frederick Borden and myself were present as witnesses. They started negotiating and got along a certain distance. Then there would be a difference that would appear to be irreconcilable. After the first conference the parties quit and went away to get dinner. We got them back. Then we got them at work at night. There was another difference, each side declaring that it would have nothing to do with the other. That process was kept up for days, before we got an agreement, which the parties were prepared to sign. The terms of the agreement, as to conditions of employment and so on, were all a matter of arrangement, between the parties themselves; but the service rendered by the government was in holding the two of them together until they got to the point where they could sign a document setting forth a common understanding.

Mr. NORTHRUP. That agreement was made between the men and the Grand Trunk, however they were brought together, and that agreement has caused no difficulty since, with the exception of the unfortunate words which were entrusted to the care of the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Militia and Defence. Over those words the whole difficulty has arisen.

Mr. KING. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. There has been absolutely no difficulty over those words—the words he refers to, I suppose, are 'as soon as possible.' The words 'as soon as possible' have in themselves no definite meaning whatever. The men wished to have 'immediately' put in; the company wished to have the words 'as soon as possible' left, leaving the meaning indefinite. The Minister of Militia and myself said to the company: Put some meaning on these words; you have no right to say you mean 'as soon as possible' unless you are prepared to give some definite time. Do you mean to take those men back within a stated time, or not to put them back at all? If you mean a stated time, name the time. We had great difficulty in getting them to name a time, and finally ninety days was agreed upon. Then the question came up. Should the ninety days go into the contract? The company did not wish ninety days to be put in writing, because at the time they did not wish it to appear to the public that they had settled this strike and agreed to take every man back at the end of ninety days. Now if they had taken every man back, this agreement about the ninety days would never have been formally disclosed. It was understood by all parties that nothing should be said about that, provided they lived up to it. The company does not deny that, they admit they promised to take these men back within ninety days, they say now they have taken them back, and the point of difference is, not the ninety days, but it is one of the terms of the contract which says 'Except those who have been guilty of acts of violence or disorderly conduct.' These words were not the words of the Minister of Militia and myself, they were the words agreed upon between the parties themselves, and it is over these words that they are differing to-day. The company says these 200 men have been guilty of disorderly conduct, the men say they have not, and it is over these words that the difficulty has taken place. So my hon. friend is wrong when he says it is over the words 'as soon as possible' that all the trouble has arisen.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I would just ask the minister to take the trouble to read the cor-

respondence, and he will find there, over Mr. Hayes' signature, the statement that the reason they have not taken the men back was because the Grand Trunk Company must be the judge of the competency and fitness of the men, and they have a right to discharge their men on the Grand Trunk system regardless of whether they had already been there before. It shows a new factor introduced by Mr. Hayes, which was not in the agreement, and which new factor is the cause of all the trouble and dissatisfaction which have since arisen.

Mr. KING. If it is a new factor introduced by Mr. Hayes which all the trouble is about, then it could not be anything which the Minister of Militia and myself are responsible for.

Mr. CROSBY. I understand by what was said by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) that Judge Barron was in the pay of the Grand Trunk Company. I would like to know if that is a fact?

Mr. KING. Judge Barron has been appointed by the Grand Trunk Company to investigate the cases of all the men who have not been reinstated, or not been taken back.

Mr. CROSBY. Is he in the pay of the Grand Trunk Company?

Mr. KING. I do not presume he is acting for nothing, I presume the Grand Trunk are paying for his services.

Mr. CROSBY. Does not the minister know whether he is being paid or not by the Grand Trunk?

Mr. KING. I cannot say what the consideration is. All I know is that Judge Barron sent me a communication himself stating that he had been asked by the Grand Trunk Railway Company to investigate the cases of these men. In the first instance, I suggested, when this difficulty arose as to the non re-instatement of certain men on the ground that they had been guilty of acts of violence, that the matter should be referred to some third party, and I suggested Judge Barron's name, as he had been engaged on similar difficulties before. He had acted as chairman of the board which prevented a strike of the street railway men in Toronto, and I knew him to be acceptable to the employees, and being a judge, I thought he was the right kind of a man to act. I suggested that he would be a good person. The company would not accept him from the outset, and as I have indicated to my hon. friend, the government intimated to the company pretty firmly that the cases of these men ought to be looked into, that they ought to take a generous view, or what the public would regard as a fair view. Then the company asked Judge Barron to investigate. I have here a letter which was written on December 23, by J. G. O'Donogahue to Judge Barron, which has reference to the view the men take of his appointment:

> I had a talk with Messrs. Murdock and Berry this morning and as a result I take the responsibility of saying to you to go ahead with the suggestions of yesterday.

That had reference to the judge investigating without solicitors for either side; he preferred to investigate the matter himself.

> Their view is that as they were ready to accept you as a government nominee they will have just as much confidence in you in the other capacity.

I am told that the men have absolute confidence in Judge Barron's ability and integrity and in the justice of his decision, whatever it may be.

Mr. MADDIN. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Crosby), before the committee rose at six o'clock, was discussing with the Minister of Labour the question of the recognition of the unions in the province of Nova Scotia growing out of the difficulties in the coal mining districts for the last year or two. I would ask him if it is a fact that out of the nineteen hundred odd unions that were in existence in Canada in 1909, over ninety per cent of these were international unions?

Mr. KING. I can hardly say offhand whether there are ninety per cent, but I would say that certainly a preponderating majority were international unions?

Mr. MADDIN. I think I remember the minister saying that out of 1,900 odd there were 1,900 international unions, which would be really over ninety per cent.

Mr. KING. I might point out that the membership in these unions varies considerably. One union might have a hundred members, and ten other unions together would have no more than a hundred members. Therefore, the mere number of the unions would not signify much.

Mr. MADDIN. I am informed it is a fact that about 1,900 of the nearly 2,000 unions in the Dominion of Canada are international unions. Now, I would ask the minister if it is not a fact that the question of the recognition of the United Mine Workers' of America was involved on three different occasions when boards of conciliation under the Industrial Disputes Act were constituted in the province of Nova Scotia, and that each of these boards was constituted by an appointee of the men who are compelled to appoint a representative when they make their application, and that the other two appointees on each of these three occasions, were appointees of

the governments. The first one of these investigations which took place was after the application was received by the Department of Labour on the 4th March, 1909, and the constitution of the board was made up of his Honour W. B. Wallace, county court judge of Halifax county, chairman, appointed by the minister in the absence of any joint recommendation of the other members of the board, and Mr. G. S. Campbell, Halifax, Nova Scotia, appointed by the minister in the absence of a recommendation by the employing company. In that case two members of the board were appointed by the minister. The question of the recognition of a union is largely an economic question, and it seems to me that the minister in selecting two representatives to form the personnel of this board might very well have selected some one familiar with economics, some professor of economics in one of our universities. Professor Shortt, who served on 28 or 29 boards of conciliation, would have made an ideal chairman of one of these boards. I discovered in 1907 that Professor Shortt is a strong advocate of international unions, a firm believer in trade combines and that he believes that a healthy restriction on trade combines is international union. It might be that other economists in this country share the views of that distinguished gentleman. However, on the occasion of which I speak, the chairman of the board was the Hon. Mr. Justice Wallace, county court judge of Halifax. I do not know anything about his capacity to sit in judgment on a question of economics, but, as a member of his profession, and in his capacity as a judge, I am sure that he has the confidence of all people who come in contact with him. But, to sit in judgment in an inquiry as to whether or not a trade union should be recognized I do not recognize his Honour Mr. Justice Wallace as a competent authority. A great deal of prejudice was exercised against international unionism in the province of Nova Scotia at that time. Evidently members of these boards forgot or took no cognizance of the fact that the principal industries of that province are developed by international capital. We have one coal mine in the province of Nova Scotia controlled by a company whose whole directorate, almost to a man, are American citizens, whose head office is in Boston and whose annual meetings are held there. I have reference to the Acadia Coal Company. The investment of American capital in the coal mining industries of our country means American boards of directors and means, as in this particular case to which I have reference, American mine managers, American overmen, American underground managers, American superintendents, or in other words, American bosses. The other appointee of the government on the first board of conciliation which was held on these matters between the Dominion Coal Company and their employees was Mr. G. S. Campbell, of Halifax. Mr. Campbell is an employer of labour, a square, upright citizen in every respect as I know him to be, but still an employer of labour and you would naturally have expected that the Industrial Disputes Act, which says that any one having an interest in the case shall not sit on the board, would have guided the minister in judging whether or not an employer of labour would be an unbiased member of a board of conciliation, and would have led him to the conclusion that, being an employer of labour, he was unfitted to discharge his duties impartially. That is one case where the government appointed two members of the board. That was the first case that came up. The next one was the dispute between the employees of the Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Company and the United Mine Workers' of America. In both those instances the United Mine Workers' had named as their nominee the president of their organization. Now, I quite admit that Mr. Campbell as an employer of labour was in as good a position to render a fair and equitable judgment as the president of the organization was on the board, and I condemn his appointment to sit on the board in the same manner that I would condemn the appointment of Mr. Campbell. But I am dealing now with the appointees of the government. Mr. Campbell was appointed in the Dominion Coal Company's matter, and at Sydney Mines the personnel of the board was made up of these gentlemen: His Honour Judge Chipman, Kentville, N.S., chairman, appointed by the minister; His Honour Judge A. McGillivray, Antigonish, N.S., appointed by the Minister and Mr. McDougall again representing the employees. His Honour Mr. Justice Chipman is, in so far as I know, just such a gentleman as the chairman of the board that sat in the dispute on the 4th March in which the Dominion Coal Company and its employers were concerned. As to his previous record with regard to organized labour I have no information, but the minister could have found the record of His Honour Mr. Justice McGillivray with regard to organized labour, and I think if he had made himself acquainted with that gentleman's past record in connection with labour unions, if he had known the active part that Mr. Justice McGillivray had taken in the legislature of Nova Scotia against organized labour in any shape or form, he might well have hesitated before he would have asked him to sit in judgment as a representative of the employer to determine a question between the employer and the employee with regard to the recognition of the labour union. In

1878 the Provincial Workmen's Association in Nova Scotia sought incorporation under the laws of the province. His Honour Mr. Justice McGillivray was a member of the government of Nova Scotia at that day, and he it was who led the attack against the organization. The government refused to pass an Act incorporating the Provincial Workmen's Association. In 1882 the Grand Council of the Provincial Workmen's Association sought incorporation in Nova Scotia again and when the Attorney General Mr. C. J. Townshend introduced the measure Mr. McGillivray said that :

Mr. McGillivray thought it was a very peculiar Bill and one that required some consideration before being passed, and that it would be imprudent to deal with it until first its real object had been ascertained. There was nothing to show what the purpose of the association sought to be incorporated was, except that it was to promote the moral, material, social, and physical well-being of its members and to manage their pecuniary affairs. Now under so indefinite a purpose much harm might be concealed. The House had nothing to do with associations of the kind proposed, and it would not be wise to make a precedent. He, therefore, would move that the Bill be read this day three months.

On the second occasion on which the Provincial Workmen's Association made an effort to get their association incorporated in Nova Scotia, Mr. Justice McGillivray, then a member of the opposition, moved the three months' hoist of the Bill and he urged that further particulars should be brought to the attention of the House, and that the constitution of this organization and its by-laws should be submitted to the House.

On a later day the Attorney General brought the Bill up again.

Hon. Mr. Townshend said in reference to the Bill to incorporate the Provincial Workmen's Association which had excited considerable discussion in committee on Friday last, in accordance with the wish expressed by the House at that time he had communicated with the secretary of that association and obtained from him several copies of the constitution and by-laws and also a statement of the object of the association.

The secretary of the association at that time was the Hon. Robert Drummond, now editor and publisher of the 'Maritime Mining Record' in Nova Scotia, and one of the leading authorities on coal mining in that province.

In his reply the secretary said: I send you a number of constitutions of our society. I think you will find them as good a code of laws as in any society. The objects of the society are therein defined as being to strive by every legitimate means to improve the condition material, social and moral—of our members. Our association has done much good and is stimulating the workingmen who come under its influence to better their conditon; to first of all respect themselves, as the surest way of gaining the respect of others. We seek to get the best remuneration possible for our labour, but we inculcate that high wages are nothing without an exercise of prudence and economy. We are, if you will, a trades union on an improved principle and allowed by law. See chap. 165, Rev. Stat. sec. 2, (appendix).

This was read by the Attorney General, and then the Bill finally came up for discussion before the House, and Mr. McGillivray, from his place in the House, said:

Mr. McGillivray suggested that as there were several hon. gentlemen absent when this bill was discussed on a previous day it would be better to let it lie over and take up some other Bills.

It is to be observed that Mr. McGillivray did everything he could to delay the passage of the Bill, or even its discussion. However, the matter came up for discussion, and then he said:

Mr. McGillivray did not oppose the Bill for any other purpose than that of getting the fullest understanding of what it contemplated.

The purpose for which this society sought to be incorporated were not very clearly set forth. The first object stated was that of managing the pecuniary affairs of the society. These were words of very extensive meaning, and very dangerous powers might be given by the use of these general and indefinite terms. The Bill proposed to incorporate the grand council and all the subordinate lodges. Some of those lodges were not in this province but in New Brunswick and the House was asked to pass upon by-laws of an institution not only belonging to this province but New Brunswick as well. One of the objects of the association, as explained in the constitution, was to shorten the hours of labour and to strive to obtain legislation by which the more efficient management of the mines might be effected, and to enforce the legislation already existing. Now it was well known that the labourers in this country were not overworked. Their hours particularly in the coal mines were not long and they were well paid except when the times were hard and all concerned were obliged to suffer and the wages were reduced in proportion. Then with respect to the management of the mines there was already an Act on the statute-book during the passing of which representatives of this association were heard and every amendment that they asked for had been substantially incorporated in the Act. Why then incorporate this society and give it a legal status when the constitution of the society was so vague and would perhaps give them power to pass by-laws by which the trade of the country would be hampered. Trades' unions were dangerous things. In other countries where the miners were subjected to oppression there might be some call for them, but there was no such oppression exercised in this country and the miners were fully protected by the law. These unions had promoted strikes which were very injurious not only to the employers

but in a greater measure still to the men themselves. In 1870 there was a strike in the United States of a serious character.

Mr. NESBITT. Mr. Chairman, under the new rules hon. gentlemen must talk to the question. I am sure that the strike the hon. gentleman is reading about in the United States has nothing to do with this question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If a point of order is raised, the item before the chair is

Conciliation and labour, including publication, printing, binding and distribution of the 'Labour Gazette,' and allowances to correspondents.

The first three words, 'conciliation and labour,' are so very broad in themselves that I hardly feel I can rule out any article that refers to such subjects.

Mr. NESBITT. So long as he confines himself to this country it is all right, but he is reading about a strike in the United States that has nothing to do with this country.

Mr. MADDIN. I think the hon. member must have been asleep and just woke up in the middle of my extract.

Mr. NESBITT. I was not asleep.

Mr. MADDIN (reading):

These unions had promoted strikes which were very injurious not only to the employees but in a greater measure still to the men themselves. In 1870 there was a strike in United States of a serious character, but the most remarkable case occurred in 1873 among the labourers in the Burton mine where the company lost $250,000, while the men suffered a loss of $750,000, in all, a million dollars of loss in consequence of that strike. What he feared was that in passing this Bill the House was merely legalizing trades unions. One of the articles provided that one of the purposes of the association should be to ascertain the true weight of the mines output. This was already provided for by law. Another purpose was to abolish all illegal stoppage of pay-lists. There was no necessity for these, as the law of the land provided for the case. These associations were managed by officers, sent as grand masters, secretaries, &c. Who was to pay these officers? No doubt those who joined the association. He thought it very undesirable to pass laws to take the money out of the pockets of these miners when there was no necessity or useful purpose to be served by it. Legislation had already been passed to put down strikes, and here the House was asked to incorporate an association the legitimate object of which was, he believed, something of this nature. The subordinate lodges that were to be incorporated might change their by-laws and might pass others that would be illegal and unjust, and when prosecuted for illegal conduct they might appeal to this legislation as a justification of their proceedings. He was not opposed to any of these associations so far as their object was to promote the intellectual, moral and physical well-being of their members, but they could accomplish all these objects without being incorporated.

These were the views expressed by a gentleman in 1882, who, in 1909, 27 years afterwards without any expressed opinion that would indicate a change of heart or of mind with regard to labour unions, is asked to sit in judgment, to represent the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, one of the most powerful corporations in the Dominion of Canada, the most powerful corporation in the maritime provinces, and say whether or not these trade unions should be recognized. I submit that when it is borne in mind that all the unions of any importance in this country, all the unions with the largest membership and the unions which embrace the greatest number of trades and branches of employment are international, there should be some very substantial reason offered why the miners of Nova Scotia should not have the union of their choice recognized.

Another board that sat at Springhill somewhat later, comprised the Hon. Justice J. W. Longley, Halifax, N.S., appointed by the minister in the absence of any joint recommendation from the members of the board; Mr. Charles Archibald, Halifax, appointed by the minister in the absence of any nominee by the company, and Mr. E. B. Paul, M.P.P., Springhill, appointed on the recommendation of the employees. Here again, the Department of Labour appointed two members to the board. In this case Mr. Paul, member of the local legislature, was not a member of the United Mine Workers' of America as in the case of Mr. McGillivray, who sat as the men's representative on the other two boards. Mr. Paul, it might be presumed, was not in the position to be biased that Mr. Macdougall was on the two boards that preceded. Mr. Archibald, who sat on the board, was general manager at the Gowrie mines in Cape Breton for a number of years, and had practically all his life been a large employer of labour. He had employed members of the Provincial Workmen's Association, and had met the labour unions time and again. I submit that any man who has been a general manager of coal mines and an employer of labour, is not a man who should be appointed by the Department of Labour to act on a board which is to determine the question whether or not a labour union should be recognized by an employer. I submit that such a man, no matter how upright he may be, or how high a sense of honour he may have, will be warped and clouded in his judgment, unconsciously it may be, but nevertheless warped and clouded, as a result of his study and his past experiences and associations, as well as his present associations, being on the side of capital. Here are three instances, the only three in which the ques-

tion of the recognition of this union has come before a tribunal formed under the provisions of this Act, and in each of the three cases this government has appointed two members of the board, in each of the three cases the company simply stood aside and said we will have none of it, and threw upon this government the burden of appointing a representative for them, and in each of the three cases, after that appointee was appointed by this government, he would not agree to a chairman, throwing the burden upon the Department of Labour of appointing the third man. In the three tribunals so constituted six appointees were appointed by this government, and in the six there was not one man who found in favour of recognition of the United Mine Workers' of America, notwithstanding the fact that 90 per cent of the unions in Canada are international unions. I ask the minister why, on an important economic question of this kind, one of the broadest economic questions which can confront an expert in economics, he did not appoint Professor Shortt as chairman of one of these boards. True, he was on the eve of accepting, or had already accepted, the chairmanship of the Civil Service Commission; but his past experience on, I think, 29 boards up to that time, and his training as an economist would have put him in a position to have dealt fairly and equitably with the situation, and I have no doubt the result would have been entirely different from what it was under the boards constituted by this government. How can men approach the subject open mindedly and fair mindedly if their training and their interests ally them with one side or the other? I submit that it is a mental and physical impossibility. Yet on each occasion an employer of labour was appointed by this government on a board of conciliation to determine the question whether or not the employers of the men down in Nova Scotia should recognize the union to which those men belonged. Now, I appreciate the difficulties which confront the minister in a matter of this kind; but when the Eight Hours Bill was before this House at the last session of parliament, he was quite ready to accept the recommendation of the committee which had charge of that Bill that a professor of Queen's University should act as a commissioner to gather some statistics with regard to the eight-hour day. In such a case as that, affecting labour all over the Dominion, he would not think of selecting an employer of labour, for the labourers of the country would at once view such an appointment with suspicion, and would regard the data gathered by such a man as unfair and one-sided. The same thing applies to the constitution of these tribunals. I know the difficulties of selecting the right men; but the universities contain men who are students on these questions. We are confronted year after year with the fact that the development of our resources is carried on largely with capital from abroad, and international capital means international boards of directors. The manufacturers who combine with each other do so for the purpose of bringing about cheap production. They can, when they have a monopoly, squeeze the employees and force them to accept lower wages, especially if they are isolated, or if they are banded in small unions of three or four thousands. In the evidence given before the committee on the Eight Hour Bill last session, it appeared that the Manufacturers' Association of Canada is composed of about 2,500 men, who have an investment of over $400,000,000, who turn out productions worth over, $500,000,000 and who employ over there 300,000 men. I am told this is a conservative estimate. What opportunity have little seven-by nine labour organizations to cope with such a union as this? The economists point out that the remedy is not to tear the Manufacturers' Association or the combines or monopolies to pieces, but for the producers, the employees, to unite together in just such proportion, so that these two bodies, equally balanced, will be able to treat fairly one with the other. That is the view taken by the leading political economists of this country, and I venture to say that there is not a gentleman occupying a chair of economics in any university of the United States or Canada who would vote on a board of conciliation, where he had taken his oath to do his duty, against the recognition of a union because it was international or had affiliations in a foreign country. In view of the fact that the government has assumed the responsibility of appointing the chairman and the company's representative on each of the boards of conciliation which have tried out this question of the recognition of the union—and I am sure the hon. minister is himself a firm believer in trades unions, having repeatedly said so in this House—I submit that the government should seriously take into consideration some step in the direction of legislation to compel employers to recognize their unions regardless of where their affiliations or connections may be. If it is the duty of the Department of Labour to act as an intermediary between the employer and the employee, if it is one of the functions of that department to bring labour and capital together, the minister must surely realize that where the open shop exists, where there are no labour unions, it is a physical impossibility to have the men brought up one by one to meet their employer, when as a union they could send their officers to deal with their employer on their behalf.

Modern trades unionism is making advances within the ranks of labour just as

are the organizations of capital within the ranks of capitalists, and this is a good thing for employers as well as employees. Many of the best trades unions of this country discipline their men and thereby relieve their employers from a distasteful responsibility and harsh measures. Our labour unions to-day recognize that the man who shirks his work, the man who watches the clock, the man who arrives late at his machine or his work, is a drag on the union, and they either compel him to mend his ways or send him about his business. If a man trespasses on the rights of his employer and it comes to the knowledge of the union, the union takes that matter up and deals with him and thereby removes from the employer a disagreeable task. That is the condition which exists in the largest and strongest international unions, and I submit it would be better for capital in the province of Nova Scotia if some good substantial union, be it international between Nova Scotia and the United States or national in the sense that it would be affiliated with a union in Great Britain, existed in that province, because then capitalists would be able to deal with some good, strong substantial union which appreciated its responsibility, as a member of a powerful association, and would undertake to discipline its own men and thus bring about greater harmony than has heretofore existed in that turbulent industry—the coal industry of Nova Scotia. I am not making these observations, nor did I make those which I did two weeks ago in discussing this matter, for the purpose of harassing or delaying the passage of the minister's estimates. I have every sympathy with him in his administration of this new department which has embarked on legislation which is really of an experimental character; but he must realize that there are many imperfections in the Industrial Disputes Act, and in the Alien Labour Act that ought to be removed. I have no doubt that had my hon. friend read that article from the 'Trainman's Magazine' a little further, he might have found that the main reason for the ability of the Grand Trunk railway to man their trains lay in the fact that they were able to hustle men across the line in spite of the Alien Labour Act. No doubt the hon. minister has had complaints of the flagrant manner in which the Alien Labour Law has been violated even in the city of Ottawa; and so long as an employer can look upon this law simply as a joke, and bring in men from across the line whenever he likes, he need be under no apprehension on account of any labour union be it weak or strong. I have every sympathy with the minister in his undertaking this new portfolio, and instead of harassing him or annoying him in any way I would rather assist him in bringing to perfection some of these measures which are in the experimental stage. I ask him in all seriousness whether he does not think that some legislation should be enacted which would relieve the situation we have in Nova Scotia—a situation which enables an employer to say to his men: I will speak to you as individuals, as John Smith or Tom Brown, but not as members of this or the other union. If that condition be allowed to continue, there is no excuse for the existence of our Department of Labour. What I urge on the minister is that he should make it clear to employers of labour that they will be obliged to recognize a union regardless of where its affiliations or ties may be; and if he would do this, the difficulties under which the department labours would be substantially removed. For in that case he would have to deal with but two factors—the union and the company. But where there is no union he has to deal with individuals whose numbers may run up into the thousands as well as with the company. It is a physical impossibility to carry out the objects of the department unless there be a union. A couple of weeks ago I asked the hon. minister if he believed in trades unions and he said he did. Then he must concede that the working man has the right to choose his own union and that the employer should not be permitted to say to him: You may join union A, but you must not join union B, for if you do I will either dismiss you or not hire you. If the hon. minister would seriously consider the framing of such legislation and also devise some means of enforcing the Alien Labour Law, and of constituting tribunals under the Industrial Disputes Act, I think he would make a very long step in advance, and would remove the cause of quite a number of breaches in the relations between labour and capital in this country.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I do not propose to follow my hon. friend throughout his meanderings or to discuss the labour question or trades unions or anything of that kind, but I rise simply to take objection to certain observations he made regarding Mr. Justice McGillivray. I happen to know Judge McGillivray, who was on the conciliation board referred to by my hon. friend, and I want to say that the remarks of the hon. gentleman with regard to him are altogether uncalled for, and absolutely unjustified. To those who know Mr. Justice McGillivray these remarks would certainly sound very strange. The hon. gentleman has eulogized the United Mine Workers, but one must not forget that he has been the paid solicitor of that organization. He has had a brief from it within very recent time and for aught I know may still hold a retainer in its behalf. But great as may be the admiration

of my hon. friend for the United Mine Workers, it is not regarded in Nova Scotia with at all that amount of respect. What I rose particularly for, however, was not to discuss this union, but to take objection to the remarks which my hon. friend made regarding Judge McGillivray. He intimated that Judge McGillivray was biased and partisan. Well, the hon. gentleman himself, if I remember rightly, served on a conciliation board; and I am sure no one will say, notwithstanding his advocacy of the United Mine Workers that when he sat on that board he did not exercise strict impartiality and discharge his duties without any prejudice. And I am quite sure that any one who knows Judge McGillivray and my hon. friend will have no hesitation whatever in saying that as great impartiality, justice and fairness should be expected from Judge McGillivray as from the hon. gentleman, and in saying this I am sure that I am casting no reflection on the latter but rather paying him a compliment.

So far as the ability, integrity, impartiality and honesty of Judge McGillivray are concerned, words of mine are not needed. My hon. friend (Mr. Maddin) has quoted some remarks made by Mr. McGillivray twenty-seven years ago, as he said, in opposition to a Bill intended for the amelioration of the condition of workingmen. The words as quoted must have struck hon. members as being such words as one would expect from a careful, impartial, truthful, judicial man like Judge McGillivray. He advised to go slow; he wanted to hear all sides. If I were disposed to offer advice, I would say that it would be well for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maddin) to follow the lines pursued by Mr. McGillivray when he was in the legislature of Nova Scotia. But, admitting that Judge McGillivray was hostile to labour unions twenty-seven years ago, great changes may have since come over his mind. I can remember when the political views of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) were entirely different from what they are to-day. That does not detract from his merits or involve any reflection upon them. Surely, even if Judge McGillivray did entertain views against labour organizations or unions—and there is no evidence that he did, mark you—the hon. gentleman might have been generous enough to believe that, in the course of twenty-seven years, his mind might have been changed and be disposed to see labour organizations in their proper light. But, when you consider the fact that Judge McGillivray was on the bench when he was on this arbitration, removed altogether from the turmoil of party warfare and freed from predjuice, and considering the fact also that he was sworn to discharge his duty impartially, to do what was right between man and man, I am sure the hon. member will agree with me, on reflection, that he spoke a little hastily when he insinuated that Judge McGillivray could not be depended upon to do justice between employer and employee. If I were interested, whether as employer or employee I would not have any hesitation in appealing to Judge McGillivray as an arbitrator who would give fair play and justice, in preference even to the hon. member for South Cape Breton, for whom I have the highest regard.

Mr. MADDIN. It seems to me that the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm) was unduly exercised about His Honour Mr. Justice McGillivray. I would utter a fervent 'amen' to all the eulogies the hon. member cast upon the distinguished jurist. I merely pointed out that Mr. Justice McGillivray was an appointee of this government, one of six, but, notwithstanding that ninety per cent of the unions of this country were international unions, he and the other five recommended against the recognition of international unions. I pointed out that his past record in connection with unions was such as might cloud and warp his judgment. Those were the terms I used. And I added that, doubtless, if such were the case, he was unconsciously biased. As a member of the legal profession, surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Chisholm) can understand a man possessing all the virtues that he attaches to Justice McGillivray could be unconsciously biased. The law takes cognizance of unconscious bias, and for that reason, forbids a father to try his son, a son to sit in judgment on his father, and others within certain grades of relationship to try their own kin. So far as Mr. Campbell and Mr. Archibald are concerned, I think they are, to say the least, the equal of Mr. Justice McGillivray in all the virtues assigned to him by the hon. member, and my observations with regard to these gentlemen were to show that their association, their training, the views they had expressed from time to time—views that there was no evidence to show had ever been changed—were such as to, perhaps, cloud and warp their judgment and thus render them unable to deal equitably with a case of this kind. I imputed absolutely nothing dishonourable to any of the gentlemen whose names I have mentioned; I simply pointed out that, in preference to these men, there might have been selected some student of economics, some professor from one of our numerous universities, a man trained in economic questions of this kind.

The hon. member for Antigonish suggests that I eulogized the United Mine Worker's of America. He is absolutely mis-

taken there. I have not uttered a syllable in this House at any time since I became a member, eulogistic or derogatory of the United Mine Workers' of America, or any other labour organization of this Dominion. I have said, and I say it again, that when it is conceded to men that they have the right to belong to a labour organization, they should be permitted to belong to the organization of their choice, whether it be in affiliation with organizations of another nation, or wholly contained within our own province and country. In order to relieve the hon. member's mind of the idea that perhaps I might be receiving a retainer—I do not know what the custom is on the other side—I can assure the hon. member that I have received no retainer to promote the interests of any labour organization in this House. During the summer of 1909, or, to be accurate, from 19th of July to the 19th of November, I was solicitor under contract to the United Mine Workers' of America and acted as their solicitor, afterwards being specially retained in some cases in my own county. That is my whole connection with them, and I have had nothing to do with them, or any other labour organization, either in a professional or any other manner, from that time up to the present. I have not even had correspondence with them, except that their officers have sent me petitions to be presented asking for the repeal of the Industrial Investigations Act. I am surprised that the hon. member for Antigonish should have suspected that the character of his distinguished friend in Antigonish was so easily susceptible to attack. I am sure that he will read 'Hansard' in vain for language of mine that will bear any construction reflecting upon the honour, dignity, or character of the Hon. Justice McGillivray, for whom I entertain as high a regard in his judicial capacity as the hon. member for Antigonish.

Mr. KING. I do not wish to take up time more than is necessary, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maddin) has mentioned as the employees have, but the government, and if I understood the force of his remarks, he would have the country believe that, in some way, due discretion had not been exercised by the government in the choice. I would like to point out to my hon. friend the circumstances under which the choice was made in each instance. In the first place, the companies have the opportunity to name a member of the board, as the employees have, but the government's opportunity to make the appointment does not come until the company has either refused to name a man or has nominated some one whom it is impossible to appoint. This afternoon, in the House, the hon. gentleman asked me if I had observed the petition from the miners of Port Morien with regard to the member of the board named by the company. I mentioned to him that I had refused to appoint the nominee of the company because I had understood he had direct interest or was a shareholder in the concern affected. I then named a member because they refused to name any other member of the board. I named the mayor of Sydney Mines, believing him to be a person who would act fairly on behalf of the company. My hon. friend will say he is a government appointee. But it was not due to any desire on the part of the government that the appointment was made, but because one of the parties failed to name a representative that could be accepted. In selecting a man where either of the parties refuse to name one, my hon. friend will see that our only desire can be to select an impartial man who would be as far as possible acceptable to the interest concerned. If it is the men who have refused to nominate, then some one acceptable to the men should be appointed. I think in some cases the men did refuse to nominate, and in those cases I nominated a man who, I thought would be acceptable to them, and at the same time would give confidence to the community in general. As to the appointment of the chairman, the remaining member of the board, the two parties selected have in the first instance an opportunity to agree upon the chairman; the government has nothing to say in the matter unless they fail to agree, and then we have to appoint the chairman. The idea always is to get some person who, there is reason to believe, will act with strict regard to the justice of the situation. In the province of Nova Scotia I was aware of the fact that the struggle was largely a union struggle, that there was hardly an employer in the mining district of the province who had not taken sides one way or the other, and there was hardly a representative of labour whose views on the question involved were not already known. Therefore, in choosing a chairman, I sought to find some impartial person, and made selections from members of the judiciary, believing they would have no personal ends to serve. I share my hon. friend's admiration for Professor Shortt, and would have appointed him on one or two of these boards if he had been available. But he had already been appointed as chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and for that reason he was not selected. As to the question of legislation compelling recognition of the unions, if the hon. gentleman has any legislation which he would like the government to consider and will submit it, it will be considered. But I would point out that in the province of Nova Scotia at the present time one of the features to be con-

sidered is the fact that you have two unions that are seeking recognition, and that is the main difficulty in Nova Scotia at the present time. There are the United Mine Workers' Association asking the employers to recognize them, and the Provincial Worker's Association asking the employers to recognize them. There you have two labour organizations, each seeking to be recognized by one employer.

Mr. MADDIN. That is not so in Springhill.

Mr. KING. No, but it is in the other two cases. Any law enacted would have to be applicable to all cases, and I cannot think of any law that I could recommend to this House which would meet a situation of that kind, and compel an employer to recognize one union as against another union which is also asking for recognition.

Mr. MADDIN. What objection could there be to legislation which would compel an employer to recognize any union to which his men belonged? Supposing there were ten unions.

Mr. KING. It depends upon what the hon. gentleman means by recognition. There are different degrees of recognition, one might involve a contract with the union, and one might not involve a contract. If what my hon. friend means is allowing an employee the right to belong to any organization which he chooses, I think that is a liberty which every man should have. On the same ground I hold the view that an employer should be free to say whom he shall employ, that is a matter of individual liberty. If you concede to the one the right to belong to any organization he chooses, you cannot take away from the other the right to employ whoever he pleases.

Mr. CROSBY. What would the minister say where there are two organizations? In the county of Cape Breton a large majority of the men, four-fifths of the men, I believe, belong to the United Mine Workers' Association. Why should they not be recognized as well as the other fifth? Is it not reasonable that the great majority of the working men who belong to the United Mine Workers' Association should be recognized by the employer?

Mr. KING. The membership may be divided, as my hon. friend has indicated. But a couple of years ago I think the large majority belonged to the Provincial Workingmen's Association. The position may have changed since then, and it may change again. I don't see that it is going to be possible on the ground of mere numbers to lay down a general rule that is going to be applicable to all cases. I take the same view with regard to membership in labour organizations that I take with regard to membership in any other organizaation. A man has a right to belong to the Conservative party, a man has a right to belong to the Presbyterian church, and he has the same right to belong to a trades union. But I do not think we can force an employer to employ only Presbyterians, or Conservatives, or trade unionists.

Mr. CROSBY. But does not the minister think that minorities have a right to be recognized as well as majorities? The Conservatives are a minority in this House, but does he not think they should be recognized?

Mr. KING. I have regard for minorities as well as for majorities. The other evening, in the course of the debate, my hon. friend mentioned that when Mr. Acland, the deputy minister, visited Sydney in September, 1909, to inquire into the conditions of the coal-fields there, Mr. Acland did not go to call upon him, and in fact that he only saw him as he was about to leave South Sydney for North Sydney. Mr. Acland was not here at the time and, of course, I could not reply. But, I may say, in justice to any officer of the government who is not in a position to put his own case before the House when a statement has been made against him, that it is only proper that I should state the circumstance myself. I know that my hon. friend would be the first who would wish that this should be done. Mr. Acland has given me a memorandum on the point and I will just read his own statement as I asked him to make it:

I spent from Wednesday, September 1, to Monday, September 6, in Sydney and vicinity. This period included one Sunday and one holiday (Labour Day). I called at Mr. Maddin's law office in Sydney on two occasions and left an official card. The dates of these calls were Friday, September 3, and Saturday, September 4. On each occasion I was told that Mr. Maddin was at court. My investigations compelled me to be principally out of Sydney or I should doubtless have called more often. I did not learn until later that the court that Mr. Maddin had been attending was at Glace Bay. On Monday, September 6, the courts and offices being closed (it being Labour Day), I hoped to find Mr. Maddin at his house, and called there at 9.30 a.m., but Mr. Maddin having no telephone at his house I was unable to make an engagement. I was again unsuccessful, Mr. Maddin having left for a picnic at Port Morien; I again left my card with the message that if Mr. Maddin would telephone me at the Sydney hotel I would come out to see him at such time as he named. Mr. Maddin kindly came in the evening to the Sydney hotel, instead of making an engagement, and spent an hour in my room discussing the situation. Mr. Maddin falls into a slight error in stating that I was anxious to leave to go to North Sydney to see the representative of the north riding. I had, when I met

Mr. Maddin, only just returned from North Sydney and I had reserved the evening in the hope of meeting Mr. Maddin. My memory and my notes on the subject are clear. I think I understand how Mr. Maddin's error occurred. Nine months later, in June, 1910, I was again in Sydney and vicinity for the purpose of making some inquiries into matters relating particularly to North Sydney. On this occasion I met Mr. Maddin by accident just as I was about to catch the boat to North Sydney and I was pleased again to have the opportunity of discussing matters with him. I do not remember mentioning the name of the member for north riding or stating that it was my intention to see him, but it was naturally my intention to speak with him on the subject of my investigation, should I chance to find him.

I think my hon. friend will desire that this statement should go on record because it is an explanation which I feel sure that he will be the first to accept.

Mr. MADDIN. I have not the slightest objection to its going on record. I could not prevent it from going on record when it is read in the House even if I wished to. The deputy minister says that when he called at my office on Friday and Saturday and left his official card there he got the reply that I was at court but did not know until Monday that I had been attending the court at Glace Bay. He knew I was solicitor for the men and he would naturally infer that I was at Glace Bay. As a matter of fact, I live fully a mile by the car-track from my office in the direction of Glace Bay, and I had my mail brought to my house every morning. A note would have found me, and a card left at my office would not. I was not going to my office during that time. On the Monday evening, after coming in from the picnic, I went down to see the deputy minister and my recollection is, as I expressed it here two weeks ago to-night, that he said he was going over to see Mr. McKenzie. I have my diary on the matter, not in Ottawa but at home, and I have a memo of the date upon which I met him, and of what took place between us. I had no desire to place Mr. Acland in a false light or misrepresent him. But, it was a very simple matter to have found out from the officers of the United Mine Workers', whom I presume he would see on the Friday or Saturday if he went down there to inquire as between the contending parties, exactly where I was because I left every morning at eight o'clock, sometimes at seven, went out to Glace Bay and returned in the evening, sometimes at six o'clock and sometimes not till later. I submit that the mere leaving of a card at my office, even although it bore the name and designation of the deputy minister, was not what I would call a very sincere effort to come in contact with me. My stenographer could have told him what court I was engaged in, and at what point. He should have been able to infer that my duties were in Glace Bay and not Sydney, knowing that I was the solicitor of the men. However, it may be that he did not know that. If he did not know that I was the solicitor of the men then I submit that his conduct in that regard is not open to the same criticism. However, I am very glad that he has this explanation to make, and I only regret that he has not some further explanation to make with regard to where he got his information that the strike was a political one, and had its origin in my running against John Moffatt for grand secretary, which took place seven years before the strike.

Combines Investigation Act, $10,000.

Mr. BEST. Would the minister tell us if he has had any investigation of combines, and if so, what has been the result?

Mr. KING. Up to the present time there have been no investigations of combines under this Act. One application is pending before Judge Cannon of the Superior Court of Quebec on behalf of certain parties who have asked for an investigation into an alleged combine known as the United Shoe Machinery Company. I understand that Judge Cannon will give his finding to-morrow as to whether or not he shall order an investigation in that case. There have been a good many inquiries received by the department for copies of this Act and for the forms which have been drafted under it. I think that the purpose of the Act has been served in part owing to the simple fact of its being on the statute-book because parties know it is there, and they have been more guarded in their actions.

Post Office Department, salaries, $561,080.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is an increase of $12,320, composed of statutory increases, as follows: 16 of $100 each, 224 of $50 each, 3 of $30 each, and one of $2.

Mr. LAKE. When does the annual postal guide come out?

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the hon. gentleman will send me his requisition I will be glad to send him any number that he requires.

Contingencies, $64,800.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Could the minister give any information with respect to the newspaper item about a new issue of stamps?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We intend to issue a new issue of stamps before the coronation, with the head of His Majesty King George V. We are in correspondence with the High Commissioner, Lord Strathcona, and I expect within a few weeks to have a copy of that stamp to lay before the House.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to ask a few questions with regard to the salaries of inspectors and railway mail clerks.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I suppose my hon. friend has in mind the proposed increase in salary to the mail clerks. That will come later on. I received a delegation of railway mail clerks the other day, and am to give the railway mail clerks the increase to which they are entitled.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. About what would the increase be?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not think I would be justified in saying in advance what the increase will be. The deputy minister and I have made up our minds, but the matter has to go before Council. The House will not be disappointed in the measure. I personally intend to give them a substantial increase.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does it cover all the railway mail clerks?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. BEATTIE. I hope the minister will be liberal in this. I find some first-class railway mail clerks drawing no higher salaries than some messengers in Ottawa.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There are two classes of railway mail clerks. We have some who have not passed the examinations required by the Post Office Act, and, of course, they must pass that examination before being entitled to the railway mileage. It is difficult with the increase of mail matter and of the railway mail service to ask from any applicant that he should pass his examination. Generally they are employed for a probationary period, and then after they have passed their examination they are entitled to their mileage. The mileage differs according to the service to which they are attached. For instance, a railway mail clerk having a service between Ottawa and Montreal would receive less than one who runs between Ottawa and Toronto, or London. We generally give the longest runs to the older mail clerks as they get the larger mileage. Of course, there is a grade to which they are entitled according to the length of service they have had in the department.

Mr. BEST. I wish to ask about the salaries of rural postmasters.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I had the pleasure of increasing their salaries two or three years ago. My hon. friend knows that some years ago the rural postmasters received only a pittance, $12 a year was the minimum. Of course, there is always a minimum and a salary, according to the revenue of each office. Sir William Mulock increased that salary from $12 to $25, and I increased it to $35. I have had representations for a further increase, and it is under consideration. I cannot say at present if their request will be favourably received, but it is under consideration.

Mr. BEST. While I have no fault to find with the salaries of any servants here in the House, and I think some of them are not receiving enough, there is no employee in any department of the government as badly paid as rural postmasters. You have a daily mail for 300 days in the year, and they get $35. The government of a country like Canada should not ask any one to keep open house for 300 days in the year for $35, or possibly with a larger revenue, $60. They should get fair play with the rest of the employers of the Dominion of Canada. I think they have been imposed on in the past, and if they do not take the amount offered in many cases the post office is taken away. In my county our post office was closed up for a day, and it was almost impossible to get any one to take it. We offered $35 and $145 for carrying a daily mail 9 miles, or 50 cents a trip.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of course, my hon. friend is aware that the mail contracts are all made under contract and by tender, and I am bound by the Post Office Act to give them to the lowest tenderer. Under $200 I am, of course, at liberty to increase the amount, according to the increase of mail matter and to the cost of living. In the last two or three years I have taken it on myself, after investigation by the inspectors, to sometimes increase the mail contracts. But when it is beyond $200 I must call for tenders. As regards the pay of rural postmasters, when I say that the matter is under serious consideration by the department at present, it is no vain word, for it is being seriously considered.

Mr. BEST. The case I mention was not really a contract. We asked for a daily mail service, and we were refused unless we got the mail carried for $145. We succeeded in getting a man to keep the post office for $35, and carry the mail for $145. But we think it is hardly fair to ask any man to carry the mail nine miles and make 300 trips a year for $145. I hope the minister can see his way clear to give the postmasters in the rural parts of the Dominion a substantial increase in their allowances.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would ask my hon. friend to give me in writing the facts he has stated, and I will certainly take a favourable view of the matter.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand that in regard to all the items passed to-night, the Postmaster General will allow them to be discussed at a future time, when his estimates come up again.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I told my hon. friend this afternoon that when postal matters come before the House, it is understood that any question may be brought up concerning post office matters, and I shall be only too pleased to answer them.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is an item here of $50 for inspecting letter carriers' boots. How are the contracts let for the manufacture of these boots? Are they all made at one place for the whole Dominion, or at different places ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are made at different places. We have contractors in all the large cities.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the name of the contractor in Toronto ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not remember at present.

Mr. RUSSELL. The reason I have brought this matter up is, that I know a very good man in Toronto, who has a well-equipped establishment for making these boots and who would be very pleased to have the contract, and would give good satisfaction.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Tell him to send his application to the department.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What has the minister to say with regard to doing something for the family of R. C. Curren, a railway mail clerk in the Owen Sound district, I believe, who was killed while on service ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The case is under the consideration of the department. Of course, the family of a railway mail clerk has always a recourse against the railway company. The department is not necessarily responsible in the case of an accident. Each case is considered by the department, and if it is thought that a compassionate allowance should be given, it is provided for in the estimates and voted by parliament. But we cannot lay it down as a general policy that in every case there will be a compassionate allowance. In any case, there is no recourse in law against the department. It is only a matter of equity, and in such a case, the House may be satisfied that I will do my duty.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When Sir William Mulock was Postmaster General, in 1903, on the 29th of June, he made this statement in the House:

> I have been for a long time contemplating some provision by which the government should decree by statute the payment of a bonus, or a compassionate allowance to the family of a railway mail clerk losing his life in the service, or to himself in case of accident. I am not aware that parliament has ever paid a compassionate allowance to the family of a railway mail clerk who has lost his life in the service, until the present government invited parliament to do so, when parliament unanimously agreed to the proposition. It has been our policy ever since coming into power to give a compassionate allowance of $2,000, a fixed sum, to the dependents of a railway mail clerk who has lost his life in the service. But we have not deemed it wise to put that policy into the Act of parliament.

He continued to emphasize that position found a case such as I understand that of the late Mr. Curran, he would grant that amount of money without hesitation. I would also call to the attention of the hon. minister another case. Of course he is well aware of the death of the late Mr. Todd, of London district, who lost his life between Goderich and Buffalo. I hope the minister will deal with that case within reasonable time, and in the same spirit as that in which Sir William Mulock said he dealt with similar cases.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have no objection to following the policy laid down by Sir William Mulock, but of course my hon. friend will understand that when, as in the case of Mr. Curran, his widow, as I am informed, received from the railway company or the insurance company some $3,000 or $4,000 or $5,000, the urgency is not so great. Each case is examined and dealt with on its own merits.

Mr. BEATTIE. In the case of Mr. Tye who lost his life between Goderich and Buffalo, I do not see how you could make the railway responsible unless it was held liable for the accident. If not held liable by the coroner's jury, damages could not be recovered from it. There should be some provision to meet a case of that kind.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The department will presently take that matter up. We always take a humane view of these cases.

Mr. BEATTIE. I hope the hon. minister will also take into consideration the mail clerks in the post office. In the city of London, their work has been doubled. There the mails are transferred north and south and east and west, and the work of the clerks is very heavy. These clerks have not had the increases to which they are entitled, and have been given those in Ottawa. I might remind the minister that if prices have advanced in Ottawa they have also advanced in London. These men have to dress their families and live respectably, and some of them have very low salaries, not larger than those of messengers in the departments at Ottawa.

Mr. MADDIN. I would like to ask if it is the intention of the government to bring in this session a superannuation Act for the benefit of the civil service, such as mail clerks, letter carriers, railway mail clerks and the outside service.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is a question of policy for the government to determine, and on which I could not pronounce at this moment. Superannuation was abolished some years ago, and I have not heard of its being revived, although, I may say, that had I been in the government at that time I might not have supported any such policy. But we are seriously considering the advisability of giving the railway mail clerks and all such employees, a relief, and before the session is through, I hope I shall be able to satisfy my hon. friend. My hon. friend has been very insistent on this point. He has frequently asked that the department should do a little better for the railway mail clerks, and I must congratulate him on the pertinacity on their behalf.

Mr. MADDIN. Is there any provision in the estimates for an increase?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It would be later on. On account of the Post Office Act I would have to introduce it by resolution.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). As the hon. minister is contemplating some amendments to the Post Office Act, I would like to call his attention to the situation of men who entered the railway mail service before they were 30 years of age. Under the law, unless they pass an examination before reaching that age, they cannot be permanently employed. I have a couple of cases in my mind of considerable hardship. It is rather unfortunate that men perfectly eligible to enter the service and who did enter it at an age somewhat less than thirty, and who for some reason were prevented from passing the examination until they had passed that age, are now not allowed to pass it and cannot be put on the permanent list. It seems to me that there ought to be an amendment to the law which would enable employees who have passed that age, but who are able to pass the examination, to be allowed to do so and be made permanent. I would ask the hon. minister if he intends submitting any amendment to that effect.

Mr. CROSBY. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, but I would add that there are some men in the service, perfectly competent, who, perhaps, will never be able to pass the examination. A man may pass the examination and yet not be competent for the position of railway mail clerk, because that position demands certain qualities of nerve and physique which every one does not possess. A man might not be able to pass a technical examination and yet be a very competent mail clerk and a very competent man on the train. I know of one case where a most excellent mail clerk tried on two or three different occasions to pass. I do not know whether he succeeded in passing in his last attempt, but I do know that he is a very competent man, and I think there should be some provision for keeping such men in the service, but when taking on new men it might be well to have them undergo an examination.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This question of examination for the railway mail clerks has many difficulties, not only in the east, but especially in the west. It is difficult to get proper men to act as railway mail clerks who can pass this examination. This is so much the case that nearly 25 per cent of our railway mail employees are engaged as labourers. Until recently I could not pay these more than $1.50 per day, and yet they are, as a rule, very excellent railway mail clerks. They could not, however, pass an examination, and consequently they had to be employed as labourers. Lately, however, I brought the matter up before the Council, and Council decided that after six months, if these men gave satisfaction I might pay them $2 per day. My view is that we should make those examinations more pertinent to the work rather than covering the field of knowledge that is at present required.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the minister think that the examination that has to be passed by the clerks in post offices, is a proper one for the railway mail clerks to pass? Does not he think that a railway mail clerk should be as well qualified as a postal clerk ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The clerk in a city post office has to do a certain class of work and that alone. But the railway mail clerk is, as has been said, ' a postmaster on wheels.' He has to command all the different branches of knowledge required of the postmaster of a large post office. Therefore, he must be better equipped mentally than the man who is merely given a certain piece of work to do during the day. Besides, more regard should be had for the railway mail clerk, who, as stated by my hon. friend a moment ago, has to travel, with all that that implies of nervous strain and danger to health and absence from home, than to one who serves in the city post office from about eight in the morning to about four or five in the afternoon. I take all that into consideration, and I intend to see that justice is rendered to whomsoever justice is due.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to hear the minister say that, for I think he is on the right track to do something for the railway mail clerks. I have heard it said that the railway mail clerk was only a stamper and sorter, but have always believed with regard to them, what the minister has just stated.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the intention of the minister to place the railway mail service under the Civil Service Commission ?

Mr. MACDONALD. I hope it is not the intention of the minister to do anything of the kind.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister is surely capable of answering the question.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) may think I am purporting to answer the question, but that is not the case. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman wishes to place these officers under the Civil Service Commission or not, but I do not think it should be done. The hon. member for East Toronto, has told us why. The case of the railway mail clerks is a special one, and ought to be dealt with specially. I do not think the law, as it stands to-day, permits of due recognition of the special conditions under which the railway mail clerks serve. If they were put under the hard and fast rules of the Civil Service Commission, it would be still more difficult to recognize their special conditions. I venture to interrupt my hon. friend to say that I hope that the minister entertains no such view.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is quite out of the ordinary to see a member butt in and answer for the minister.

Mr. MACDONALD. I did not pretend to answer; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong), knows that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Postmaster General is capable of answering without assistance. I think the question is a fair one, and one that I am justified in asking.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There was a time—to use the language quoted by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), the other day, in my green and salad days—when I did hope that we could put all the outside service under the Civil Service Act. That was my view two years ago, and even last year. But the more I go into the post office work, and the more I come in contact with the outside service, and the more I see of the working of the new Civil Service Act, the more I am convinced that the railway mail clerks especially, could not be brought under the Civil Service Act. It is too exacting a law. I may tell the House very candidly that it is difficult for the department at Ottawa, even with the university men, who pass very brilliant examinations, before Messrs. Shortt and Larochelle, to get the practical men we want. Of course, after a while, the university men, the young students, become quite able to perform the work. But in the case of a service like the railway mail service, it would be impossible to get the work done if we had to apply to the Civil Service Commission at Ottawa, and employ men only as they could send them to us. As to the railway mail service, you have no idea, Mr. Chairman, of the difficulty we have, especially in the west, to get the proper men. The young men will not take the office of railway mail clerk. They object to it, and ask for pay which we cannot afford to give and to which they are not entitled. The railway development of the country is so great, and the service is increasing so rapidly and its extension is so large that it would be impossible for us to depend upon a supply of railway mail clerks through the Civil Service Commission. I had the idea a year or two ago that it could be done, but I must recant and say that the railway mail service, in my judgment, must always remain an outside service. As regards the large city post offices like Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, Toronto, Winnipeg, the supply of officers needed during the rush seasons, is also a difficult matter. I am studying that point. My views are shared by the highest officers of my department. But, in my judgment, we should try to bring these officers under the Civil Service Commission. I hope to be able to do it some day, but it is a question to be carefully studied, before deciding the point.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The minister said something a short time ago about the labourers in the city post offices. Does not he think it beneath his dignity to employ a lot of clerks and call them labourers for the sole purpose of evading the provisions of the Act ? Does he not think it would be better to amend the Act in such a way as to allow him to employ these people under their proper title as clerks ? The matter is referred to in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Unfortunately, the law will not allow me to give them any other name than that of labourers. But there is nothing infra dignitatem in that name. We are all labourers—my hon. friend is a labourer; I am a labourer. The law is such that it provides that a special examination should be passed. That is for the protection of the government, of the minister and the department.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would they not come under the head of porters ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Some do; for instance, those who carry on the exchange of mails at Toronto, Montreal and other large places. There are porters—regularly empoyees. But others who have some qualifications, but are not ready to take the examination, are needed in the rush seasons in the large post offices. They are appointed as labourers. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor, New Westminster) that those who want to

come in are not ashamed to come in under the title of 'labourers' provided they get a suitable salary.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I think it was beneath the dignity of a minister of the Crown to employ a lot of persons in an occupation where he was not authorized by law to appoint them, and to beat the devil around the bush by calling them labourers. That was the dignity I referred to.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the hon. gentleman reads the correspondence exchanged between the Auditor General and my department, he will find that we had not recourse to that class of men in order to carry out the work of the department, otherwise it could not be carried out. At the Christmas season and at Easter, in all the large cities, we had to take a certain number of men on temporarily and pay them as labourers. I explained that to the Auditor General. It has been the custom for many years.

Mr. BURRELL. The minister suggested that there was a good deal of difficulty in getting the right class of labour for the various branches of his department. I did not understand whether it was owing to the defective education supplied by our universities that he was getting an inferior class of men, or whether it was that the men were not sufficiently paid. I believe throughout my hon. friend's department the men are not paid in proportion to their responsibility. It is my opinion that of all the departments in the government the last one that can be justified in showing a surplus is the Post Office Department. It is a matter of such tremendous utility and importance to the whole people of the country, that too much attention cannot be paid to the officers who administer it. He said he had difficulty in getting adequate and capable men in the west for railway clerks and other branches of his department. The further west he goes the higher wages he will have to pay all round, and unless you pay adequate remuneration you are not likely to get the class of men that you need. The Postmaster General cannot afford to be niggardly in that respect. I have in my hand a request that meets with a good deal of sympathy from me, it is a memorial signed, I believe, by some 6,000 postmasters. Here are the requests they make:

1. An increase in salary to meet the sharp advance in the cost of living.
2. An increase in the rent allowance, and the placing of it on the straight percentage basis.
3. Necessary supplies, such as twine, ink, pens, pencils, &c., to be furnished by the department.

Now, these are all reasonable requests, especially the last one.

4. The postmasters to be given greater protection in the purchase of good equipment for offices.
5. That offices be classified, and a system of promotion (optional for a time) be established, with a view to promoting greater efficiency and permanency.

I think the postmasters deserve our sympathy in that request. There is no doubt that greater efficiency and permanency would be promoted by placing the postmasters on a civil service basis. The day has come for the government to take a step forward in that direction.

6. Better newspaper labelling, with a view to greater despatch and accuracy.
7. Full recognition of the association by the government, that postmasters may establish a system of post relief and make suggestions from time to time.
8. That a copy of the Postmaster General's report be sent to each accounting office.

I am sure the Postmaster General will see the reasonableness of a request like that. I am getting requests continually from postmasters for a copy of the Postmaster General's Report, and I have no doubt the postmasters would read it with more interest than the members of this House read it.

9. That where safes are advisable, they be furnished by the department.
10. Throwing the civil service insurance open to postmasters.
11. A more adequate night service.

At this hour of the night I do not propose to discuss the merits of each one of these claims, but I feel sure they will all appeal to the Postmaster General's sense of justice. They all seem entirely reasonable. He must remember that upon this class of men great responsibilities are thrown, they are men from whom every one of us requires the very full performance of small duties as well as great. I think a generous recognition should be given to this class of the public service.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This petition has already been forwarded to me by the Postmaster's Association, and by several members of the House. It is under consideration by the department.

Mr. BURRELL. Favourable?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would not say favourable consideration for each particular item, but it is being considered very seriously by the department. We have always taken their part in the past, at least I take credit for doing so. If they have had an increase in their salary they owe it to me. I am glad my hon. friend has made these remarks as an adjunct to the petition presented by the Postmasters' Association.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would like to endorse what my hon. friend

has said in favour of that petition. I would also take this occasion of asking the minister whether there is anything in this item for a post office at Central Park, as to which we had some conversation last year. It is near New Westminster.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have not got the papers before me. Is the condition the same as it was last year?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I heard that the minister's deputy had visited the locality this year and had given the people some encouragement.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If my deputy has given the Central Park people some encouragement, my hon. friend may rest assured that the post office will be established, because he generally goes one better than the Postmaster General. He has been there to see what the requirements are. I think he found great improvement in that particular section of British Columbia ; he found a new Vancouver, a new New Westminster and a new Victoria. He was much surprised to see the increased population and business in those cities. He spent a month there at the request of the Prime Minister, who took my place during my absence.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). If the minister will refer to his deputy he will find that the representations I made last year as to Central park were fully borne out. The minister will remember that the office was closed, and another office bearing the same name was established about a mile away. We had a long conversation about it last year, and the minister promised to give it attention.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will have a report upon it.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would like to point out to the minister that while the boundaries of Vancouver city have very recently been extended so as to come very close to where the post office at Central park was, that would not be an adequate reason for not reopening that office because, following on the extension of the Vancouver boundaries that far, there has been opened up another district which will add as much on the east of that old Central Park post office as will be taken off in the west for inclusion in the Vancouver service.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is there a street railway service there?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). There is the Interurban tram which passes through Central park from Vancouver to New Westminster. But the district is settling very fast, and although half of the persons who petitioned the department have now been included in Vancouver and will get the city service there will, in a few months, be some other places contiguous to Central Park who will require post office facilities. I would be glad if the minister would inquire into the matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will have to take the case up with my deputy.

Mr. HERRON. I have had some correspondence along the same line as that read by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) and I would heartily agree in the recommendation made by the hon. member that the postmasters in the outside service should be more adequately paid. I think that some more liberal allowance should be made for rent for post offices in smaller towns. I do not know whether an allowance is made or whether the department pays the rent, but I know that in many towns very inferior buildings are used for post office purposes, and that they are not adequate to the proportions and importance of the towns in which they are situated. In many cases very much better post offices could be provided for a very small additional sum.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the minister if in all cases every clerk in the outside service is treated equally and equitably with regard to statutory allowances and things of that kind. I have in mind now, although I have no list with me that we have in the post office in St. John men who have been there a great many years, and I think, are entitled to larger salaries than they are getting. These men are not getting as much as others who have come in and who occupy what may be called inferior positions, certainly junior positions. It is not encouraging to young men to enter the service if they can see inequalities in the treatment of clerks ahead of them which may possibly be due to changes in government but which ought not to occur under any circumstances. The minister was complaining just now of the difficulty of getting suitable men to occupy positions in the postal service. I think that probably is one of the reasons why he is not as successful as he ought to be. The men, when they go into the government service, go in with the expectation of being treated equitably. Every one expects to be put on the same footing, and to be treated with the same amount of consideration. If the minister expects, as I have no doubt he wishes, to have a contented and satisfactory service, all the officials in his department ought to be able to feel that they would be treated with the same consideration no matter by whom appointed according to their length of service, and things of that kind. Governments change and even the government of which my hon. friend is such an ornament may some day cross to the other side of the House. He would not like to feel

that all those gentlemen whom he appointed might suffer on that account, and I think that every official ought to be equitably treated no matter by whom appointed. I think the minister will agree that what I am saying is reasonable, and I hope that he will see to it that no injustice may continue to be done as I think injustice is now being done in St. John.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) will draw my attention to any such injustice I will certainly do my best to remedy it, but I may inform my hon. friend that as far as I and the head officers of my department are concerned there is no prejudice whatever concerning matters of this kind. Men come into the department after passing the examination required by the Post Office Act, they enter in a certain class and then they go up automatically every year provided that the inspector, the postmaster and the general superintendent agree that the officer has been a faithful employee. It is not to my knowledge that in the many post offices we have in the country any injustice has been done for really it is a shame to deprive a man of his increase merely for political considerations. My hon. friend knows that I am myself a son of a civil servant and I know how in days gone by we were sometimes sad on account of the poor salary that my father received he being the head of a very large family. He never complained himself, he was treated fairly by the ministers of his department although he was known to be a good Grit himself. I want to see the same fairness shown towards all the employees to-day as the ministers of old extended to my own father. It is not to my knowledge that any man has been deprived of his increase on account of his political proclivities. I can assure my hon. friend that if any case arises where in his judgment, or in the judgment of an employee, an injustice has been done he has only to report the case to me, and I will see that it is dealt with in fairness and equity.

Mr. DANIEL. The first time I am down home I will look up this matter and bring it to the notice of the minister.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the minister know of a Bill considered in the Senate last year dealing with superannuation, and is there any likelihood it will reach the House this session?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think it was considered by the Senate as an academic proposition. Of course that question would have to be decided by the government. Many wise people think we should return to the superannuation system.

Mr. CROSBY. I was glad to hear the minister is increasing the salaries of postal clerks and railway mail clerks. So many new post offices are being erected by the Public Works Department that the Postmaster General will be relieved of many rental charges and I anticipated that this increase would be made. I would suggest that no clerk in the postal service living in the city should get less than $1,000 a year. The salary of $400 which used to be the minimum was quite insufficient. I believe there is no man in the country who ought to be protected by parliament to the same extent as the civil servant if he faithfully discharges his duty. I wish to mention the case of a lady in Halifax who was in the service some years ago and then left the service and owing to circumstances over which she had no control returned to it. In the meantime she was deprived of the advantage that would come to her of superannuation. Representations have been made and I hope the case will be favourably considered.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will take up the case.

Mr. CROSBY. We have some cases in Halifax, such as have been referred to by the hon. member for St. John, of men who complain of being in the department many years but who have been caught up to by younger men.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The deputy informs me he has instructed Mr. Ross to prepare a list of the men who have been long in the service in order to review their salaries.

Mr. CROSBY. We have also many cases of poorly paid rural postmasters in my district, one Mr. Wesley Crooks, who has been in the postal service for 46 years, who has a daily mail which must have increased greatly in that time, and is now getting what he commenced with, $30 a year and nothing for rent. I trust the Postmaster General will be particularly kind to that gentleman. It is so long since he entered the service that I forget the politics of the government in power at that time. I know this man very well, and I think he has been postmaster for some 46 years, which would indicate that he is pretty well up in years. His name is Crooks, and the name of the place is Peggy's Cove. He is a very active and capable man, and I think is entitled to some reasonable increase.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will look into the matter.

Mr. LAKE. I wish to ask that a small post office in the province of Saskatchewan called Lajord should be made an accounting post office. It has considerable revenue and it would be a great convenience to the town and district.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will make a note of it, and if it is possible it will be done.

Mr. FRASER. Does the same schedule of salaries for postmasters prevail in the east as in the west?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is a special allowance to the west.

Mr. FRASER. Some post offices in the east have been closed, while in the west new post offices are being opened. Some have been closed in my own riding, though they have been open for over 40 years. One has been closed at New Harmony, the reason given being that the revenue was very small. But there are as many people in the settlement as there were when the office was opened. The reason the revenue is so small is that it has only a tri-weekly service, while the next post office, 3 or 4½ miles distant, has a daily service, and the people go there for their mail, leaving the other office almost forsaken.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will take a note of it.

Mr. FRASER. Another matter. There is a string of nine post offices near Souris, in almost a continuous chain. One carrier carries the mail to all of them, but three or four have a daily mail service, while the others have only a tri-weekly service.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am having a report on that very matter at present from the deputy, and as soon as I get it I will send a copy of it to my hon. friend.

Mr. WALLACE. Has the Postmaster General done anything with regard to a free mail delivery in North Toronto?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am going to Toronto on Monday, and that is one of the matters which I am to discuss with Mr. Ross.

Mr. WALLACE. What about the post office at Mimico Beach, which I asked for last year?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will get the papers.

Mr. JAMESON. I observe by the Postmaster General's Report this year that he is claiming a surplus of $743,210.25 on the year's business. I do not suppose that any person except the Postmaster General entertains the idea that the Post Office Department should be a money-making department, and therefore, in view of the very substantial surplus which the Postmaster General has, I do not think I need be at all diffident in pressing this matter upon his attention. There is a request from the residents of Meteghan Centre, in Digby, This village is situated midway between Meteghan and Meteghan River. The mail carrier in travelling from Meteghan station passes through Meteghan River and so on to Meteghan and on the way, necessarily passes through the village of Meteghan Centre. There is no post office at Meteghan Centre, at present, but there are some 50 families resident there, besides a store and milling concern, and the business is increasing. The people therefore feel greatly the need of a post office. When I presented their petition for one, the answer which the department gave me was that inasmuch as there was a post office at Meteghan and one at Meteghan River, and as these were not very far from Meteghan Centre, there did not appear to be any great necessity of a post office at Meteghan Centre. The cost, however, of opening an office would not be very great. I think that the minimum salary which the Postmaster General pays for small offices is $35, and that would be what he would have to pay there. The transportation of the mails would probably not cost anything, because the mail passes through there now on its way to Meteghan, so that the total cost would be only $35 per year for providing the necessary postal facilities for a very prosperous and thriving village and one which has a bright future. Under the circumstances and considering the substantial surplus which the post office department enjoys, I think that the request I make is a very reasonable one.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the distance between Meteghan Centre and the others.

Mr. JAMESON. About two miles each way.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As there is no mail carrier to pay, I think my hon. friend has made out a very good case, and if he would send me over the papers, I think I can meet his views.

Mr. JAMESON. Do I understand the minister to say that he is convinced because if not, I have more facts which I would present and which will make the case still stronger.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend says it is two miles from each office.

Mr. JAMESON. Approximately. I have travelled the road many times, and that is the distance to the best of my judgment.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is all right.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I hope the minister will allow us to take up matters pertaining to this item at any future time. I intend to emphasize the necessity of rural free mail delivery and there are others not here, who are prepared to take up the same question.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That question must necessarily come up, because I shall have an announcement to make with regard to it.

Mail service, $1,137,700.

Mr. PERLEY. There are some other members who would like to ask questions

with regard to this matter and I think the hon. minister should not proceed any further as it is now past midnight and there are very few in the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have other estimates to bring up and every opportunity will be given to ask questions on anything connected with the mails when they are submitted.

Mr. PERLEY. Having passed the first item, I think we have done very well.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I want the whole item of 309 to pass as I require the money, but I give my hon. friend the assurance that if he or any of his friends want to discuss the general item of post offices, there will be no objection whatever, and they will have every opportunity of doing so on other items.

Mr. PERLEY. I think the minister is asking something very unreasonable when he asks us to pass the whole of his estimates at this hour of the night.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have other estimates to bring before the House.

Mr. PERLEY. We have had a long day, and the minister brought on his estimates very late. He can hardly expect us to pass this whole item covering an expenditure of over $8,000,000 with so few members here. I myself have a good many questions to ask, and I do not think that I should be forced to enter into a discussion at this late hour. We have had a very long day as it is.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am in the hands of the House, but I understood that I had made an arrangement with the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), and until my friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) made an objection, there was no disposition to prevent this item going through.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I did not understand that all these estimates were to go through in an hour's time. We have passed some $4,000,000 already, and I think we ought to stop there and give opportunity for further discussion.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Suppose we leave 'miscellaneous' and carry the mail service.

Mr. LAKE. These different estimates are all part of the one item, and you cannot hold over an item in part and pass it in part.

Mr. LEMIEUX. You can leave the last item.

Mr. DANIEL. The Postmaster General will understand that all these estimates are part of the one item 309, and either the whole of item 309 stands or it passes. I appeal to the chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I, of course, am only too willing to respect any arrangement that both sides may come to; but if objection be raised, there are certain rules of procedure which I may be compelled to enforce.

Mr. LAKE. All the four services are under the one item, and it can be of no use to the Postmaster general to pass three-quarters of them and not the other quarter.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not wish to insist more that I should. But I thought we had discussed very fully every item. However, at the special request of my hon. friend (Mr. Perley) I waive any objection I might have.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Lemieux, House adjourned at 12.20 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 27, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 130) for the relief of Matilda Emo—Mr. Hodgins.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to call the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to an item appearing in the English 'Morning Post,' of the 18th February, in which they refer to the approaching Imperial Conference, and point out that many of the overseas Dominions have sent in an outline of important proposals which they propose to submit to the conference—from New Zealand 15 or 16 various resolutions looking to better communication and better carrying facilities; from Australia about the same number from South Africa, and so on. This item is headed:

NO SUGGESTIONS FROM CANADA.

And it says:

A White Paper was issued last night containing the suggestions made by the governments of the British dominions oversea as to resolutions for discussion at the forthcoming Imperial Conferences.

The main outstanding feature of the correspondence is the passive attitude adopted by Canada. She will take part in the discussion of any subject put forward by the other participants in the conference. She makes no suggestions herself. She gives a guarded welcome to suggestions looking to uniformity as far as practicable in the naturalization laws throughout the empire.

I desire to ask the Prime Minister if it is a fact that with all the important questions looming up concerning this great Dominion and its commercial and other relations with Great Britain and the empire, and with these resolutions now on file and completed, there is no suggestion nothing in the way of initiative from the Dominion of Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that the Dominion government has no new suggestions to make to the Imperial Conference, which meets this year.

RECIPROCITY NEGOTIATIONS.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to read a paragraph from a letter written by Mr. J. A. Macdonald, the present editor of the Toronto 'Globe, and published in the Stratford 'Herald,' of the 21st inst. I propose to read one paragraph of the letter, and then to ask only one question:

(1) Reciprocity had absolutely nothing to do with my going to Washington a year ago. After the close of a certain libel suit in which I was defendant I sought change and rest. On my way to Atlantic city I dropped off at Washington for a day or two. My presence there would have been unrecognized had not the newspaper men dragged me into the discussion of the American-Canadian tariff situation, then at an acute stage. Once in I made the most of it, and got good newspaper copy for the 'Globe.' I saw Aldrich, Cannon, Lodge, Dolliver, Champ Clark and Secretary Knox. On the third day President Taft sent for me. We discussed tariff matters with a great frankness. He expressed an earnest wish to meet Sir Wilfrid Laurier or some member of the Canadian government at Albany, and asked me to prepare the way. That evening I left for Ottawa. The only man who knew of these things was Ambassador Bryce, with whom I was in daily conferense. Not until I reached Ottawa did Sir Wilfrid know. So far as I am aware he knew nothing of my movements. Therefore, when Col. Hughes charged in parliament that I was the 'unofficial agent' of the government he spoke a falsehood.

(Sgd.) J. A. MACDONALD.

La Jolia, Cal., Feb. 18, 1911.

I would like to know from the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)) whether or not that was the first communication with respect to the tariff negotiations between this government and the government at Washington.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The brief communication that the government had, was from the President of the United States, inviting Mr. Fielding to meet him at Albany. Mr. Macdonald is right in saying that up to the time of the interview, there had been no communication with him whatever or anybody else.

Mr. FOSTER. Had the communication from Mr. Taft been received before Mr. Macdonald's conference on his return from Washington with Sir Wilfrid Laurier here?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not remember it at all; it may or it may not.

COMBINES ACT—UNITED SHOE MACHINERY COMPANY.

Mr. ETHIER. I wish to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) whether his department has taken any action with a view to an inquiry under the Combines Investigation Act, in connection with the complaints made against the United Shoe Machinery Company?

Mr. KING. I have received notification from Mr. Justice Cannon of Quebec that he has granted an order directing an investigation under the Combines Investigation Act into an alleged combine on the part of the United Shoe Machinery Company, and that the documents in connection with the matter are being forwarded to the Department of Labour as soon as received, proceedings will be instituted in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 125) respecting the Pacific, Northern and Omenica Railway Company.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

Bill (No. 127) to incorporate the Universal Life Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Low.

Bill (No. 121) respecting the Globe Printing Company.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

IMMIGRATION—EXPENDITURE.

* Mr. WILSON (Lennox) :

1. How much money has been expended for immigration purposes in the United States by the Canadian government during the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1910?
2. How much money has been expended for immigration purposes in Great Britain by the Canadian government during the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1910?

Mr. OLIVER :

1. $232,347.
2. $245,577.

SHIP 'WANDA.'

* Mr. SHARPE (Ontario) :

1. Was there a ship called 'Wanda' on the American register at Detroit changed to the Canadian register at Brockville? If so, what was the date when the change took place?
2. What official appraised its value for duty?
3. What was the value of the ship and the amount of duty?
4. Who was the owner of the vessel?

5. At whose direction and instruction was the value of the vessel appraised for duty?

Mr. MURPHY :

1. A vessel named 'Wanda' purchased in the United States, was registered at the port of Brockville under the name 'Tenno,' on the 20th October, 1909.
2. J. C. Boughner, Dominion appraiser of customs.
3. Appraised value, $1,600 ; duty, $400.
4. William Richard Travers, Toronto, Ont.—bank manager.
5. Department of Customs.

CHACASTAPASIN INDIAN RESERVE.

* Mr. SCHAFFNER :

Who is the owner, or who are the owners, of the Chacastapasin Indian reserve in ranges 25 and 26, west of the 2nd principal meridian?

Mr. OLIVER :

The department is not aware of the present owner or owners of the sold portion of this reserve. The reserve, comprising an area of 15,906·38 acres, was surrendered by the Indians on the 23rd of June, 1897, to be sold for their benefit, and 14,860·35 acres of the reserve have been sold, paid for and patented, with the exception of four fractional quarter sections which have been sold but not patented ; there remaining unsold Sugar island, containing an area of 1,046·03 acres, which is still held by the department in trust for the Indians.

SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, MAHONE BAY.

* Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds) :

1. Has the sub-collector of customs at Mahone Bay, Nova Scotia, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reason, and after what investigation?

Mr. PATERSON :

1. The sub-collector of customs at Mahone Bay, N.S., aged 78 years, has been granted three months leave of absence with pay, until 1st June, 1911, when his services as a customs officer are terminated on account of his advanced age and physical condition. This case was investigated by Mr. D. C. MacDonald, inspector of customs.

THE CENSUS.

* Mr. MARSHALL :

1. Has the commissioner been appointed for taking the census of East Elgin?
2. If appointment is made, what is his name and remuneration?
3. Have enumerators been appointed for East Elgin? If so, what are their names and remuneration?

Mr. FISHER :

No census commissioners or enumerators have been appointed.

EXPENDITURE ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. GILBERT :

What is the total expenditure incurred by the Department of Agriculture since confederation?

Mr. FISHER :

The answer is as follows :

Year.	Civil Government.	Arts, Agriculture and Statistics.	Immigration.	Quarantine.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1867	32,636 77	108,078 25	50,137 91	2,660 83	193,513 76
1868	28,402 37	5,580 59	53,630 73	6,765 50	94,379 19
1869	30,060 42	7,020 14	37,006 22	6,141 33	80,228 11
1870	32,289 69	6,226 84	59,988 68	11,945 96	110,451 17
1871	35,854 75	165,680 01	52,808 83	18,981 20	273,324 79
1872	35,726 43	224,015 68	108,260 83	20,705 85	388,708 99
1873	44,064 31	68,255 96	255,970 53	21,398 30	889,689 10
1874	46,208 59	58,562 31	275,102 37	43,470 50	423,343 77
1875	48,734 07	30,327 94	278,776 99	23,993 69	381,832 69
1876	49,156 58	77,742 21	365,594 00	20,251 36	512,744 15
1877	45,080 17	73,313 93	309,352 90	44,598 14	472,345 14
1878	49,395 75	93,419 28	154,351 42	26,340 02	313,506 47
1879	50,787 22	63,068 23	186,403 06	26,099 17	326,357 68
1880	46,705 62	25,068 24	106,183 98	77,020 37	254,978 21
1881	47,867 51	149,441 69	214,251 05	36,561 94	448,062 19
1882	51,778 55	273,413 31	215,339 24	37,721 78	578,252 88
1883	55,822 83	62,894 07	373,957 71	63,776 73	556,451 34
1884	60,045 35	67,767 43	511,208 83	64,117 89	703,139 50
1885	68,464 40	91,381 60	423,860 90	82,547 11	666,254 01
1886	72,981 81	203,312 02	257,354 93	90,220 62	623,869 38

Year.	Civil Government.	Arts, Agriculture and Statistics.	Immigration.	Quarantine.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1887	72,504 62	253,759 10	341,237 39	121,627 31	789,127 42
1888	75,233 13	311,159 17	244,789 09	67,701 47	698,882 86
1889	73,160 66	161,629 29	202,499 26	90,052 68	527,341 89
1890	77,140 91	153,398 44	110,091 76	72,245 19	412,876 30
1891	79,461 95	410,187 43	181,045 38	77,243 90	747,938 66
1892	78,053 84	426,503 32	177,604 82	80,083 30	762,245 28
1893 (a)	85,526 52	286,553 30	180,677 43	101,954 31	654,711 56
1894	82,424 10	264,879 66		113,571 43	460,875 19
1895	79,564 55	216,740 30		101,761 75	398,066 60
1896	76,151 05	210,877 61		96,404 19	383,431 85
1897	77,366 83	223,972 97		121,044 92	422,383 72
1898	71,537 88	245,231 59		137,293 59	454,062 06
1899	70,746 13	258,782 02		136,743 52	466,271 67
1900	74,835 65	461,560 76		136,134 18	672,530 59
1901	79,446 73	697,206 50		170,474 60	947,127 83
1902	84,321 04	1,274,790 14		264,737 78	1,623,848 96
1903	82,753 19	543,704 93		263,385 72	889,843 84
1904	88,631 58	660,052 60		220,514 68	969,198 86
1905	99,811 96	698,210 65		304,758 28	1,102,780 89
1906	110,186 62	603,590 34		652,083 23	1,365,860 19
1907	82,631 44	625,933 53		397,906 63	1,106,471 60
1908 (b)	107,801 11	1,218,242 38		155,048 18	1,481,091 67
1909 (c)	245,389 20	1,406,345 33		126,665 29	1,778,399 82
1910	351,953 28	997,054 39		143,512 67	1,492,520 34
Total					28,399,327 34

(a) Immigration transferred to Department of Interior 1892-93.
(b) Cattle Quarantine transferred to Arts, Agriculture and Statistics as Health of Animals, 1907-08.
(c) Outside service at Ottawa transferred to Civil Government, September 1, 1908.

HOLLAND PEAT BOG.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Has the government been investigating conditions along the shores of the Holland river for the purpose of ascertaining whether peat or other fuel can be obtained there on a commercially profitable basis?

2. If so, what is the result, and what further does the government intend to do?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1. The Holland bog, which covers an area of several thousand acres in the counties of Simcoe and York, was surveyed and examined during the months of November and part of December, 1910.

2. The results of the survey of the entire bog have not as yet been worked out since the map which is in course of preparation is not complete, and the analyses of the different samples of peat which have been taken at various depths are not finished. The results, however, have been worked out for a portion of the southern part of the bog. The peat contained in this portion of the bog is suitable for fuel purposes.

When the map is completed and the results of the survey thoroughly worked out, the commercial value of the Holland bog and the various purposes to which the peat contained is best adapted will be known, and published in a report.

Mr. FISHER.

BEAUSOLEIL INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Have permits been issued to the Indians of Beausoleil reserve, Christian island? If so, upon whose application?

2. To what person, in what locations and for how many acres have the permits been issued in each case?

3. Have the boundaries of the territory included in the permits been blazed by the Indian agent, what instructions have been issued to him as to supervision to prevent waste, fraud and the like, and to what extent have these instructions been carried out?

4. Are any white men engaged in cutting timber on this reserve or island? If so, is this in harmony with the regulations?

5. Have Indians applied for permission to cut timber on Beckwith island, has permission been granted or will permission be granted to them to do this?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Yes, on application of Indians.

2. Permits issued by local agent under instructions, and the department is not aware as to what permits have been issued.

3. The local agent was instructed that each member of the band might be given a permit to cut over an area of one or two acres adjoining existing clearances; that the permits should describe the area to be cut over, after being blazed by the Indian

the permits should describe the area to be cleared, fenced and put under cultivation within two seasons, or sown with sufficient grass and clover seed next summer to prevent the growth of noxious weeds. The department has no reason to believe that these instructions are not being carried out.

4. The department has no knowledge of white men being engaged in cutting timber on Christian island. The Indians are required to cut and take out timber themselves under permits.

5. Yes; but the same was not granted.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Who is the Indian agent of Beausoleil reserve, Christian island?

2. When was he appointed, on whose recommendation, is he a practical farmer, what evidence had the department of this at the time of his appointment; was it made a condition of his appointment that he should reside upon the reserve and instruct the Indians in agriculture, cattle feeding and the like, and has he resided on the reserve at any time? If so, during what periods, and is he residing upon the reserve or the island now?

3. In order to attain his object, did the government erect a residence for the agent upon the reserve, and at what cost; has the Indian agent ever resided in this house, and by whom is it occupied?

4. Where does the Indian agent reside, and when did he last visit the reserve?

5. Who was the immediate predecessor of the present Indian agent, and for what alleged cause was he retired?

6. Does the government propose to insist that the agent shall reside upon the reserve?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Mr. H. G. Todd.

2, 3 and 4. He was appointed on the 6th of July, 1910. His name was suggested by the Indians of the band, who stated that he was a good farmer. It was a condition of his appointment that he should reside upon the reserve and give the Indians practical advice in farming. He has moved to the reserve, and from information received he was there a few days ago. A residence was erected for the agent on the reserve at a cost of $3,470.

5. Mr. Charles McGibbon. He was retired because he had no qualifications to give the Indians practical advice on farming.

6. The government proposes to insist that the agent shall reside upon the reserve.

FALSE MINERAL NOTICES.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Referring to the following circular, which it is alleged is being sent out from Ottawa to the land owners in the township of King, county of York, viz.:—' By order of Professor J. H. Wilson, government analyst, we have entered upon a lot (describing the property) and surveyed, bored, analysed and assayed the soil on said lots, and found it contained deposits of mineral carbon autricht. Operations for development will commence May 1. All transfers, encumbrances and drainage schemes in connection with said lots after the date hereof will be null and void, as the government claims all rights over said lots.

F. H. FORCHET,
Analysis and Search Department.'

Is there in all the patents a reservation of the minerals for the Crown?

2. Has the government authorized these notices?

2. Do the minerals belong to the Dominion or to the province?

4. Does the government intend to carry on mining or any other operations upon these lands? If so, of what character, with what object, when, and to what extent?

5. In any case are the notices not too broad?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Mr. J. A. Wilson referred to therein is not attached to the Analyst's Branch of the Inland Revenue Department, nor connected in any way with the Mines Department, or Geological Survey, and none of these departments have any knowledge whatever relative to the circular issued by Mr. F. H. Forchet, who is likewise unknown to, and unconnected with any of the departments above mentioned.

THE DOMINION SENATE.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN (Huron) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Dominion Senate as at present constituted is not in accordance with the representative institutions of this country, and the government should take the necessary proceedings to have the Senate made representatives of and directly responsible to the people.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving this resolution I wish it to be distinctly understood at the outset that I have no particular objection to the personnel of the Senate of Canada. There are able and eminent men in that body; men who have devoted their ability and energy to the welfare of their country and who deserve well from her; men whom any constituency might justly feel proud to have as its representative. I think I may be excused if I mention as representative of this class, Sir Richard Cartwright on the one side, and Sir Mackenzie Bowell on the other. So that, Sir, it is not the thing constituted that I object to so much as the manner in which it is constituted. I believe that the people of this country should and must rule, and I further believe that a life appointed and irresponsible body, a legislating body that is above, and beyond, and out of the reach of the people, is entirely at variance with the representative institutions of this country, and is an anomaly that should not be permitted to exist in any free country.

I am safe in saying that a Senate constituted as ours now is must of necessity be either dangerous or useless. If it runs counter to the will of the people as ex-

pressed through this House, then I think it is dangerous, and if it does not do so, in most instances it is useless. I may be pardoned for saying that in so far as our Senate is concerned it belongs to the latter class. I had not the opportunity of listening to the discussion of the resolution introduced this session by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) calling for the abolition of the Senate, but I listened very attentively to the discussion last session and while I can agree with a good deal which fell from my hon. friend in his advocacy of this resolution, I do not agree with the conclusions at which he arrived. I do not think it would be wise or judicious to entirely abolish the Senate and for this reason: As we know, the Senate as at present constituted, is a legacy left by the fathers of confederation, in fact it is a part of the confederation compact. It was instituted and designed for the purpose of protecting the smaller provinces from oppression or aggression by the then larger provinces, and if there was at that time even a suspicion for the necessity of a body of this kind, I think that that necessity is even much greater now, and that it will grow as time goes on, and as the newer western provinces grow in population, power, wealth and aggressiveness. So I do not think it would be wise or judicious to remove from the smaller provinces the protection which was guaranteed to them unless it is shown fairly and conclusively that they are willing to be relieved from this protection. I am not aware that the provinces have given any reason to suppose that they would desire to be relieved from this protection which was given to them as a part of the confederation compact. But there is no reason why an elective Senate, a Senate made responsible to the people, should not be more effective as a protection to these provinces than a Senate appointed by the government of the day, entirely irresponsible to the people and appointed for life, because a Senate elected by the people would represent the will of the people and would of necessity be a greater check upon oppression to the smaller provinces than a body such as we now have, owing its appointment to the government of the day and its members more or less obligated to that government. The Senate may properly be divided into three divisions:

First, those who value their seats as a respectable refuge where they can spend their declining years with ease at the expense of the country. ,

Second, those who value their seats for the social position they gain, and for the facilities afforded for the advancement of their own personal and business schemes.

Third, those who give of their ripe experience and rich, matured judgment for the benefit of the country.

The elective system, I claim, would wipe out the two first classes and relegate them to private life where they properly belong, and would retain for the benefit of the country those who belong to the third class.

Mr. BLAIN. There is no such division now over there?

Mr. McLEAN (Huron). Yes, and they must always exist in such a body appointed as the Senate is.

Let us see for a moment how the situation stands in other countries. An elective Senate is not by any means a new thing. In the commonwealth of Australia six senators are elected for each state for a term of six years, half the number retiring every three years and the entire vote of each state is for each candidate.

In New Zealand, the upper chamber were formerly appointed for life. The term is now limited to seven years.

In South Africa, the last constitution that has been evolved, the first House of Assembly will consist of 121 representatives and the Senate of 64, 16 for each of the four provinces. Eight will be elected in each province, eight will be nominated by the Governor General in Council, four in each province.

In other countries, Mexico, Brazil, and the Argentine Republic, the upper chambers are elective. The same condition exists in the other countries of South and Central America. Canada is the only country in North or South America having life appointees. So it will be seen that this is the only country on the American continent that still continues this antediluvian system. I noticed during the recent discussion that my honoured leader stated that there are many difficulties in making a change in the Senate under present conditions. He has also expressed the opinion that an elective Senate would not be advantageous and that no person in the present day advocates an elective Senate. I agree with my right hon. friend in nearly everything but on this question I must certainly disagree. If I can diagnose public sentiment at all I am convinced that a very large proportion of the people of this country would very much prefer an elective Senate to the system we now have and I have paid very considerable attention to public sentiment on this matter. The objection has been raised to an elective Senate that it would be simply a reflex of this House. I think an elective Senate could be constituted which would not be a reflex of this House, but would represent quite a different constituency from that represented in this House, and I shall endeavour to outline a system which I think will accomplish this object.

In the first place, I would have the country divided into senatorial divisons.

For example, the county to which I belong now sends three representatives to this House. The adjoining county, represented by my hon. friend the Deputy Speaker, sends two representatives. If these two counties were united and sent one representative to the Senate, and the rest of the Dominion were divided in like manner, I think we would have a representation in the Senate considerably different from that in this House. My own county is at present represented by two Conservatives and one Liberal. The adjoining county of Perth is represented by two Liberals. What would be the political colour of the senatorial representative elected by these two counties it would be impossible to say, though I think it possible that he would have strong Conservative leanings. In the second place, I would have the senators elected for seven or ten years, as the case might be. In the third place, I would have a small property qualification for the electorate. At present, in the province of Ontario at any rate, we have practically a manhood franchise. I would have a property qualification for the senatorial electors somewhat similar to what we have now for our municipal elections in this province. I would also have an educational qualification to the extent that I would require that every elector should be able to read and write in his own language. I would also require each elector whose name is on the voters' list to go to the polls and deposit his ballot. This is sometimes termed compulsory voting, and is objected to on that score. I fancy, however, that there is no such thing as compulsory voting. It would be impossible to compel a man to vote for either one candidate or another, and it would certainly be very unjust to do so. But I do not think any injustice would be inflicted on any individual by requiring him at least to attend a polling place and deposit his ballot. If he could not conscientiously vote for any one of the candidates, he could at least deposit his ballot, and in this way show that he was prepared to do his duty. I do not think that it would be an undue hardship to any one. The franchise is a privilege granted by the state to the individual; and if the individual does not think sufficiently of this privilege to exercise it, it certainly would be no hardship or no wrong to deprive him of it for at least a season. Consequently, I would say that every voter whose name is on the list and who fails to attend at the polling booth and at least deposit his ballot unless he can give some reasonable excuse satisfactory to some judicial authority, should have his name erased from the voters' list for the subsequent election, and be disfranchised at any rate to that extent. Now, let us see what the result of this would be. At the last Dominion elections in this country there were on the voters' list 1,461,793 votes. The total vote cast at that election was 1,176,104, leaving 285,689 who did not vote at all. But there were certain elections by acclamation. At these elections there were 22,000 voters, leaving 263,689, or about one-fifth of the voters in Canada who did not record their votes at the last election. In Belgium, where compulsory voting exists, and the only country I know of at the present time where it does exist, at the last election practically the full vote was recorded. So that under this system we would have a large vote brought out which does not appear in the elections to this House, and in that respect, at least, as well as in other respects, we would have a considerably different constituency represented by those who would be elected to the Senate. I would also require the practice of personal canvassing to be prohibited by law. We have been endeavouring long and faithfully in this House to make laws which would ensure electoral purity. I do not know that we have succeeded very well. I do know that we have built up the pains and penalties so high that we are now barely able to see over them, although I must say this for Canada, that I think our elections are as pure if not purer than those of most other countries, and certainly they are as pure as those of the mother country, if we are to judge by the reports concerning the last two general elections there. If we are to judge by these reports, I think our friends in the mother country can give us pointers in the ways that are dark and the tricks that are vain. But notwithstanding that fact, there is a good deal more electoral impurity in connection with our elections in this country than most of us would like to see; and in order to eradicate this evil I think it is necessary to strike at its very root, and strike good and hard. In my humble opinion, this abominable practice of personal canvassing, travelling from concession to concession, from street to street, and from door to door, begging people to come out and vote for you, is demoralizing to the candidate as well as to the elector, and has a very strong tendency to lessen the dignity which should naturally attach to the representative position. It is at this every foundation of much of this electoral impurity in this country. To do away with this evil as much as possible in connection with the senatorial elections, I would make personal canvassing on the part of a candidate an offence that would invalidate the election. I would make personal canvassing on the part of a friend or a supporter of a candidate a ground for disfranchising him at the succeeding election. But in order that the public might be made thoroughly conversant with the public affairs of the country,

I would also require that each candidate should hold a certain number of meetings within the constituency, which should be well advertised and be open to the public, and at which the affairs of the country should be thoroughly discussed.

Another provision which I think would be advisable in connection with an elective Senate would be in reference to the veto power. I do not like the idea of any body having the veto power over this House. But I think that the function of the Senate, constituted as it is now, or as it might be if elected by the people, is that of a revising body. The Senate would have greater leisure to consider the measures passed by this House, and they might secure from this House additional consideration of any measure they might think required such consideration. Consequently, I think it would be advisable to adopt a system such as has been spoken of in the mother country. That is, a measure objected to by the Senate should be sent back to the Commons, and if it should be adopted by the Commons at three successive sessions, it should become law, even though the Senate objected to it. In that respect, the will of the people would receive full expression, the measure would receive proper consideration, and everybody would have an opportunity of consulting with those whom he represented.

I had not intended to speak on this subject to-day, and am not going to take up much time; nor is it necessary to do so. My principal object in bringing this matter before the House was to have it discussed here and in the country. I think the scheme I have outlined is desirable and feasible. Every legislative body in a free country should be directly responsible to the people, and I think I have outlined a scheme, which, although it may be faultily outlined, although it could be, in some respects, improved, it at least lays down a basis on which an elective Senate could be constructed, which would be acceptable and beneficial to the people of this country. In conclusion, I have only to say that I would like to see this government take this matter up earnestly, and give it very careful consideration. I sincerely trust that in their wisdom they will be able to evolve a scheme which will remove from this free country the reproach of having as one of its legislative bodies a body that is entirely irresponsible and over and above the people, and that in this way the government will redeem the only pledge made by the Liberal party when in opposition that has not been already fully redeemed.

Mr. THOMAS BEATTIE (London). I am sorry I cannot agree with the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean). I do not wish to see the Senate either done away with or made elective. The Prime Minister expressed an idea when this subject was previously under discussion that seemed to me a wise one, and that was to make the term of a senator ten or twelve years, and make retirement compulsory at the age of eighty years. To make the Senate elective at this time would be a very serious matter. I agree with those who think it would be well to have the Senate non-partisan. This could be accomplished by having the leaders of the two parties nominate senators turn about. If you have senators elected they must be elected for large districts, each of them covering at least three or four constituencies of this House. You could not expect to get the best men who have reached advanced years to engage in canvassing so large a district. For instance, take the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), or the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson)—I think it would be advisable to have them in the Senate. But you could not expect either of these gentlemen to undertake the work of canvassing a large district with a view to election. I never expect to go to the Senate myself, but I certainly would not wish to go if it were necessary to canvass so large a division in order to obtain the position. But if the Prime Minister's idea were carried out and the senator's term made ten or twelve years, with compulsory retirement at eighty years, I think that the change would be a most desirable one. It is true that there are men who, even after eighty years of age, would be good men for the Senate—there are some of them there now. Still, at an advanced age, as a rule, it is well that men should retire. I hope the head of the present government will carry out the idea that he has expressed.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I have listened to a great deal of debate in reference to the Senate, and I confess I have never heard any suggestions made that appeared to me advisable to adopt. It is very fashionable to talk against the Senate. I believe that, while they are subject to criticism—or, rather, those who appoint them are subject to criticism—we do not appreciate the Senate to the extent we ought to. For my part, I have no hesitation in saying that, long ago, I formed the opinion that we required a Senate in Canada, and I see no reason to change my mind. But I think we could have a better condition of things in the Senate—just as we might have a very much better condition of things in the House of Commons. There is no use beating about the bush—there is no difficulty in reforming the Senate if we wish to reform it. There are a lot of excellent men in the Senate. But there are some not so excellent, and the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who leads the House knew that before he appointed them. He

could have avoided such appointments if he had wanted to; but, if appointments to the Senate are made as reward for stepping down from some other positions, or something of that kind, it must follow—not speaking of any particular gentlemen who got the appointments in these cases—it must follow as a principle that we have bad appointments in the Senate, appointments that never should be made.

When my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) spoke the other day, the First Minister, if I understood him rightly, was in very low spirits. He regretted exceedingly the condition of the Senate, but he regretted it all the more because he was helpless to avoid it—at least, so he wanted us to understand. But I do not understand it in that way. The main difficulty about the Senate is that the gentleman who, for the time being, has in his control the appointments to the Senate will not deal honestly and squarely by the people of Canada in making these appointments. And I want to tell the Prime Minister squarely to his face that, if the Senate is not in the condition to-day it ought to be in—and it certainly is not—he, above all men in Canada, is responsible. And when he wants the House to understand that he is anxious to reform the Senate, I wish to tell him, through you, Mr. Speaker, that he has had for years the opportunity to reform the Senate, that it was his duty to reform the Senate, and that he has not done it. He could have redeemed his promise without any radical action, and, redeeming his promise, he might have had a Senate which would be the pride of Canada to-day.

Now, I do not believe in the scheme of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLean, Huron), I believe we have in our constitution at present, the means of forming an able, trustworthy and efficient body of men, who would be a great safeguard to the people of Canada, if the head of the government would only be reasonably honest, and make fair and honest appointments in the interests of the people. I do not know that I have very much hope that the right hon. gentleman will do that. But even at this late day, I do feel that the First Minister ought to take into his serious consideration whether, in view of the promises he made long ago, perhaps in 1893, in view of his duty in any case, if he never made a promise, in view of the solemn pledges he made upon the hustings that he would introduce a reasonable measure of Senate reform, should be not now, even now, in making appointments to the Senate, be guided, not by political expediency, but solely by the public interest, and I say if he did that, we would very soon have a body of which neither side could complain. I said a moment ago that I did not have much sympathy with those who were always making cheap capital, by decrying the Senate. I like to speak of that body as a representative body of Canadians, a great body under the constitution of Canada. I have much respect for them, and in past times, they have rendered efficient service to Canada; they have stood between the government and great wrongs sought to be done to the people of Canada. I look to the time, even as the Senate is at present constituted, I look with great hope to a day not far distant, when the Senate will assert itself again, when the Senate will show that those members of parliament who have decried them, have not estimated them according to their real worth. I look to the time at no distant day, before we have done with this reciprocity tariff, when probably the Senate of Canada, will, as it was designed to do, stand between a government which has not considered the best interests of the people, and the final perpetration of that government's design; will show by their actions, that above all other bodies in Canada, they can be relied upon in the final resort, to stand fairly and squarely in the interest of Canada, uninfluenced by any body of politicians whatever.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am glad to see that my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) is so sanguine that it is possible to reform the Senate, even without reforming the constitution at all. He looks to the time when the Senate will be up to the high standards which he sets for it, and I suppose there is an alternative of standards. One would meet his views especially if the Senate was composed of angels alone, if the Prime Minister, who is more responsible, I admit, than anybody else, were to select angels, the angel Gabriel and others. I suppose that would meet the views of my hon. friend. If that could not be done, I suppose that a Senate composed of Tories would meet the views of my hon. friend, and I have no doubt that then the Senate would be reformed according to his notions. The difficulty, however, is, that whoever occupies the post which at present, unworthy as I am, I occupy, has to appoint men, and whoever occupies this position will be guided by the motives which generally actuate men. I can assure the House, though perhaps my hon. friend will not believe me—but there are others who will believe me—that in recommendations to His Excellency for appointments to the Senate, I have always thought that I was acting in the best interests of the country. In everything I have done, I have always been actuated by the same motives, I honestly believed that I was serving the best interests of the country. If it were not going out of the scope of this

resolution, I might mention the reciprocity question, which my hon. friend first mentioned; I certainly thought that in this matter, we were acting in the best interests of the country, and I may say that, after having heard my hon. friend to the contrary, I have not changed my opinion either.

Mr. LENNOX. I think my hon. friend did not hear much of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On the contrary, I heard all of it, except the last ten minutes, and I read that part of it; and my hon. friend cannot find fault if I tell him that it was the best part of his speech, because it was composed almost entirely of quotations from myself. So I am perfectly familiar with everything that was said by my hon. friend on that occasion.

This is not the first time that we have heard proposals for the reform of the Senate, discussed in this House; we have had a discussion upon it even during the present session. But the present motion which has been made by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McLean) has this advantage over others, that it makes at least some suggestion. All the former motions we have had, have been indefinite in that respect. All pointed to the composition of the Senate as being unsatisfactory, that it did not represent the opinions of the country. But no one who ever made such a motion heretofore offered any practical suggestion. The hon. member for Huron, however, has today made a new departure, he has made a suggestion, a suggestion that we should abandon the present method of appointing the Senate, and adopt a new method, that is to say, that we should substitute an elective for a nominative Senate. My hon. friend, I think, has realized already, that the remedy which he suggests, would hardly be accepted by this House, nor do I believe by the country, at the present moment. The mode of constituting the Senate by appointment, was adopted, I think in 1865, when the present constitution was formed under the old parliament of Canada; that constitution substituted a nominative for an elective Senate. My hon. friend who knows the history of this country is aware, he cannot have forgotten, that in the old regime, under the constitution of United Canada, which was adopted in 1841, we had as a second chamber a nominative legislative council. There was a long and anxious struggle to reform this system, and at last it succeeded, and the second chamber, which was called the legislative council, at that time, was made elective—I forget the exact date, but it was between 1855 and 1860. It must be admitted, however, that the elective system which was then adopted and which came into force about 1860, met with serious objections up till about 1864 or 1865, although a number of very able men were in the council at that day.

Mr. FOSTER. Under the elective system ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. In Upper Canada, Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Vankoughnet, afterwards Chancellor Vankoughnet, and several other men of great eminence, were brought into the council. In Lower Canada, Mr. Dessaulles, and several others were brought into the Senate, all men of great eminence. But in face of that condition which existed in 1865, the fathers of confederation deliberately abandoned the elective system in favour of the nominative system. My hon. friend, who is an old reformer, will remember that even George Brown, who had been one of the most prominent advocates of the elective system, accepted the nominative system.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman probably knows more about this question than I do, but is it not true that although in 1865 the elective system was left and the nomination system taken for the new confederation, it was done not because the fathers of confederation were convinced that the nominative system was superior to the elective one but because of certain practical considerations; to wit, the fact that there were different provinces coming in, and that they had already nominative executive councils or upper bodies, and it was on that account that the conviction of the fathers of confederation was laid aside for the sake of smoothing temporary difficulties.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As a matter of compromise?

Mr. FOSTER. As a matter of compromise.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, I would not admit that historically. The two men who had more to do than any others with the framing of the constitution were George Brown and Sir John Macdonald. Sir George Cartier had a great deal to do with it also but it was George Brown and Sir John Macdonald who had most to do with the making of the present constitution. My hon. friend is aware that while George Brown was in favour of the elective system Sir John Macdonald was equally strong in favour of the nominative system. Sir George Cartier was also equally strong in favour of the nominative system, and I believe that the opinion of these two men more than any other factor influenced the decision in favour of the nominative system. I believe that on that occasion George Brown gave in to the views of others at the conference while, if his views had prevailed we might have had an elective instead of a nominative

system. But George Brown, very properly I think, yielded his views on that occasion and allowed the views of Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Cartier to prevail, and they were embodied in confederation.

I can agree with my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) that the Senate has not been given all the justice to which it is entitled. It is a very eminent and efficient body. If my hon. friend will accept the statement which I make in perfect sincerity, the only objection I have had in the past, and which I would have at the present time is to be found in the fact that the Senate is too predominatingly under one party. The Liberal party at the present time is the predominating party in the Senate. But, in the olden time, before the accession to power of the present government, the Conservative party was the predominating one ; in fact, when we came into office in 1896 the Liberal party was represented by a mere corporal's guard in that great body. I am asked : Why should you have only one party represented in the Senate? It is easy to make that reproach, it is easy to point to the fact but any man who has been somewhat familiar with politics knows how difficult it is to have any other system than the present one to be acted upon so long as the situation remains as it is. There must be necessarily, in the nature of the case, party appointment. While the appointments that we have made may not all have been perfect I believe that on the whole that they have been as creditable to the government as the appointments of our predecessors. If all of the men who have been appointed by this government have not been perfectly free of fault they have on the whole been as free as those appointed by the previous regime. If you analyze the criticisms or recall the objections which are offered from time to time in connection with motions which have been made for the reform of the Senate, I think you will find that they largely originate from the fact that one party has predominated there to the prejudice of the other party, and if it were possible to have a proper balance of the different opinions which prevail in this House and in this country perhaps we would find a solution of the question. I will go farther and I will give this as my very deliberate opinion that if there is to be a reform of the Senate it should be in line with the purpose for which the Senate was instituted in this country, that is to say, to protect minorities, and to make it representative of the provinces rather than any other body of men. At one time I was very much in favour of the American system of election. The Senate of the United States is elected by the local legislatures, and for the first sixty or eighty years of the existence of the Republic the Senate of the United States compared favourably with any other assembly that ever was in existence in the world. It was a body remarkable for its powers, its efficiency and the great service which it rendered to the nation. It has been alleged of late, and I believe the allegation is substantially correct, that the character, the standard of the American Senate has not been kept up to the high degree of excellence which it reached for the first sixty or eighty years of the existence of the Republic. It is alleged, and I know that the allegation is currently made by the American magazines and press that the present mode of election has become dangerous, and there is serious talk at the present time of reforming it because the Senate has become the prey of plutocrats, and that election by the legislatures is susceptible to the influence of money which has contributed, as it is alleged, to degrade the character of that body. I must say that this has modified my views and that it would not be perhaps acceptable to us to have a Senate appointed by the local legislatures. But, I am prepared to consider whether we should not have some proportion of the appointments made by local authority. That is a suggestion which I made, and it is one which is worthy of consideration. For my part I would like exceedingly that this matter should be approached by both sides absolutely unbiassed and with the view of getting the best system of appointment possible. The present government will not always remain in office. Governments, like men, are born to die, but some men, while they are born to die, will live pretty long, and I do not think this government will die prematurely. But, in the course of time everything must come to an end. My hon. friends on the other side of the House will come into the position which we are in at the present time. I am not prepared to say that it will be as soon as my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) hopes. But, whenever there is a change of government my hon. friends sitting on the other side of the House will have precisely the same difficulty to meet that we have at the present time. I am prepared to approach this question without any bias, and I am prepared to have the question examined whether or not, while we should keep the nominative appointment in the government, we should give a share of the responsibility to the different provinces. That is a suggestion which is well worthy of consideration. I agree with my hon. friend that something should be done. This is the last of the reforms which we promised the country, and which we have not yet carried out. It is a reform which we are anxious to carry out, but we wish to carry it out on lines which, I think, would be more in consonance with the spirit of our constitution.

Motion (Mr. McLean, South Huron) withdrawn.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND WORKS.

On the motion of Mr. Lalor:

That, in the opinion of this House, the practice of the government in determining when and where public buildings and other public works shall be erected or constructed should be replaced by definite rules fixing conditions upon which such buildings should be erected as money is available for such purpose.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In the absence of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lalor) who has given notice of this motion, I beg to move that the order be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, before committing the country to any of the alternative propositions, now under consideration for construction of the Quebec bridge, or incurring any substantial additional outlay, it is the duty of the Minister of Railways to inform this House, by a general comprehensive statement, of all the important steps taken and information secured by the government in connection with the undertaking, and the present situation in reference to alternative plans, cost and the like, but not including information liable to prejudice the public interest in connection with tenders; and to afford the peoples' representatives in parliament an opportunity of considering and advising upon what is best in the public interest.

He said: This is a question which is of course surrounded by a good deal of difficulty, and I recognize the embarrassing position the Minister of Railways finds himself in in connection with this Quebec bridge. So far it has been an unsatisfactory and expensive undertaking, without any good results. We are now committed to an additional large expenditure and what I aim at in this motion is not for the present to criticise the government, but to ascertain what the situation is. A good deal of effort has been made during the present session to discover how far the undertaking has advanced, what the probable cost may be, what kind of structure is contemplated, and other matters of interest to the public, but we have not been successful in getting that information. In January, 1909, the minister said that plans were being then prepared, and that before a year's end he expected he would be able to tell the House the probable cost of the new structure. But the year has elapsed, and another year since, and still we are in the dark. In 1909 the minister seemed to think that as soon as the three experts had prepared their plans and were ready to call for tenders he would announce to the House the probable cost. I understand that he is less hopeful now of being able to tell us that. I trust the minister will take the House into his confidence and tell us within a few hundred thousand dollars or perhaps a million dollars what this bridge will be likely to cost the people of Canada. I took the liberty of sending the minister a memorandum the other day which intimates my personal attitude in reference to the matter and some of the information I desire. My attitude is not at present a position of hostile criticism; it is simply a request that the minister should make a comprehensive statement of all the important steps that have been taken and of the present condition of affairs. The country is anxious about this matter and it is not surprising that it should be. Without saying whose fault it was, or whether it was the fault of anybody, there is already in connection with this project, an awful lot of money at the bottom of the St. Lawrence. Under the most favourable conditions it is hard to tell which is the wisest and best course to take in such a matter, but the government might, without militating in any way against their dignity, bring down the plans and let us have a look at them. I admit that many of us would not know a great deal about them, I certainly would not pretend to, but we may form opinions and the expression of these opinions might by some possibility be helpful. It is not often that I agree with the 'Globe', but sometime when I was perhaps in a better mood than usual I appear to have decided to take the 'Globe' for a guide for once, and I read from a clipping from that newspaper the following:

SAFETY, THE FIRST ESSENTIAL.

The Minister of Railways is having more than his share of trouble over the Quebec bridge. Mr. Graham has been of necessity pretty much in the hands of the expert engineers, who have been advising him as to the tenders for the new bridge and the conditions under which it shall be built. He inherited rather a bad mess and has found it far from easy to clean it up.

There is one thing that Mr. Graham should, and no doubt will, put first in considering the question—the element of safety. The matters of cost, elegance of design, and even convenience of navigation must all be subordinated to safety. One Quebec bridge disaster was enough. It may be that some old-fashioned bridge engineer who puts safety first is holding out against a spidery bridge and in favour of some massive structure like that across the Forth, the unnecessary strength of which provokes the mirth of the modern bridge builder. The 'Globe' does not know what the points of difference are, but it is certain that the people of Canada are for the old fogey ideas that mean unnecessary strength rather than for the sacrifice of assured safety to cheapness. No matter what the cost, the Quebec bridge must be built to last.

No fair minded person, whatever his politics, can cavil at that view: safety is

the first consideration, and we have had enough experience in connection with this bridge to indicate that the question of safety is not yet finally settled. I may, without accepting responsibility for any condemnation that appears in these articles, but merely to call the attention of the minister to the matter, read two or three passages from articles published in the 'Scientific American' of last year. I do not understand that the bridge here referred to is the bridge which the government now contemplates building, but some of the suggestions in these articles may be useful. In its issue of February 12, 1910, the 'Scientific American' refers to the proposition that a country may be judged as to its capacity by the kinds of structures it erects, and it says:

When the Canadian government took hold of the matter and lent all its powerful prestige and financial assistance to the scheme it was accepted as an augury that the new bridge would be worthy of the great Dominion across the border line. We have to confess, however, that the bridge which it is now proposed to build is decidedly disappointing. The type selected and the method of treatment are not up to the latest standards of bridge engineering. In other words, the design is distinctly commonplace; æsthetically it has not a single redeeming feature. In re-designing the bridge the Canadian government could have made more sure of securing the best possible designs if they had thrown the bridge open to world wide competition.

That is an important statement, and although it is pretty late in the day to suggest it now, it might be even at this date worth while to consider whether that is not the position that should be taken by the government. I understand that the engineers are, in a sense, at loggerheads, that they did not agree upon the design when it was prepared, that the expensive design prepared was practically abandoned, and the government now adopts the very doubtful expedient of advertising for tenders, telling those who tender that they are to prepare their own plans and state the amount for which they will undertake to erect the bridge. That seems to me a job lot way of doing it, and I have my doubts as to the wisdom or safety of this plan. This paper says:

We should then have learned whether the strongest, most economical, and most beautiful bridge could have been secured under the cantilever or under the suspension system of design. Personally, we believe that on all three counts it would be possible to produce a suspension bridge that would be greatly superior to the structure which it is now proposed to build. The suspension bridge, especially when built of these great proportions, is a far easier bridge to erect, not being subjected to those heavy erection stresses which are the peril of large cantilever erection. Moreover, the essential elements, namely, the anchorages, the towers, and the main cables, are at all times entirely free from suspicion, and may be erected with the absolute certainty that they are well within the limits of safe construction. With these main elements assured, it is possible for failures to occur in subordinate elements, such as the suspenders and stiffening trusses, without in the least endangering the integrity of the bridge as a whole.

Not so, however, the cantilever bridge, the greater part of whose intricate framework is in compression. Let but one among the multitudinous members of the main trusses fall, and the whole structure will be thrown into immediate and absolute ruin—as witness the mass of tangled steel now lying in the St. Lawrence river.

For the credit of the profession of bridge engineering in the new world; for the prestige of the great and growing people of Canada; and above all for the greater safety of the public at large, we trust that, before the final plans of this great bridge are adopted, the Canadian government will take steps to make it certain that the final bridge will, from every point of view—engineering, architectural and artistic—be the noblest work of its kind yet erected in any country.

Then if I might read a line or two a few pages further on, where they give a view of the Forth bridge in Scotland, the Quebec bridge which collapsed, and of what was at the time of the writing of this article, the proposed bridge, in other words the government design, the design prepared by the government experts. They say:

The commission was appointed about eighteen months ago. In the interim the preparation of the plans has cost about $150,000, and as the result of its eighteen months' work the commission has produced the very commonplace design, herewith illustrated, regarding which there is a general professional opinion that both structurally and æsthetically it is distinctly inferior to the Forth bridge, which was completed nearly twenty years ago.

If the bridge is built according to the proposed plans, it will not only be of inferior merit, considered from the bridge engineer's standpoint, but will also be the ugliest bridge of monumental proportions among those hitherto proposed or built. It presents the appearance of a monotonous mesh of triangles and straight lines. From abutment to abutment there is not one graceful line in the whole structure; not the slightest attempt to combine the beautiful with the useful. The faulty structure which collapsed had at least the redeeming feature that the oulines were structurally and æsthetically correct; and although the Forth bridge has been made the subject of much criticism by the artist and the architect, it must be regarded as having distinct claims to beauty when compared, as on the accompanying page, with the new plans for the Quebec bridge.

It would seem, however, that the board has some doubts as to the merits of its own work; for it now invites competitive plans from contractors, which are to be filed by May 1, 1910; the plans to be drawn at the contractor's own

expense. But if the board has taken eighteen months' time and spent $150,000 to produce the present plans, the public will naturally ask: How can the board expect responsible firms to furnish them with new plans in one-sixth the time and for nothing?

As I understand, it is still intended to construct a cantilever bridge, and without reading I would call the attention of the minister to the fact that in this article they discuss the important question of the width of the bridge. I am not vain enough to imagine that what I shall say is going to change the minister's plans at this stage of the proceedings. I am very strongly impressed with the idea that if any great mistakes have been made in this matter, one of them is that probably this bridge is not wide enough. I am not saying that as a scientific conclusion of my own; I am saying it from having read something as to the width of bridges in relation to their span. These engineers in the 'Scientific American' point out that the fallen bridge was 67 feet wide. I assume that is correct. They say that the new bridge is 88 feet wide, and they figure out that that is one foot in width to every 20 feet in length of span, the span in this case being about 1,800 feet. The Forth bridge is 120 feet wide, and its span is 1,700 feet odd, pretty nearly as great a span as this, and the width of the Forth bridge is as one foot in width to 14 feet of span This writer points out that there have been bridges which have been built on a narrower basis, and which are still standing, but he says they were fortunate, perhaps, at the time of construction in not having to encounter heavy winds. He points out that both during construction, by reason of winds, which have to be taken into account, and also by reason of winds after construction and the vibration of trains on this bridge, anything less than say 120 feet in width would be altogether too narrow.

The result, he also points out, will be that trains will not be able to pass over the bridge at probably more than 25 miles an hour, whereas they pass over the Forth bridge at the rate of 50 or 60 miles an hour. I assume that all these questions have been considered by the minister. They are not new or discoveries of my own; but they are elements which enter into the consideration of this problem in which we are all interested, and to which I thought it right to call the minister's attention before asking him to reply. I would be glad, and I think the House and the country would appreciate it if the minister would tell us, as nearly as he can, about how much the proposed new bridge will cost, when it is expected that it will be completed and ready for the reception of trains, what are the various schemes that have been submitted for construction, and how matters stand as regards the engineering staff at the present time. The minister was good enough to tell us the other day that the chairman of the enginering board has resigned. It is rumoured that that gentleman was not himself an engineer. I do not know that it has ever been alleged in this House that he is. Whether that is material or not, I am not at present proposing to argue; but that we would like to know. Perhaps the minister would also tell us why the cantilever plan is considered the better plan under the circumstances. Although I know that the minister has a great contempt for the suggestion of a tunnel, he might also tell us how far the question of a tunnel was considered. He said the other day that owing to the high banks at the point where the bridge is being constructed, a tunnel would not be feasible. I recognize that, but I am told that other schemes were suggested, for instance, a tunnel from somewhere near the mouth of the St. Charles river. The minister might also explain to the House whether he considered the question of building a bridge across to the island of Orleans, and then to the other shore, which is advocated by some as being a scheme more suitable than the present one. The government has a great responsibility thrown upon it in connection with this bridge. The people are anxious to know what the situation is at the present time, and the minister would be relieving himself of a certain amount of responsibility and would perhaps be satisfying the public if he gives us a pretty full statement of the present condition of the matter.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, for nearly a quarter of a century I was engaged in newspaper work, and it has always been contended in that profession that everybody knows better how to run a newspaper than the man who is running it. That is the way I would like to apply criticisms by the press of various engineers in regard to the Quebec bridge. Every man who has ever dealt in horses has had this experience, that as soon as he has sold a horse for a hundred dollars, somebody came along and told him that if he had known that he was going to sell the horse, he would have given him a hundred and ten dollars for it; and if he bought a horse, somebody came along immediately afterwards and told him that he had a better one to sell at the same price. This Quebec bridge, as my hon. friend intimates, has been a most troublesome thing to deal with, and for this reason. If it were something of ordinary importance or magnitude, the head of a department, even with ordinary ability, would get the various interests together and then decide what ought to be done. But this bridge is the greatest thing of the kind ever undertaken in the world. The Forth bridge has a span of practically the same

length; but the trains to be accommodated on it are so light that you can hardly make a comparison between the two. To begin at the reverse end of what my hon. friend said, I think it but fair to Mr. H. E. Vautelet to make it clear that he is not only an engineer, but a magnificent, able man, and resigned in spite of my urgent protest. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, in whose employ he was for years as chief bridge engineer of the Canadian Pacific railway, bears testimony to his ability, and how any person could have ever intimated that he was not an engineer is beyond my comprehension, because his name has always 'C. E.' affixed to it wherever it appears. I wish to state most emphatically that Mr. Vautelet is a very able man, and Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, recommended him to me even before he was placed on this commission. He designed the structure at St. Andrew's Rapids, Manitoba, which is an evidence of his great engineering skill, and he was for years in other positions. As to the speed required of certain companies to prepare plans, my hon. friend read an article from the 'Scientific American,' which I beg to remind him is not looked upon as the leading scientific authority on this continent at the present time. Years ago it was; but while attending a meeting of the engineers of America not long ago, I discovered that there were one or two other journals which at the present time they regarded as being, greater authority. It is an able journal, but it has devoted its columns of late years, so I am told by the best engineers, rather to criticisms—what journalists call knocker's column; though I do not wish to make that point in what I am going to say. My hon friend, reading from the 'Scientific American,' said that it would be better if these plans were thrown open to world wide competition. Well, they were, practically. Practically all the large bridge companies of the world sent representatives to Montreal to look into the plans and specifications. They were notified by advertisement and personally that, in addition to tendering on the board's design, they were invited to put in tenders on designs of their own.

Mr. LENNOX. Perhaps my reading was not first-class, and the minister (Mr. Graham) did not quite catch the idea. As I understand it, the 'Scientific American,' is saying that, instead of engaging three distinguished engineers to prepare plans, it would have been better to throw open the preparation of plans to the world, so that engineers the world over could compete in the drawing of designs and furnishing of plans. I suppose they would have to be paid something. But it would be on the same basis as the competitive plans for the public buildings supposed to be built here.

Mr. GRAHAM. Which are quite often not accepted.

Mr. LENNOX. I know.

Mr. GRAHAM. But, in another way that is practically what was done, the bridge companies of the world have the best of the bridge engineers, with a few exceptions, in their employ. All these bridge companies were invited to put in their own designs. But, it is fair to my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) to add, that they were to adhere to the specifications of the board. As a result, four large bridge companies, including some of the best in the world, did tender. My hon. friend, reading from the 'Scientific American,' complains that they did not have sufficient time to make out their plans and designs, and, as proof, says that it took the board some eighteen months. As a matter of fact, every one of these companies had had access to every investigation the board's staff was making during all these months. As soon as the board started working out their designs, putting on a paper the result of their studies and investigations, representatives from all these companies were given free access to everything they had done. So, as a matter of fact, everything that could be got together in the way of information by the board's staff these men had at their disposal. So, they were in the same position as the board which had to make the investigation from the beginning. I had a talk with a prominent engineer the other night, and he said that whatever might be the result, or whoever might build this bridge, one thing certain was that the investigations made and information obtained by the board had contributed very materially to the scientific knowledge of the world, and that information, of course, laid the foundation upon which the other tenders were submitted.

Then, my hon. friend asks why a cantilever design was chosen instead of a suspension, and quoted from the 'Scientific American' again in favour of a suspension bridge. One gentleman was strongly in favour of a suspension bridge, but he has had a hobby of that for some years, and possibly it is right. A certain school of engineers, very small in number, were very anxious that this design of a suspension bridge should be tried on the Canadian people at Quebec. But, I say to my hon. friend candidly that not one engineer I have met or have had the opportunity of consulting on this continent or in Europe but disagrees with the proposal to put a suspension bridge there—they were unanimously in favour of a cantilever. One of the bridge firms, the Philadelphia concern, did, for another party, present a plan for a suspension bridge, but it was immediately rejected by the board as insufficient.

Now, I cannot tell why a cantilever is considered better than a suspension. That is a scientific matter. It has been explained to me a good many times, but if I were to endeavour to set forth the technical reasons on the subject, I should only display what I do not know about it. My safe plan is to adhere to the opinion and advice of the men who, I think, are as capable of forming opinions on these matters as any that can be found on the continent.

Now, as to the principle of the bridge: It is fair to say, on behalf of the chief engineer who has resigned, that he always contended for what is known as a single intersection design. The Forth bridge is a double intersection design. The chairman disagreed with some other members of the board on this question of single and double intersection. He contended, and adhered to it to the end, that the single intersection was the proper principle to adopt. They discussed it thoroughly. As a result, the board's design, prepared by Mr. Vautelet, was on the single intersection. And I may add that every design tendered on by any bridge company, either here or elsewhere, was on the single intersection principle, which shows fairly clearly, to my mind, that that was the proper one, because whoever builds this bridge has to take full responsibility for the design as well as the construction on that design.

Mr. LENNOX. Can the minister (Mr. Graham) explain what is meant by the single or double intersection?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a technical matter which the engineers have threshed out thoroughly. It is something that I do not know anything about; and I say with candour that I think there are few gentlemen in this room who know anything about it. But I do not mind giving what seems to me an illustration of it. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) has seen a lattice fence. If it were built on the double intersection principle, the lattices would be double. Engineers take the position that it is much easier to calculate the direct stress on the members of a single intersection than to divide up the strains amongst the members of the double intersection. At all events, as I say, all those companies that put in their own designs must have favoured the single intersection, as they based their tenders upon that principle.

Now, as to safety. As I have stated to the House on previous occasions, the instruction always given to the members of the board was that safety was the first consideration. We have had one disaster. As my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) says, we are not now discussing who was at fault; but we have had one disaster, the most lamentable part of which was the great loss of life. We must provide against anything of that kind in the future. The question of safety might be divided into two periods. There is the question of safety after the bridge is erected—that is one thing that is most essential. But there is another which is second in importance only to the first, and that is safety during erection. One of the chief points under discussion by the board at various times has been, if possible, to secure a design that will afford the greatest safety to both life and property during the time of erection; in fact, at one time that was the chief subject of disagreement among the members, each contending for his own theory, the one part of the board pointing out that it was——

Mr. LENNOX. Safety in construction is a necessary preliminary condition, because if you cannot get the bridge erected, you certainly cannot use it afterward.

Mr. GRAHAM. The bridge might fall down once and a hundred lives be lost and five or six million dollars' worth of property might be destroyed; then the company responsible, might erect the bridge, profiting by their sad experience. But that would not restore lost lives. We must have safety in the erection, so that there will be no other calamity. I impressed that on the board, and they have made that one of the chief features of their discussions, and one of the chief requirements. I do not know what else I can say to my hon. friend. Every precaution has been taken. When this project was brought before the House by myself, shortly after coming into the government, I made a statement to the House, when I asked them to pass an Act to take over this work, on what lines I would try to have the bridge reconstructed. I admit now that I little knew the difficulties I was facing in attempting the reconstruction of the bridge, it is such an enormous undertaking. It may be, that I had the enthusiasm of youth, in thinking I would accomplish everything in a short space of time. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to accomplish the reconstruction of this Quebec bridge in a safe and sure way, but it is taking a great deal longer time than I expected. Scientific men tell me that I should not be discouraged, that the country should not be discouraged, at the slowness with which we are progressing. For some months we have been feeling our way, and testing it at every step. I believe that is the proper thing to do, and I rather encourage them to take their time and not to hurry, because we must make a success of the bridge, no matter if it does take a few years longer.

Now I said to the House at that time, that I would appoint prominent engineers, men of reputation, and place in their hands the entire responsibility for the

plans, and in addition, the responsibility for the construction of the bridge on the plans. An order in council was passed, embodying those ideas. Under that order in council, Mr. Vautelet, of Montreal, a very prominent and able man, was appointed chairman and chief engineer; Mr. Fitzmaurice, of London, England, who was associated with Sir Edmund Baker, on the Forth bridge, was appointed as another; and Mr. Modjeska, of Chicago, a very eminent bridge engineer, and a member of the American Society of Engineers, was appointed the third man. They proceeded to prepare the plans, and as I have pointed out, they have differed at various times. Mr. Fitzmaurice, some months ago, I think about the close of last session, intimated to me that he would like to resign his position. He gave two reasons, one was his health, and the other was, that he did not approve of the plans being prepared by the chairman, and thought they could be improved on. After returning from the west I accepted Mr. Fitzmaurice's resignation, one of my chief reasons being, that we were coming to the point where some practical work had to be done in connection with accepting the contracts, and we ought to have a man who could pay more attention to the work and be at the meetings more regularly. His resignation was accepted; and I looked around to find a man to replace him, and I believe I have found a first class men. I went to New York, and discussed the matter with several men, and I heard about Mr. Charles Macdonald, an ex-president of the American Society of Engineers, a man who was born, I think, in Leeds county—which is certainly nothing to his detriment—who had been a bridge engineer for many years, engaged in construction, who was afterwards, I think, associated with the American Bridge company, a very successful bridge builder, and engineer, so successful that he had acquired a competence, and is now living in Gananoque, practically retired. When I went to New York, I was aware that Mr. Macdonald had returned, and was living in Gananoque. But it seemed to be the universal opinion among the engineers with whom I spoke, and of Mr. Vautelet as well, that if I could secure the services of Mr. Charles Macdonald, I would be getting one of the foremost authorities in bridge construction on this continent. Mr. Macdonald, for reasons that are obvious, was not anxious to join the board. He is in a position where he does not have to work any longer, and it took a good deal of persuasion on my part, before he would consent. Finally he took this position: If I can assist this great project, I have such a pride in my old home, and have such a strong Canadianism in my nature, that I will sacrifice myself for a little while, and give up some of my time, in order to work out this problem. Mr. Macdonald did not know what the remuneration was to be,—I believe he would have consented to act without remuneration—and I consider Mr. Macdonald's motive in coming practically out of retirement, to assist in this work. is a patriotic one exclusively, and that there is no mercenary motive in his act. Now he has been giving attention to this work. As I said, he is a great authority on bridge work. I think nearly a year ago, Mr. Vautelet, in conversation with me, suggested that he believed when the time came for the construction of the bridge—he did not put it just in that way, but that was the essence of what he said—he would feel like retiring. It has been a most trying work for him, and trying on others as well. I thought I had induced him to remain at a recent meeting I had with the board in New York, and I was congratulating myself that Mr. Vautelet would remain as chief engineer. The design prepared by the chairman of the board was his design, he is strongly in favour of it, and believes it is the better design. There was some disagreement as to the design, and he took the position later—that under the conditions existing, he would resign and his formal resignation was handed in. It is possible he would have continued in his desire to resign any way—even if his design had been selected. Among the engineers, I believe it is held that the man who makes a design is the best man you can get to erect the design, because he has faith in his structure, and knows all about it, knows what he is doing, and is more competent perhaps, than any other engineer to successfully complete what he started out to do. I might say that Mr. Macdonald accepted appointment only until the contract is let.

Mr. LENNOX. While the minister is dealing with Mr. Vautelet's resignation, will he pardon me for interrupting him? It is rumoured—and I am only taking it as a rumour, so that it can be cleared up—it is rumoured that Mr. Vautelet refused to consider the other designs, that when the question of selecting a design came to be considered, I think probably at the time the question of awarding the contracts came to be considered, Mr. Vautelet, for some reason, refused to take any part in the question whatever. It is also said that he was so determined about this matter, that he would not put a certain question to the vote at a meeting of the board, and that in consequence, the minister was called in, and had to act himself as chairman. Now I am not, for the present, criticising Mr. Vautelet. What the minister says about his adhering to his own design, and not desiring to continue his

services if it was not accepted, may be a proper position for him to take. But I would like the minister to explain, if he understands what I am driving at, how much foundation there is for that story.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be absolutely courteous to my hon. friend, but I am afraid it would not be in the public interest just now, at the point we are at, for me to go into these details. He will see on a moment's reflection, that I am trying to bring order out of all these difficulties, and we must not do anything that might tend to create chaos.

Mr. LENNOX. If the minister does not think it is desirable at the present time, I do not press the matter.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will give this much along that point: It is incorrect to say that Mr. Vautelet did not consider these original tenders that were put in. They sat as a board, considered them all and made a report to me, which they all signed on the various tenders, but I thought that was not sufficiently definite, and I asked for a more definite report. The original tenders were discussed by all the members of the board, and the report was signed by Messrs. Vautelet, Macdonald and Modjeska. The other point was merely a matter of detail. At a meeting of the board certain motions were placed before the board, which I will be happy to give the House at a later stage. The chairman thought—and he gave his reasons for it—that these motions were out of order, and he did not put them. I never acted as chairman at any meeting of the board.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister stated that some little time ago, it was determined that the responsibility for the plans and for the construction should be absolutely placed upon the three engineers. The minister mentioned the other day in the House—I think he was entirely right—that when there was an effort to shift the responsibility he said: You gentlemen must take that responsibility yourselves. When the minister formed the plan of leaving the responsibility for the plans and construction upon these three engineers, did they accept that position?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is taking me along, step by step, I am afraid.

Mr. LENNOX. At the time that they engaged to act as engineers of this great work, did they take upon themselves the full responsibility for all the proceedings?

Mr. GRAHAM. They were appointed under order in council; they knew the order in council providing absolutely for what I have stated.

Mr. LENNOX. They accepted that position?

Mr. GRAHAM. Certainly; there was no doubt in my mind that they accepted full responsibility.

Mr. LENNOX. Then two of these engineers at least have resigned—Mr. Fitzmaurice and Mr. Vautelet. How does the matter stand as regards the responsibility for construction now that they have resigned?

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, their successors accept the responsibility they had.

Mr. LENNOX. Did the responsibility mean anything? Was there anything binding upon them at all? There was no obligation taken from them that they would be responsible from beginning to end?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot exactly get at what my hon. friend means. If the minister accepts the full responsibility of his once, and the people put him out, or if he resigns, he is relieved of responsibility.

Mr. LENNOX. But there is some difference in a case of this kind.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not get at what my hon. friend means.

Mr. LENNOX. There is an order in council placing the responsibility, and the minister says that the engineers appointed were to take the responsibility for the design and construction. I do not understand that there was any obligation entered into by these engineers that they would assume that responsibility.

Mr. GRAHAM. They gave no bond, of course, that they would do so, but they accepted the position as members of that board, and so long as they remained members of the board they fulfilled the duties devolving upon them. When they resigned we had to get some others to fill their places.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Have their places been filled?

Mr. GRAHAM. The place of the chairman and chief engineer has not been filled. Mr. Fitzmaurice resigned and Mr. Charles Macdonald, as I explained, has accepted the position, and a happy choice, I think, it was. Now, as to the cost: My hon. friend must see that we must look at this question from a business standpoint. We are within hailing distance of having the matter closed up, and the contract signed, the details of which, I think, will fully satisfy my hon. friend, judging from his speech this afternoon, when he sees the documents laid on the table of the House. This will be the result if we are successful, but my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) will understand that you are never sure of having a contract closed until the signatures are placed upon it, and it would not be in the public interest for me to enter

into fuller details as to this contract than I have done. I have given the House all the information that, from a business standpoint, I ought to give. Suppose I were to go into details and state some of the differences, and it would take a very long time to discuss in detail all that has taken place at the board—

Mr. LENNOX. What about putting the plans on the table?

Mr. GRAHAM. If we knew exactly the design upon which the bridge was to be constructed to-day, I might put them on the table, but inasmuch as the design under consideration and the contract are unalterably united, if the contractors or the bridge builders declined at the last moment under the conditions imposed to sign the contract, I might be in the position of having to accept some other design, and as the matter is not yet decided, I think it would be altogether unwise from a business point for me to give any further details to the House. I assure my hon. friend that the point that he has raised has been guarded in so far as we can guard it. We have taken the advice of the very best men, I believe, to be found on this continent. No step has been taken without full consideration. There has been no difference without calling in some other expert engineers in order to get the benefit of their advice. Step by step this work has been progressing, and I hope that in a few weeks at the utmost I will be able to give the House the result of months and months of great anxiety on my part and very hard work on the part of the several members of the board. Safety is the first thing—absolute safety—and the criticisms of the 'Scientific American,' I believe, will be found to be totally unwarranted when the papers and designs are put on the table of the House. I assure my hon. friend that this is one of the most difficult problems that any government has ever had to deal with. I have devoted hours, day and night, to try and work it out, but I have depended absolutely at every step on the advice of the scientific men engaged for that purpose, I assure my hon. friend and the House that I have not taken any step of importance in the matter in which I have not had the majority of the board behind me. I have acted on their advice, and if we cannot be successful with the advice we have had, then I believe no success can attend such an enterprise. But I have full confidence in the plan adopted. I have every confidence in the men on the board, and I believe that when this contract is signed, as I hope to have it very shortly, the country will be satisfied, my hon. friend will be satisfied. The construction of material at least for this great undertaking will proceed in a few months, and the people and the government will have reason to be proud of the Quebec bridge in the years to come. As to the cost, my hon. friend will see that it would not be wise for me to mention that at the present moment.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to ask the minister what is the width and what time it is now estimated it will take, in a general way, to complete the bridge. I do not think he can give the time within a few months. There is one question that I want to ask the minister that I do not understand myself. It has been handed to me by a gentleman who does understand it, and I am requested to ask it. It is this: How many safety factors, after completion, does the design provide for. That is some technical point that I do not profess to understand.

Mr. GRAHAM. Neither do I.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). The minister has not told us what is likely to be the cost of this bridge. He says it would be injudicious to do so, but I have never yet heard a minister ask for a vote unless he was able to at least give the estimated cost. Again, is the minister satisfied that the present location of the bridge is the best one possible? I have been informed that there are other locations on which the bridge could be built for less than half the cost, say for instance, a little above Three Rivers, or across the Island of Orleans. It may only be common talk, and it may have no foundation, but it is certainly stated that the reason the bridge cost so much is because it is built there so as to be near the city of Quebec.

Mr. GRAHAM. The width of the bridge as in the official design is 88 feet, and I think the same width is maintained in the other designs, but as to that I am not absolutely sure. The time runs from three to five years and judging from the progress we have made so far my own opinion is that it will be nearer five than three. Last year my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) suggested that the superstructure would cost $11,000,000 and I will not quarrel with that approximation of the estimate; I am hoping that it may be something less. I think the contract for the substructure was in the vicinity of two and a quarter millions. One of the duties of the new board was to examine the location, and they reported that the present location was the best; it is eight miles west of the city of Quebec. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) withdraw his motion?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is one point which should be explained. A board of three able engineers, as I understand, was constituted and we are told that the best men in that particular department were secured. These three engineers con-

sulted, investigated, and eventually prepared plans, having taken a reasonably long time in which to do that work. It appears that when tenders were asked it was suggested that any tenderer might tender upon his own plans, and it is said that the plan likely to be accepted was prepared by a certain corporation which tendered. It is singular that after a board of very able engineers had been at work for a long time on this problem, that the government should have cast their plans aside and adopted a different one. I do not inquire as to this for the purpose of getting information that the country and parliament should not have at present, but I mention it as being rather singular.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a very proper question and without explanation it would bear the interpretation suggested by my hon. friend. One of the difficulties of the department was this: The chairman of the board had very decided views along certain lines, and the other members of the board had very decided views along other lines. When I considered the time had arrived when we ought to advertise for tenders I found they were not a unit on the chairman's design which was called the board's design, and to proceed with the advertisement—and Mr. Fitzmaurice puts it fairly plainly in his letter to me—I thought it well to make it as a compromise that they would agree to the government advertising for tenders on this design, but that tenderers should be invited to put in a design of their own. The other two members of the board took the position that they were not satisfied that, for such a great undertaking the board's was the very best possible design, and in the resolution of the board they set out that if any better design were presented by any of the tenderers they would accept it over the board's design. On that understanding we advertised for tenders on the board's design and permitted the tenderers to send in competing designs. Two members of the board think there is a better design than the official design, and that is the explanation.

Mr. LENNOX. I have no complaint to make of the reply made by the minister; I treated him very well and he responded. There is a good deal of information no doubt that we would like to have at this stage which it might possibly be urged that it is not wise to give just now but, on the other hand there is a lot of information which I believe might be given to the country now or soon. I trust it will turn out as the minister says, that within a few weeks at furthest we will have the information that the country is waiting for. I hope the minister will make the announcement to the House, without being asked, at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The minister said that a condition was attached to the tenders that the plans should adhere to the specifications of the board. That may be a good controlling feature in the matter. Ordinarily I would not think it wise or safe to take the somewhat haphazard plans that are prepared by contractors. Another feature not fully developed by the minister is that the minister realized when he was about to let this contract that it was necessary not only that he should have competent men to design the bridge but that these men should be in charge of the carrying out of the work. That, I think, was wise. The chief engineer refused to go on with the work when his plan was disregarded. It may be that from his very desire to obtain the services of gentlemen especially eminent, the minister has run into that other dangerous extreme that as men do not become eminent until they become somewhat advanced in years, and as they become advanced in years they sometimes become independent, the government have probably employed engineers in this case who are to a large extent independent of the compensation they were to receive. The minister might have done better if he had obtained the services of some men who by reason of their position might be expected to remain in the employment of the government throughout not only in the making of the design but the execution of the work. I am inclined to think there is a weakness at this point, that we are now virtually away altogether from the position at which we started, and which was covered by the order in council referred to by the minister. Mr. Vautelet is out of it, his responsibility is gone, Mr. Fitzmaurice is out of it, and his responsibility is gone. The original official plan is out of it, and all the benefit of that plan or at least a great deal of it is lost. The chairman of the board is taking no part in this matter, his plan has been disregarded, he is eliminated from the proposition altogether.

A word as to the cost of the bridge. I am not going to quarrel with the minister's statement but to call attention to it. He says that as to the superstructure of the bridge he does not quarrel with, the figures cited in the House, namely $11,000,000, and as regards the substructure about two and a quarter or two and a half millions. In addition to that there is the cost of the previous structure without counting subsequent interest, &c., about $7,000,000. Thus the total cost exclusive of interest during construction, incidentals, engineering and approaches, of that bridge will come to upwards of $20,000,000. That is as far as we have got, no one can tell what the expense will be hereafter, but anywhere between $20,000,000 and $30,000,000 is

within range. I would be inclined to say, at the risk of making a mistake, that it would be a good deal closer to $25,000,000 than to $20,000,000.

In withdrawing the motion I would say that I am gratified that the minister has endeavoured to give us some information this afternoon.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the proposal of the minister with reference to security from the contractors?

Mr. GRAHAM. The clause in the contract reads:

Each tenderer must send with his tender or tenders a cheque accepted by a Canadian chartered Bank of Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($500,000.00) made payable to the order of the 'Minister of Railways and Canals of Canada.' As soon as a tender is accepted, the successful contractor shall deposit with the minister another similarly accepted cheque made payable to the order of the minister for such amount as will make the united amount of the two cheques equal to fifteen per cent (15%) of the cost of the works as estimated by the chief engineer.

Motion withdrawn.

HAGUE ARBITRATION PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) (for Mr. Jameson) moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, papers, minutes and documents between the imperial authorities and the government of Canada, and the government of the United States of America, relating to the settlement of the case in the matter of the North Atlantic Fisheries arbitration at the Hague.

He said: I may say to the Minister of Justice that I do not think any copy of the various proceedings upon that arbitration has been placed for reference in the library. It might be very convenient for many members if a copy could be placed in the library. We have copies there of the previous arbitrations such as the Behring Sea, and the papers relating to the Alaska arbitration.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Copies will be sent to the library, I have several extra copies on hand.

Motion agreed to.

THE CENSUS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax) moved:

For a copy of all enactments, regulations, documents, papers and information of every kind setting forth or showing the systems or method by which the census is taken in the United Kingdom, the British Dominions and foreign countries, respectively; and showing in what respect, if any, the principle, system or method adopted in the United Kingdom, the British Dominions, and foreign countries differs from that proposed for the approaching census in Canada.

He said: I have put this motion on the Order Paper for the purpose of getting some information which I have found it difficult to collect in the time at my command. I do not know how far the method which we use for taking the census of this country is in use by other countries which take a census of their population at regular intervals, as I found it somewhat difficult to get much information upon that point within a reasonably limited time in the library. For that reason I would like to have a return brought down giving this information to the House, and the country, and I would be glad if the occasion would be utilized by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, who, of course, has had great experience upon this question, to give us a brief statement covering in a general way the information which I hope will be brought down in more detail in the return. I have an impression, I do know whether it is correct or not, that in many other countries a different system is followed from that which we have pursued hitherto. I understand that there was at one time a debate in this House upon the expediency of adopting some other method. I trust that there will be no objection to having the return brought down at as early a day as possible. It would be very interesting to us at the present time, when we are approaching the taking of another census.

Mr. FISHER. I would not like to attempt to give in detail a description of the way in which we take our census, and the way in which the census is taken in other countries. I shall be glad to have a memorandum brought down giving the information which my hon. friend asks for. I may say in a general way that we take in Canada what is called the de jure census and not the de facto. The United States follow the de jure system as we do. The system in England is the de facto. The de jure census is taken for a particular date, all the questions asked having reference to that date. For the coming census the date will be the first day of June. The enumerators are given a reasonable time in which to take the information, going from house to house and filling the schedules. That information covers a great deal besides a simple counting of the people. One schedule has a list of personal questions, another deals with mortuary statistics, another with industrial affairs, another with fisheries, another with agriculture, and so on. The information thus collected is sent in, and is compiled in the census office here in a series of tables, which appear in the census report. The same thing is done in the United States. In England very little is taken beyond the actual counting of the people, and that is all done on one day. The forms are left in every house, the inmates are expected

to fill them up, and then they are collected. Very little information is taken beyond personal information, such as the age and sex of the individual, and things of that kind. Anything with regard to business is taken separately, and almost wholly by correspondence. Forms are sent to business houses, filled up and returned.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are these embodied in the census returns?

Mr. FISHER. No, the information is issued in special bulletins. For the last ten years or so I have been doing, in the Department of Census and Statistics, a good deal of that work between the decennial censuses, getting information in the same way by correspondence. In this country, besides the decennial census of the whole country, we have to take a quinquennial census of the western provinces for population. In the last one I took advantage of the opportunity to get a great deal of agricultural information. The year before that we got by correspondence a good deal of information about manufacturing. At another time we made a dairy census, at another time we got the general crop returns of the whole country. This year all that information will be given in the census schedules. Each individual will give a statement of his own business, and the information will be more accurate than it can possibly be when obtained by correspondence.

Mr. FOSTER. Are those sworn to?

Mr. FISHER. The enumerators of the regular census are sworn; the correspondence is not sworn to; but in the Census Act there is a penalty provided for any one who supplies false information.

Mr. FOSTER. As to the population, what we have recorded in the census of Canada is not the number of people actually in Canada on a certain day, but those who have the right to be? Is that it?

Mr. FISHER. We count the people whose homes are in Canada. If they happen to be absent at the moment, we still count them, but, on the other hand, if a person from another country happens to be travelling in Canada, he is not counted

Mr. FOSTER. The question of who has the right to be counted must depend upon the truthfulness of the person who gives the information. Is there any check in any way by the enumerators?

Mr. FISHER. None, except by question. Instructions are given as to who shall be considered a resident. This is described to the householder or person who gives the information. For instance, a father of a family whose son happens to be away for a month—his statement in regard to that is accepted. I may say that a discussion has arisen on various occasions as to the advisability of changing our method and adopting the de facto instead of the de jure census. I have been rather impressed with the advantage of the de facto system. But I have to recognize the fact that the census of Canada has been taken some five times now, and always upon the de jure system. If we were to make a change and adopt the de facto census, comparisons would not be quite fair. So, I have not thought it well to attempt to make any change.

Mr. DANIEL. From whom does the enumerator take his information, as to those whose homes are in Canada at the time the census is taken? Is that information taken from other members of the family alone, or is any one allowed to go to the enumerator and state that so and so is in the United States and expects to come back sooner or later, and hand in his name and have it recorded?

Mr. FISHER. The questions are put to the householders. The enumerators go to the dwellings in their district. In each dwelling they seek to find a responsible person, the head of the family as a rule, or, if it is a boarding house, the keeper of the house, and ask who are residing there at the time. Should there be no resident in the dwelling house at the time, he will try to find out who are the absent people. It would be only people in charge of the dwelling house who would have the right to say who those are who usually dwell in that House but are absent. As to one going to the enumerator and saying that a certain person is absent from Canada but will return, and getting his name recorded in that way, it would be impossible.

Mr. DANIEL. That information, I take it, is accepted only from the householder, and from no one else—for instance, not from the clergyman of the parish or any one of that kind?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. PERLEY. What would happen in this case? Suppose that the minister (Mr. Fisher) himself happened to be in Victoria at the time the census was taken, would he be counted in Ottawa and likewise in Victoria?

Mr. FISHER. No, I should be counted at my home. If I happened to be away, the person in charge would be asked who was in my house. The answer would be that I was the householder but happened to be away, and would give whatever information they could. The hotelkeeper in Victoria, when questioned, would say: Mr. Fisher is here, but he does not live here and that enumerator would not enter my name.

Mr. PERLEY. So far as a hotel is concerned, the proprietor would be supposed to give the names of those who actually live there all the time? And they would be counted?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. PERLEY. I was surprised at one thing the minister said—that there would be difficulty in changing from our old system to the de facto system; that, as Canada has always used the de jure system, the new system would be inaccurate. Does he mean by that that our present system of taking the census does, as a matter of fact, give as accurate an enumeration of the people as the de facto system? Or does our present system, in his opinion, give a larger number of people as being in the country than would be obtained by the de facto system?

Mr. FISHER. I would not like to say positively one way or the other. I think that, so far as the whole country is concerned, the probability is there would be very little difference. But there might be great differences in relation to individual places. For instance, if a big convention were going on, in a given town, the de facto system would show that town as having several hundred people more than it ordinarily has. Things of that kind would occur, and the results, as to localities, would be quite unknowable beforehand. That is why the change from one system to the other might make very considerable differences, but I do not think that in relation to the aggregate population of the country, it would make any great difference.

Mr. BLAIN. Could the minister explain briefly the different schedules compared with the schedules placed in the hands of the enumerators of 1901?

Mr. FISHER. I would not undertake to do that from memory.

Mr. BLAIN. For example, when this matter was discussed a year or two ago, it appeared that in the census of 1901, there was no census of fallow land in Canada.

Mr. FISHER. That is included in the schedules this year.

Mr. BLAIN. There was no schedule showing the value of the poultry industry.

Mr. FISHER. I think that is included.

Mr. FOSTER. Will these schedules be laid on the table before they are distributed?

Mr. FISHER. I will do so.

Mr. A. M. BEAUPARLANT (St. Hyacinthe). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, with the kind permission of the House, as regards this resolution, I will ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture whether he could not be induced to amend in some particulars the proposition he has kindly submitted to the members of this House and in which is indicated the number of enumerators it is his intention to appoint for each electoral division.

According to the notice already given, the minister's intention would be to appoint only one enumerator for each municipality or parish. I think it would be preferable to appoint one enumerator for each polling district, so that there would be two, three, four or five enumerators for each municipality or parish.

Although there is nothing final in the proposition submitted by the hon. minister, it seems to be his intention to diminish the number of enumerators, while for my part I think it would be better to appoint the same number of enumerators as in the preceding census.

I submit the suggestion to the hon. minister and I hope he will give it due consideration.

My idea would be to take the number of polling divisions as a basis for appointing the enumerators. It would afford employment to a greater number and give an additional guarantee of correctness to the census to be taken next summer.

Mr. FISHER. (Translation). I shall be pleased to take into consideration the suggestions just made by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe. For the present, all I can say is that without having exactly decided to reduce the number of census enumerators, our intention is, as much as possible, to take as a basis the population of each locality. For instance, we suppose that one enumerator can take about fifteen hundred names in a town or city, and between 1,000 and 1,200 in a rural municipality. Consequently, the number will have to be reduced in order to comply with this condition.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

INFORMATION CONCERNING TRUSTS AND COMBINES IN UNITED STATES.

Mr. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie) moved:

For a return showing all statutes, regulations, reports and proceedings in the courts of the United States or in the courts of any of the respective states, and all other documents, papers and information of every kind touching or concerning the methods and operations of the meat trust and other trusts and combines in the United States, and touching the results both to the producer and to

the consumer of such methods and operations, including all departmental proceedings and reports and other proceedings and reports of the government of the United States or of any department thereof with respect to the matters aforesaid, and in general all available information in respect to the operations of such trusts and combines in the United States.

He said: The subject touched on in this order, was more fully dealt with in the House on the 2nd of the present month, on a motion by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). It has to do with the experience of the United States of America, both in the investigation and control of the various mergers and trusts that operate in that country. The order has particular reference to the methods and operations of the meat trust in the United States. In moving for the information, which, I hope, will be full and complete bearing on this subject, so far as can be gathered from the United States courts, and authorities, I do not propose to make any extended remarks on the general subject of combines and mergers, such as would be more appropriate on a definite resolution dealing with policy. However, I may say in passing, that this resolution, looking, as it does, only to the securing of data, is necessarily of an introductory character; and I hope that at a later date, a discussion may be had on a more definite and specific resolution. I am unfortunate in this regard, that when the hon. member for Jacques Cartier moved his resolution on the 2nd of February, there being no notice given I was not in my seat when the discussion took place. However, from a perusal of the 'Hansard,' of that date, I find that the government, through the mouth of the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), has taken the position, that no further efforts need be made on their part, towards rescuing the general public of this country from the claws of the mergers and combines into which they have fallen to a lamentable extent, in the country to **the south of us**, and towards preserving us against a more or less similar fate. The Minister of Labour appeared to believe that so long as our banks were loaning more money than they did in previous years, so long as they could show a statement that large increases had been made in their loaning power, and so long as various securities floated by the merged companies and other corporations operating under Dominion or provincial statutes in this country found a ready market in the old land, so long as these conditions obtained, he did not believe that anything further was necessary, or that there were any danger signals on the horizon, but that the government would be well advised simply to stand pat on the situation.

Mr. MEIGHEN.

The Minister of Labour took the further ground that his own Act, passed, I believe, in the last session of this House, dealing with combines, was amply sufficient to meet all present contingencies, and that it had been especially effective, in that it had never had occasion to go into operation at all. He further remarked that in view of the negotiations then under way, with the government to the south, it would be very inopportune for parliament then to take any steps dealing with large corporations, whose products were to be seriously affected by those negotiations.

With the last of his objections, there is no need to deal now, even were this motion a controversial one. There is only this to say, that the commodities largely dealt in by these corporations, have come through the ordeal of the reciprocity negotiations, without serious modification. As to the second reason, namely, the efficiency of the Companies Act, I can say nothing more clearly than did the member for Jacques Cartier, that the Combines Act entirely leaves out of contemplation the very object set out so well in the hon. member's resolution of that date, and indirectly referred to in this. The very fact that a merger has taken place, the very fact that many companies now are one, places it out of the power of any one to say that there is a combination of companies, for there cannot be a combination of companies to enhance prices when all the companies are one. Consequently, the purpose of this resolution cannot be served in any degree by the Combines Act, nor can the purpose which I hope to work out of the data to be furnished under this resolution, be assisted in any way by that Act.

I do not think I need say anything further at present, than merely to promise this, that never in the history of any country, I think, has the evolution of capital proceeded at so rapid a pace, as it has in our country in the last ten, and more especially, in the last three or five years. Never has the development of huge mergers, the great spirit of the age operating in industry, gone faster than it has in our own land. At present our great industries are coming together, and more and more we are being brought industrially under the power of mergers and combines. There is no need of going further than to note this, that while we are exercising our functions they are exercising theirs in a much more fruitful field of operation, and if matters go on as they are, absolutely unhindered, absolutely uncontrolled, particularly so far as capitalization goes, if matters proceed as they are proceeding, the powers of these corporations will be more absolute, more despotic than will be the power of parliament itself. It seems to me that if I could I would use on this subject much the same

language as the hon. the Prime Minister, used when, in 1903, he urged with such beautiful eloquence, the immediate construction of the Transcontinental railway. 'Time will not wait,' in this regard, and I do not think the officers of the government could be better employed than in securing from whatever source, however remote or however difficult, the information asked for by this order. May I express the hope that too much time will not be lost. We are now pretty well on in the session; and though it might have been well if the information had been asked for sooner, it is my desire that the government should use every endeavour to secure this data at the earliest possible moment.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen), that a good deal of this information which he asks for on the subject of mergers and trusts, is not contained in reports. It has been the experience of those who have to do with these matters, that the workings of these organizations are so obscure, that it is difficult to get first hand information as to their methods of proceeding. This government being aware of that circumstance, introduced at the last session of the House, an Act that, it was hoped, would enable parties interested in the operation of trusts and mergers to get the facts, and to ascertain whether these large organizations of capital were operating in a manner detrimental to producers or to consumers. The method of procedure under that measure, as I think my hon. friend knows, is a very simple one. When there is reason to believe that a trust or merger is operating in a manner detrimental to Canadians, any six persons are at liberty to make application to any judge of any high court for an order of investigation into that particular merger; and if they are able to make out a prima facie case, they are entitled to have all the workings of the merger thoroughly investigated.

I am glad to be able to inform my hon. friend that in the first application that has been made to any judge an order has been granted for an investigation which will be carried out under this law.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Is that in the case of the United Shoe Machine Company?

Mr. KING. Yes. Some manufacturers in the province of Quebec, who believed that, by reason of this American trust, or rather this company operating in Canada under a parent company in the United States, they were unable to sell some of their commodities which they would have been able to sell if it had not been for the methods adopted by this trust, and who also found it difficult to obtain machinery under the conditions which this trust exacts, made application before the court of Mr. Justice Cannon of Quebec for an order directing an investigation to be held under the Combines Act. This application has been heard, and this afternoon the government received from Mr. Justice Cannon a communication in which he orders an investigation into that trust. He states at considerable length that these gentlemen, having presented their statement to him, had made out a prima facie case as to the existence of a combination detrimental to consumers and producers. The investigation will be proceeded with forthwith. The parties affected will have an opportunity of each naming a member of the board of investigation. The two, so named, if they are able to do so, will agree upon a chairman; otherwise, the government will appoint a chairman, and these three persons will be clothed with all the powers of a court of record. It is also the intention of the government to appoint a solicitor to assist the parties in getting full information in regard to the working of this combination. In this way it would be possible to bring to light a mass of evidence which it would be impossible to obtain from any records or reports which may be in existence at the present time. This is a combination which, as my hon. friend knows, has occasioned a good deal of interest in the United States and in Great Britain. While there has been reason to believe that it is a combination operating in restraint of trade, up to the present time no effective means have been discovered of really getting at its inner workings. What has happened in the case of this particular organization or trust which is operating in this country, although it is an American organization, if there is reason to believe in its existence, may be carried out under the circumstances with regard to any other trust, and I submit that in the legislation which this government have on the statute-book to-day we have one of the most effective means to be found of getting at precisely the information which my hon. friend hopes to be able to secure by the reports for which he is asking.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to observe to my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) with regard to the urgency which he has pressed upon us with reference to this motion that it lays a very large contract upon the government. The information which he wants us to collect is of a very weighty nature, and as he knows we have no power to compel it. We can only proceed by way of request. I have no objection at all to the motion of my hon. friend; on the contrary, we will be very happy to supply him with the information, but I

cannot hope that my hon. friend will receive it in as short a time as he would like.

Motion agreed to.

FLYING OF FLAGS IN CANADA.

Mr. THOMAS BEATTIE (London) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, proper regulations should be issued by the government of the Dominion of Canada insisting that where a foreign flag or ensign is displayed or used either upon a flag pole, private residence, vehicle or in any other manner or place whatsoever within this Dominion by any person or persons except the accredited representative of a foreign government, a Union Jack of equal size and make shall also be hoisted or displayed therewith at the same time and place, and that the Union Jack shall always be placed in the most prominent position on every such occasion.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion is made with the intention of preventing in future the displaying of foreign flags or ensigns indiscriminately throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion. Subjects of other countries are in the habit of flying foreign flags on every possible occasion when within our borders. They seem to forget that whilst they are upon Canadian soil, so long as they do not break the laws of this country, they are entitled to the same protection as our citizens and that the Union Jack is the emblem of authority here in Canada. They also seem to forget that in some of the places they come from the hoisting of our flag would be considered an insult. That cannot be done in foreign countries; yet, foreign flags and ensigns are allowed to be displayed in Canada by those who, through ignorance or otherwise, daily outrage the rules of common decency and international law. This House should insist that those who live within our borders shall not display foreign ensigns to the exclusion of our own flag. More than that, if we desire to keep this Dominion a part of the British Empire we must instill into the minds of the children of the country a love for the flag which represents our empire.

I bring this matter up now although I intended to have brought it up a year ago. I live on the line between Buffalo and Detroit and I suppose that forty or fifty automobiles pass that way every day. They never display the Union Jack but generally have three or four United States flags. It has come to be that the children of that part of the country do not know whether they are in the Dominion of Canada or in a foreign land. Last year I was up in Muskoka and in the vicinity of the Georgian bay and I had with me two young lads. They asked me: Is this not Canada? I said, I thought it was, but they said: We see nothing but the stars and stripes. I think it is nothing but common decency that when a person hoists the stars and stripes he should put the Union Jack alongside of the American flag. Our people are too easy-going with respect to that matter. It was thought to be necessary to display the stars and stripes at a military banquet held in the city of Toronto. If I were in the United States I would not think of hoisting the Union Jack without putting the Stars and Stripes alongside of it. A case in point occurred last year up in the north country. A minister came over to this country and hoisted the stars and stripes on his flagpole. A gentleman went to him and told him that he thought he should put up the Union Jack as well. He said he would not do it. The gentleman said that common decency, to say nothing of his position, should induce him to put the two flags together. The minister was rather impertinent and the gentleman said: I will give you twenty-four hours to hoist the Union Jack or take that other flag down. The minister refused and another gentleman got a ladder, went up and pulled the flag down. I hope that no one will think that in bringing this matter up my action has any reference to the talk which we have recently heard about annexation. I have nothing of that kind in my mind at all. If we have a flag we should respect it and teach our children that it is the flag of our country.

Mr. GERALD V. WHITE (North Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur in this resolution and in the sentiments which have been expressed by my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie) in moving it. It would seem to me, Sir, that we Canadians, loyal and patriotic as we are—I believe as loyal and patriotic a people as ever existed—are not as demonstrative as we ought to be of the patriotic feelings which actuate us. Contrast our action in this respect with that of our neighbours across the line, who, in every town, village, and hamlet of their vast country, are proud to display the stars and stripes. Some thirteen years ago I had occasion to travel through the Lake of the Woods district, along the international border, and across the river in United States territory everywhere the eye rested the flag of the United States was visible, but strange to say, in the town of Fort Frances, on the Canadian side, not a Union Jack was to be seen. I believe that every true Canadian should take to himself the words of St. Paul: I am a citizen of no mean state, for Sir, we Canadians are citizens of no mean country. Canada comprises in territory thirty per cent of the great empire to which we belong and has an area of one-fifteenth of the total area of the globe; Canada possesses unlimited resources in the wealth of the forest, the mine, the fishery; vast stretches of the most fertile land,

great lakes, noble rivers, and mountains, the scenery which is unrivalled. We, the possessors of this grand heritage, should be proud to display on every possible occasion that emblem which is ours, of the greatest empire of history. And, Sir, while we are the fortunate possessors of these great natural resources, we have, I believe, a population as intelligent, as industrious, as sober, as law-abiding and as God-fearing as ever existed on the face of the earth. The Union Jack, which for a thousand years has braved the battle and the breeze in every corner of the known world, the emblem of all this moral and material wealth, is a flag to be proud of. Let me quote from an address delivered before the Empire Club in Toronto in 1906 by Mr. F. Barlow Cumberland, M.A., on the subject of 'The Union Jack of the Empire':

> The flag tells us whence we came; the flag tells us from whom we obtained it; it tells us that we are to keep it not only for those who are living here, but for those who are loyal to it around the world. Well, then, may it fly upon the school-houses of Manitoba; well has that government taken the foremost step in saying that all those varied nationalities which are coming within their lands shall be taught by the visible emblem which they have placed above their school-houses, that they are coming under the influences and under the charge of the Union Jack. So, too, may we have them all over our school-houses in Ontario. 'Well done' to those men and to those people who would spread the use of these flags among our Canadian school-houses, for they are the signals not only of our own union; they are the signs of a nationality wider than the country in which we live; they are a sign of brotherhood with our fellow peoples around the world.

I am happy to say, Sir, that since this address was delivered the government of Ontario has seen fit to order that the Union Jack shall be displayed from every schoolhouse in the province, on every public holiday throughout the year. Mr. Cumberland continued:

> This Union Jack, then, is the flag which is the birthright of each British man; this is the flag which should always fly and be held and be esteemed as our own. It heralds loyalty to our forefathers, to King, to country, and to empire. It speaks to us from the past; it tells us of the great heroes; it inspires us to greater deeds.

Before concluding I shall cite a stanza of verse which I deem appropriate to this occasion:

> It's only a small bit of bunting,
> It's only an old coloured rag,
> Yet thousands have died for its honour,
> And shed their best blood for the flag.
>
> It floats over Cyprus and Malta,
> Over Canada, the Indies, Hong Kong,
> And Britons where'er their flag's flying,
> Claim the rights which to Britons belong.
>
> We hoist it to show our devotion
> To our King, to our country, our laws,
> It's the outward and visible emblem
> Of advancement and liberty's cause.
>
> You may say it's an old bit of bunting,
> You may call it an old coloured rag,
> But freedom has made it majestic,
> And time has enobled our flag.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I am very glad indeed that my hon. friend (Mr. Beattie) has moved this resolution, if for no other reason than that it has given us the pleasure of hearing a very eloquent speech from the mover and an equally eloquent speech from the seconder of the resolution. It is certainly well that we should have our attention called to the importance of keeping the flag flying as often as possible—I was going to say as long as possible, but it is unnecessary to say that, because I believe with every member of this House that the Union Jack will fly over Canada as an integral part of the British Empire until the end of time. However, my hon. friend will see that his resolution can hardly be passed with propriety because it calls upon the government to make a regulation which will require the Union Jack always to be displayed above any foreign flag which may be flown anywhere in Canada, except on the office or residence of a foreign consul.

We have no statute upon the subject, and therefore the government are powerless to pass a regulation which could be enforced. In order to make it effective there would have to be a statute and in order that it might be within the purview of the Dominion parliament, it would have to be a part of the Criminal law. It would have to be provided that the Union Jack was always to be placed above any foreign flag and penalties would have to be provided for any infraction of the law. Therefore, I am sure my hon. friend will see that the resolution could not be properly passed in its present form. Perhaps all my hon. friend desires, will have been obtained by calling attention to the subject which I admit is one of great importance. I do not know whether or not in other countries there are laws upon the subject, or whether it rests entirely with the people to have this view enforced and upon the respect which other people would have for the views of the citizens of these other countries. I know that in many parts of Canada, residents of the United States, who come to this country, are always in the habit of honouring the Union Jack, by placing it above the flag of their own country. There have been cases where that has not been done, and I know that our people upon a number of occasions have been incensed at the conduct of persons who have declined to honour the flag of our coun-

try. It is worthy of consideration whether or not a law should be passed, which, of course could be enforced by provisions with regard to a penalty.

My hon. friend has called attention to the fact that the Union Jack is flown upon the schoolhouses of Ontario. My impression is that it is flown every day in the year on the school-houses of Manitoba. In that respect, Manitoba has gone away ahead of the loyal province of Ontario, and all honour to the province of Manitoba that it has gone as far as it has, because there is no better means of teaching the youth of our country the principles of loyalty, than to teach them to know what the flag stands for, and to honour it as they would do, if it was flown from the school-house every day in the year. If it is flown only on public holidays, the school children are not apt to see it, because they do not attend school on public holidays. Therefore, I think it would be desirable that my hon. friend should endeavour to get the government of Ontario to follow the example which has been set by the government of Manitoba. When I was a member of the government of New Brunswick, the question was seriously discussed, and the government adopted a resolution favourable to having the school trustees fly the flag from the schcol-houses upon every day in the year, providing that some assistance should be given by the Board of Education to enable the various school districts to do so. I do not know whether that regulation has been generally observed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is that by virtue of a statute or a regulation ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is done by regulation, the Board of Education undertaking to contribute a certain amount for the purchase of flags.

It will be gratifying to my hon. friend to know that the order which I have had passed in my department, requiring the flag to be flown every day in the year upon every public building in all the border towns, and all the principal seaports of Canada, has met with, I think, the universal approval of the people of the country.

Mr. EDWARDS. Under what statute is that flag flown over public buildings and what penalty is attached if it is not flown?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is flown by an official of the department of Public Works, and the penalty is, that if he does not obey the order of the department, he will be dismissed from office. The order has been given and the flag is now being flown upon the public buildings in all the border towns and cities of Canada, and also at the principal seaports.

Mr. BRADBURY. Could I induce the minister to include the city of Winnipeg and other cities of that kind, where there are so many public buildings ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have started in the way I have described, of ordering the flag to be flown in the border cities and towns and also at the principal seaports. That is so that people crossing the border will see the Union Jack flying and as they come into our country at the various seaports, they will also see the flag of our country flying upon whatever day they happen to arrive. To extend it to every public building in Canada would, no doubt, be somewhat expensive, but I may say to my hon. friend, that this question is under consideration. I myself, think it is worthy of very careful consideration. I believe that if an order were passed to have the flag flown from every public building in every city and town of Canada upon every day in the year—and here, I am expressing my own personal opinion—it would not be unpopular, and I am rather inclined to think the country would justify the additional expense to which the government would be put in having these regulations carried out. However, that is a matter for consideration. I have had applications from other cities than border cities and towns, one from Peterborough; one from Calgary, urging that the flag should be flown on every day of the year in those cities. There have also been applications from other cities and towns throughout Canada. I trust my hon. friend will see that under the present law it would be impossible for the government to pass an effective regulation, and I hope my hon. friend will feel that he has discharged his duty, by thus bringing the matter forcibly to the attention of the House, and will leave it to the government to consider whether or not some modification should be made in the statutes which would enable his views to be carried out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there actually a flag supplied to every Dominion public building in the country ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the understanding, and if my attention is called to any building where the caretaker is not in possession of a flag, I will see that he is supplied with one.

Mr. BORDEN Halifax). As I understand a regulation has been made that in certain towns and cities near the border the flag is to be flown every day in the year. What is the regulation as to public buildings where that does not apply ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My recollection is, that it is flown upon the 1st of July, Dominion Day, also upon Victoria Day, St. George's Day, St. Andrew's Day, St. Patrick's Day, and hereafter on St. David's Day. Then upon other days, in regard to which directions are given by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the 12th of July?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no order that it should be flown on that day.

Mr. MEIGHEN. There were some remarks that fell from the hon. Minister of Public Works that will be gladly welcomed on this side of the House. He finds fault with the resolution on the ground that it calls for the government to enact regulations looking to the protection of the supremacy of the British flag on Canadian soil. It may be that under the statutes now obtaining in Canada regulations would have no legal effect. Of that I do not presume to speak. The objection applies only to the wording of the resolution. It affects in no way the principle, and it would be quite out of the power of the mover and quite within the power of the government through the Minister of Public Works to effect the amendment and make it a statutory provision instead. There is a principle in the resolution. That principle we hope the government will not antagonize. The hon. minister was good enough to express the hope that the Union Jack would for all time fly over the capital of this country. In that, I presume, he also expresses the hope of the government, including the first minister. I do not think it is quite consistent, though, to expect the Union Jack, which is the flag of the British Empire, to fly on Canadian soil after the ripe fruit has fallen from the tree. I leave that, however, for the Minister of Public Works to work out with his own chieftain. He was good enough to render some applause—and his applause is always appreciated— to the government of Manitoba for doing a little pioneer work in the way of installing into the minds of Canadian youth the importance of reverence for the Union Jack. I want to remind the Minister of Public Works that when this movement was placed in the form of legislation on the statute-books of Manitoba, it was opposed with the bitterest ridicule by the party in Manitoba with which the hon. minister is identified. That party, through its press and speakers, pointed out that this was simply an attempt at flag waving by the Conservative party then in power. I am glad indeed to see the Minister of Public Works come over to our side on this question, and I hope on other and greater occasion, when this side of the House endeavours to protect the Union Jack on Canadian soil against the attacks of its open foes, and against what is worse, the invidious carelessness of the indifferent, we shall find the hon. minister again coming over to our side and assisting us in that great work. Now, Sir, it is my earnest hope—I speak only as one member of the House—that the hon. member for London will not think that his work is done by simply uttering a few remarks on this occasion, but that this House will take occasion to do something effective in at least laying down a principle that will do somewhat to secure the supremacy of the British flag on this side of the 49th parallel, even though we must, when securing that supremacy, tolerate the prevalence of other flags. There is no objection, so far as I can see, to citizens of other lands, or to any one, if he sees fit, displaying the stars and stripes, or whatever flag they may be identified with; but there is objection, as has been well pointed out by the hon. member for London to the far too frequent display of that flag to the utter subserviency, the utter neglect of our own flag of empire. It is to prevent that, that the resolution is moved, but I do not think anything whatever will be done to prevent it if it simply stops at that point.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, it has always seemed somewhat strange to me that the regulations or laws or statutes with regard to the flying of the flag at sea should always be so intensely stringent, while with regard to the flying of flags on shore there seems to be no regulation whatever. Personally I do not know whether the regulations with regard to the flying of the flag at sea are statutory or merely admiralty regulations; but there the law, under whatever form it may be, is well known and well recognized. I listened with interest to the remarks of the Minister of Public Works. He and I both come from the same city, and what he has noticed in St. John, I have noticed also. There are a number of American citizens living there. Now, it appears to be characteristic of American citizens, no matter where they may be, to have an uncontrollable desire to fly their flag—to pin it on themselves —to put it on their autos, on their little yachts, or over the houses where they are staying. That is all very well in their own country; no one objects to that; but they do not appear to recognize that when they fly their flag in what is to them a foreign country, they are only doing it by the courtesy of the country in which for the time being they reside. The American citizens living in St. John appear to fly their flag almost every day in the year. The Minister of Public Works stated that they fly the Union Jack over the stars and stripes. I think that on consideration he will withdraw that. Occasionally some of them fly the Union Jack on the same pole, but on different halyards, at the same level as the stars and stripes. But the majority of them do not do so at all. They are generally content with flying the stars and stripes alone. If it is important that this matter of flags should be attended to in the east, which is a much older settled country as far as Britishers are concerned, certainly,

I think we can all readily agree it is far more important that this flag business should be properly attended to in our great Northwest, which is filling up so rapidly with people of so many different nationalities who perhaps hardly know our flag when they see it. I think this resolution contains a most important principle, one that I hope the Prime Minister and the government of this country will take to heart, so that some regulation will be put into force that will have the effect which the resolution anticipates. It has been said that the resolution would not give the government power to issue regulations that might be of use; but the government has the power to obtain a statute so that they may be empowered to make such regulations as they could legally and practically put into force. In the United States as we all know, it is almost as much as a man's life is worth, in some of the cities, to hoist the British flag. Apparently, it does not require any statute there to provide for the pulling down of that flag very quickly. If officials of the state or of the United States do not attend to the matter, the people soon take it into their own hands, and means are quickly taken by which that flag disappears from its flag-pole. I certainly support this resolution very heartily, and I hope that the government will bring in a Bill to authorize them to make necessary regulations, or that any other means required to carry out the idea of the resolution may be taken. I am quite certain it is high time that we took this matter up. It seems to be a simple thing on the face of it, but our young people are growing up, and strangers of all nationalities are coming into the country who have not been educated in regard to this matter and are content to see the foreign flag flying where their own flag should fly.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). Like the rest of my colleagues, I was gratified at the encouragement this resolution met at the hands of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), but I think the House would have been better pleased if the minister had gone at least one step further. I think he should have stated that the government would take this matter into its own hands, and would introduce legislation to carry the resolution into effect. This is not the first occasion on which the flag matter has been brought up in this House. I do not desire to disparage the loyalty of the hon. gentlemen opposite, but I think it not unfair to point out, that on every occasion, the initiative with regard to the flag flying in Canada has come from the opposition side. It is not so many years since the flag did not float from this building in which we sit during the sittings of this House. I myself brought up the matter here, and complained of the omission; and ever since that day the flag has been flying at least on this building every day on which the House sits. And so it has been, from time to time, on each occasion the matter has emanated from the opposition side of this House. But it may be that the proposal of legislation to carry this resolution into effect may not properly come from this side. I apprehend that it would be a matter requiring the expenditure of money, and if so, the legislation would have to originate with the Treasury Benches. But, regardless of that, such legislation should be introduced at the earliest moment by those who control the majority in this House. This is not a mere matter of sentiment, but, even if it were, the introduction of such legislation would be quite justified. Many visitors come here, notably from the United States. They are good people, they make excellent friends and neighbours, and we are glad to have them amongst us. But it does violence to the feelings of Canadians when these people arrive enveloped in their stars and stripes? If they come to make their home here for the summer, before they enter their summer houses, they surround themselves, their grounds, their houses and their boats with a great galaxy of American flags. One would think, going through certain parts of this country, that he was in the United States of America. This is all very well, but side by side with these flags, there should be some proper display of the national emblem to mark this country as British. Unfortunately, this display of foreign flags has led to a number of what are known as 'flag incidents'. On certain occasions, the wanton flaunting of American flags in the faces of British subjects has caused men to make the law for themselves, and flags have been taken down in a way that is unpleasant for all concerned. These incidents sometimes become international affairs, but serious trouble has heretofore been averted. Not only the people of our own country, but visitors also are ignorant as to the status of our flag. A visitor will hoist a foreign flag in a more or less insulting way, then a British citizen will threaten to take it down, but does not know his rights in the matter any more than does the man who raises the flag. So, I think the time has come when the government should consider this whole question, and embody our proper rights in a simple statute which should be accessible to everybody and easily understood. For breaches of this law there should be some proper penalty, some fine or some other not too severe sanction. Not only do I concur in the language of the resolution, but I think this whole matter of flag flying in this country should be surrounded by proper regulations, so that the people of this country and visitors to this country may know the rights of our flag, and also of any other flag floated here for

the time being. The Minister of Public Works has been good enough to extend the flag flying to border towns and seaports. Personally, I would like to see the regulation extended throughout the whole country. The expense would be comparatively small. As we are having so many foreigners coming to Canada, we want to let them know of what nationality this country is; we want to let them know that Canada is British, and let them know what the British emblem is. It would be a proper thing, and public opinion would back the government up in flying the flag on every public building. Especially this regulation should be extended, not only to seaports, but to the ports on our Great Lakes, some of which have a much larger quantity of shipping than many seaport towns.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The ports to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonell) refers, I class as border cities—those that stand on the shores of boundary waters. The flag is flying on the public buildings of all such cities on Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, Lake St. Clair and other boundary waters.

Mr. MACDONELL. I congratulate the minister upon the extension of his ruling. And, now that he has gone so far and extended it to seaports, ports on boundary waters and border towns, the minister might as well throw in the tail with the hide and have the flag flying on all public buildings in Canada. Then the government might take up this resolution and bring down a Bill containing provision not only for flying the flag, but for the regulation of this whole flag matter.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I am so much in sympathy with the general purpose of my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie), and with the sentiments expressed by him, that I regret to have to join the Minister of Public Works in advising him not to press his motion. I am thoroughly persuaded that the discussion to-night is a timely one, and will have a good effect, yet I feel that to press his motion in the terms in which the hon. gentleman has presented it to the House would not be wise. I am bound to say that I admire our American neighbours for the prominence they give to their flag in their own country, and I do not think any the less of them because, when they go abroad, they still exhibit their flag. Sometimes they may do it in a way that is not always pleasant to us, but after all, their main purpose is to declare themselves as citizens of the great republic, and we should not think any the less of them on that account. I regret that we in Canada do not make more use of our national flag. It is one of those things which we take for granted, that everybody is loyal in this country, and therefore there is no need for us to assert our loyalty. In a country situated as ours is, lying alongside another great nation, I think it is very desirable that there should be, not only upon public buildings, but upon the private homes of our people, a very prominent display of the Union Jack. While I am most heartily in sympathy with my hon. friend in his motive in bringing this matter before us, still I must point out to him that when he asks us to make regulations such as he proposes, I think he will be advised by any hon. gentleman of the legal profession that we practically have no power to make any such regulations. We could, by an Act of this parliament, take the power. But before doing that, it would be well that we should have some regard to the practice of other countries. Flag incidents are always troublesome. Every man who has any pride of country is justly offended when an insult is offered to his flag, and he properly resents it. We feel that way ourselves, and on that account we should be all the more careful to see that we give no cause of offence to the citizens of a foreign country who want to make use of their flag in a proper way. If we had a regulation exactly in the terms of the hon. gentleman's motion it might lead us into trouble. These are international questions. An insult offered to the flag is something of which the recognized authorities of every great nation must take notice. But I think in a matter of so much delicacy, warmly as we must sympathize with the good purpose the hon. gentleman has in view, we would do well to pause and make inquiry as to what is the practice of other nations in this matter. I do not think we are called upon to rush into this matter and do something, even with a good purpose, which might lead us into difficulties with citizens of a foreign country. We have much to learn in regard to these matters from the mother country and from other nations, and while sympathizing strongly with my hon. friend's purpose, and with the sentiments he has expressed in supporting his motion, I think he should let the matter stand over in order that inquiry may be made as to the effect—not of this resolution, because it would have no effect—but if a measure were to be brought forward in the shape of an amendment to the criminal law, declaring what should be done in these cases when a citizen of a foreign nation shows his flag abroad, we might get ourselves into grave difficulties. Regarding flags on public buildings, the government may, as a right, determine whether a flag shall be shown, and on what day. But when you come to deal with the house of a private citizen, or with the motor car or boat of a private citizen, you may be treading on delicate and possibly dangerous ground. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he has

accomplished a good purpose already in having this discussion, and that it would be wise for him to withdraw his motion and leave the matter for the consideration of the government, with a view of inquiring as to what is done by other nations under similar circumstances. I would like my hon. friend to concur in that suggestion, because it is a matter on which it would be undesirable to have any division.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). It is so seldom that I have an opportunity of agreeing with anything the Minister of Public Works says that it is a sufficient excuse for me, on this occasion, to rise and say that I do agree with him in the sentiments he has expressed here to-night in regard to the Union Jack being maintained in a prominent position as the flag of this country. I almost expected, before the Finance Minister took his seat, that, judging from the fears that were in his heart with regard to the trouble that might arise if we undertook to deal with this matter, he was going to suggest that a deputation be sent to Washington to talk the matter over with them before we came to a conclusion. Now, I believe there is an evil in this country pointed out by my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie), and that something ought to be done along the lines of his motion to impress upon the minds of American citizens that when they come over to this country they must not give undue prominence to the stars and stripes on their automobiles or on their residences in this country. If it be necessary to take those steps. even though they be offended, I say by all means let those steps be taken, and let them be offended thereat. In this country and in the country across the line the majority of people are able to read. The people of Canada are sufficiently well posted to know that if they go into the United States and flaunt their flag in the way that American citizens flaunt their flag in Canada, they would be showing disrespect to the people of that country. We respect them in their loyalty and their devotion to their flag, and we show our respect for them by respecting their flag. If they cannot show similar respect for us by respecting our flag, then it is high time that the government gave them to understand that they must respect it. Only last summer, in my county, a very unpleasant flag incident took place. We have in different parts of the county of Frontenac many American citizens, who come in to engage in fishing and to reside part of the summer, and in one part of the county you would think it was a portion of the United States, so many stars and stripes do you see floating, while the Union Jack is scarcely ever visible. When one of our citizens protested because the stars and stripes were flying from the top of a flag pole without a Union Jack, he was insulted, and given to understand that he must mind his own business. I certainly think that a rule which applies to an individual should apply to a nation. A man must respect himself if he expects others to respect him. That is true of the individual, and that is also true of the nation. If we do not as a nation respect ourselves we cannot expect to enjoy the respect of other nations. I believe that our American cousins across the line, and the people of other foreign nations that come into Canada from all parts of the world, would have a much higher regard for Canada if we showed them that the British flag must be placed in the most prominent position, and that whatever other flag is shown, the Union Jack must have a position of superiority. That is no more than we should insist upon. Now, I do not see why the resolution of my hon. friend from London should not pass. He asks that regulations should be made by the government to secure respect for our national flag, and if it be necessary to enact a statute, then he asks the government to enact that statute. I think if the government were to propose a law on the lines of the motion of my hon. friend from London there would be no delay at all in passing it; if they brought in a Bill to-morrow or the next day, I think it would go through its first, second and third readings with the unanimous consent of this side of the House.

Reference has been made to the flying of the flag on the school-houses of Manitoba. Some twenty years ago I was the principal of one of the public schools in that province. I started a movement in the school over which I presided, had a flag pole erected and the flag flown, and I think I am right in saying that that school was the first school in Manitoba to have the Union Jack flying over it. It was at Souris, Manitoba. I hope something will be done along the line of the resolution moved by my hon. friend from London. I think it is high time that something should be done. Our beautiful summer resorts are every season attracting not only Americans, but people from England, Scotland, France, Germany and other lands. What must they think, in going through the beautiful lakes of Muskoka and the Thousand Islands to find a hundred American flags for one Union Jack? I feel very strongly that something should be done to regulate this and to show to the people of this country as well as to the people of the world that this is British territory, and that we intend to keep it such.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say only a few words upon this subject. I entirely agree with the proposed resolution of my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie), and I see no reason whatever why

the government should not accept it. There must be a law in this country, or we can make a law, to stop Americans, or the people of any other nation from coming into Canada and flying foreign flags. It is no insult to any person who comes into Canada from the outside to say to him that he must give prominence to the flag of the country in which he happens to be. I would advise my hon. friend from London very strongly not to withdraw this resolution. I think it is right and I see no reason whatever why the government should not adopt it. The Union Jack is good enough to fly in Canada, or any other place, and it is only proper that we should give due prominence to the flag of our country. I wish to emphasize my view upon this question, and to ask my hon. friend not to withdraw his resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Beattie) wish to withdraw the motion, or does he wish to speak? He would shut out debate.

Mr. BEATTIE. I would like to make a few remarks.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend would shut out others; that is all.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, the resolution proposed by my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie) asserts the proposition that some regulation should be issued by the federal government providing for some penalty, I suppose, where a foreign flag is exhibited in Canada above the Union Jack. I am sure that the proposition that due regard and pre-eminence should always be given to the flag of our country, whether in the presence of the flag of another country or not, is one that every member of this House and every good thinking person in Canada agrees with. It will be noticed that my hon. friend does not propose, in his resolution, any extension of the regulation which my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) issued with regard to the use of the British flag on public buildings. I apprehend that my hon. friend, therefore, and the other hon. gentlemen who spoke with him on this subject, agree that the government have acted wisely in that matter. Let me say that for myself I have always regarded it as one of the most singular things in Canada that we have never had very much of an open exhibition of patriotic feeling by the display of flags, or by patriotic national music such as is seen in other countries. I think it is one of the great regrets in Canada that this custom has not obtained. Apparently our forefathers, and even the people of the present generation, have accepted all the privileges and rights which have come to them under British rule and under the British flag in a quiescent mood. They have been content to go along and accept the blessings of constitutional government and the advantages of British protection without making any fuss about it. It is only after forty years of our national history that we are seriously beginning to discuss the question of flying our flag. For at least forty years of our national life it was never thought necessary to fly the flag of our country every day on the parliament buildings. It was in the last parliament for the first time that any hon. gentleman in this House thought it necessary that the flag of Great Britain, should be flown above the parliament buildings when parliament is sitting. This indicates a peculiarly quiescent mood on the part of the public in Canada generally with regard to the exhibition of patriotism in that way. No other country with its population, extent or resources has ever got along so far in its national existence as Canada has without having more patriotic songs. True, I think in no part of the British Empire is 'God Save the King' sung so loyally or so frequently on public occasions as in Canada, but outside of that there are very few songs that Canadians sing which are emblematic of their devotion to this country of ours. There is 'The Maple Leaf For Ever,' a song that appeals to the patriotism of every Canadian, and our friends in the province of Quebec sing their patriotic song 'O Canada,' which is, I believe, the best Canadian national anthem. Why is it that we have not more of our national songs, and why is it that we do not fly our national flag more? I felt that sense of humiliation that hon. gentlemen have spoken of when, about ten years ago, on crossing the River St. Lawrence, I found on the other side an adequate display of the American flag on the public buildings and in their public squares such as is not to be found in Canada. The desire that Canadians should make a public exhibition of their devotion to their country either in song or by the use of their flag is one that is growing, and one which I think deservedly ought to grow. Various provinces have adopted the provision that the flag should be flown from the school buildings, a most admirable provision, one that should obtain in every province, so that the young people may learn to realize the history of their country, its traditions, and the great wealth of privilege and right which have been conferred upon us as a result of British rule. Too often our fathers and ourselves and children accept all these advantages and have nothing to say about them, failing to recognize the source from which they came.

With regard to dealing with the propo-

sition contained in the resolution of my hon. friend I think it is a question which is worthy of consideration. I think that any foreigner who comes into Canada, no matter from where he comes, should feel that in this country he is not able to do any more than he can in any other country by the exhibition of the flag of the country to which he belongs. I think there is to be found legislation in the other countries of the world which deals with the exhibition of flags of alien nations, and that we should have something of the same kind on the statute-book of Canada. I think that would be in accordance with the sentiment which obtains in Canada to-day; which for the last ten or fifteen years has been increasing, and which was practically non-existent before. But, this is something which must be formulated in a statute, and the greatest care must be exercised because when you come to deal with the flags of foreign countries it is a very delicate matter. The idea of my hon. friend is a good one, but a cursory examination of the wording of his resolution will show that it is altogether too crude to crystallize into a statute. I submit that in order to deal with the matter in a sensible, sane and practical way, there should be delay so that inquiry may be made as to what is the best form for legislation to take. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Beattie) proposes that regulations should be issued by the government insisting that :

> Where a foreign flag or ensign is displayed or used either upon a flag pole, private residence, vehicle, or in any other manner or place whatsoever within this Dominion——

I suppose that language would be sufficiently broad to cover the display of flags on pleasure boats, although were one to apply the maxim ejusdem generis it is doubtful whether these words would apply to anything but something akin to a flag pole, private house, or vehicle. The hon. gentleman then goes on in his resolution to except only, the accredited representative of a foreign government from this regulation, but vessels of a foreign country within the harbours of Canada have by international law the right to fly the flag of their nation.

Mr. BEATTIE. That is acknowledged. This resolution would not apply to such a vessel at all.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am merely citing that to show that if we are to pass legislation on the subject a great deal more care would be necessary than to merely adopt the wording of this resolution and make it law. With the object of giving the matter that greater care I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Beattie) should accept the assurance of the Minister of Finance that inquiry will be made, and withdraw his resolution. Then, the resolution says :

> That a Union Jack of equal size and make shall also be hoisted and displayed therewith at the same time and place, and that the Union Jack shall always be placed in the most prominent position on every occasion.

Perhaps I am looking at it with the critical eyes of a lawyer, but it does seem to me that it would not be dignified for the parliament of Canada to dispose of such a question by adopting the language of the resolution which is very crude indeed. The use of the word 'occasion' in the resolution seems to be ungrammatical because instead of referring to time or place it would seem to apply to a vehicle, flagpole, or private residence. We are all anxious with my hon. friend (Mr. Beattie) that this question should be properly dealt with, and that every Canadian should be encouraged to show on all occasions his devotion to Canada and the empire, but when we are legislating about the use of foreign flags we have to proceed very carefully. It was the Manitoba government I believe, that first blazed the way with regard to the flying of the flag on public schools and I remember that a strong imperialist and a man of high position in the mother country who visited Canada shortly after that action of the Manitoba government, spoke to me in reference to what could be done in Canada for strengthening the ties which bind her to the mother country. I, of course, told him that the Canadian people with firm determination of purpose and sincere devotion of heart were proud of their British allegiance, and were so content under it that nobody ever thought of questioning it, but if anything were to be done we ought to encourage the display of the British flag on all occasions and cultivate among the people a knowledge of national songs which in all countries, and all ages have best given the inspiration of patriotism to the people. Gradually, since the order of the Manitoba government, the different provinces have been taking the question up, and as a result I believe that in recent years our people are expressing more generally than ever before their pride in being Canadians, and citizens of the British Empire. I am sincerely anxious that some legislation should be passed as a result of the proposition now put forward by my hon. friend (Mr. Beattie), and in order that the legislation to be enacted may be appropriate and well considered I would move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey). The hon. member from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is perfectly aware that the passage of this resolution would not crystallize its wording into law, but would merely be an

expression of opinion from this House that any foreigner who comes to Canada and who is so loyal to his own country that he must hoist his flag, must go to the expense of purchasing a Union Jack and hoisting it in the most prominent position. That is all the resolution amounts to. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) should taunt us with waving the flag.

Mr. MACDONALD. I did not say so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I am a little surprised at my hon. friend saying he is surprised that we have not seen more of the flag and that the flag has not been hoisted on more public buildings and made more conspicuous in Canada than it has been. I believe that is in part due to the policies which his party has advocated in the past. We know that in years gone by if there was one thing more than another with which the Conservative party were taunted it was waving the old flag for party purposes, and we know that the party opposite were taunted with advocating a policy of unrestricted reciprocity, commercial union and continental freedom of trade. We know that his own leader at that time, Hon. Edward Blake, said if that policy had been insisted on, and if they had been successful at the polls the ultimate result would have been annexation to the country to the south. We admired Hon. Edward Blake for taking that course. We know that on this same occasion Sir John Macdonald uttered the famous words: 'A British subject I was born, a British subject I will die'. So it ill becomes the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) to say he was surprised that the flag has not been used in the past more than it has been.

Mr. MACDONALD. In the days of Sir John A. Macdonald did he find it necessary to fly the flag over the parliament buildings of this country?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Not only did the party of the hon. gentleman not propose that, but they proposed to put into force a policy that would ultimately have led to our annexation to the United States.

Mr. MACDONALD. Let me inform my hon. friend that it was under this government that the flag first flew over this building.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. When the reciprocity treaty was brought into this House, his own Finance Minister said that the first action of the Conservative party would be to beat the drum.

Mr. FIELDING. They are doing that.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That means no more than waving the old flag. I am surprised that the member for Pictou has moved the adjournment which means shelving this question. I cannot see why they cannot adopt the resolution which does not become law, but simply affirms the opinion of this House. A Canadian visiting another country and not showing proper respect for the flag of that country would be open to the same blame as a foreigner acting in that way in Canada.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). I agree with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that there should be no division of opinion in the House upon this question. I see no reason why the government should not accept this resolution in the spirit in which it has been moved. The hon. member criticises it because it is not couched in such language as would be used in a statute and he seems to me to be begging the question. The resolution says that in the opinion of this House proper regulations should be issued by the government of the Dominion of Canada. The resolution leaves it open to the House or any member to decide what would be proper regulations to carry out the spirit of the resolution. The hon. member has himself made the argument for adopting this resolution, he has said that the spirit of loyalty in this country has been rather quiescent. It seems to me that this is but the fitting outcome of the gradual growth of the national spirit in this Canada of ours. It is quite true that we Canadians can look back to the time when our young men were leaving for the United States and were ready to give allegiance to that flag. I am glad to say that that is changed to-day, but our young men are realizing that we have a national spirit of our own, that the day has come when it is the proud boast of the manufacturers of Canada to place on their goods the trade mark: Made in Canada. A Canadian citizen is proud to purchase goods with that particular trade mark upon them, and now to-night the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) proposes to go one step further and to say that the flag, the emblem of our nationhood, shall be displayed on all occasions so that those who come as guests to our country shall realize that as our guests they must give due honour and respect to that flag. There is nothing more in the resolution, and for that reason I cannot see why the Minister of Finance should object and ask that it be withdrawn. He and other speakers on that side have all said that they agree with the spirit of the resolution. The member for Pictou says he agrees with the kernel of the resolution, the only difference is with the phraseology, but as I have pointed out this resolution will not become legislation. I trust that the Minister of Finance will withdraw his objection, and that this resolution may go forth from this House unanimously to the people of Canada affirming that we shall take one step further in

our nationhood, and that we as members of parliament say that the flag of Canada, and the flag of the empire shall always be pre-eminent in our own country.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I heartily support the resolution which is only an expression of the opinion of this House, and I think the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) is deserving of the thanks of every member for bringing it forward. It ill becomes the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) to find fault with the language in which it is couched, I would hope rather that he would fall in line and say it was in the best interests of our people. The resolution reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, proper regulations should be issued by the government of the Dominion of Canada insisting that where a foreign flag or ensign is displayed or used either upon a flag pole, private residence, vehicle or in any other manner or place whatsoever within this Dominion by any person or persons except the accredited representative of a foreign government, a Union Jack of equal size and make shall also be hoisted or displayed therewith at the same time and place, and that the Union Jack shall always be placed in the most prominent position on every such occasion.

The kernel of the resolution, to use the words of the hon. member for Pictou, is sound and he agrees heartily with it ; and yet in the very same breath he moves the adjournment of the debate practically to kill it. I have only to say that I have hearty sympathy with the resolution, and the hon. member for London is deserving of great credit for bringing it forward.

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL (Dauphin). I dare say there is still in the mind of the hon. Minister of Public Works a gleam of his old political allegiance when he congratulates the province of Manitoba upon the fact that the flag flies over every school-house in that province. The member for Pictou is to be congratulated on the fact that he sees that the little province of Manitoba, under a Liberal-Conservative government, was the first to blaze the trail in educating the foreign children who have come into our country. But if the hon. member for Pictou, and perhaps also the hon. Minister of Public Works, had been in the legislature of Manitoba at the time Mr. Roblin introduced that flag policy, I am sure they would have done just what as good men as themselves did on the Liberal side—worked against it in every manner possible. Let me quote to you something from a man whose name is familiar to all the Liberals in this House, Mr. Edward Brown, the leader of the Liberal party in Manitoba. He felt that he and his party were much hurt by the flag policy inaugurated by Mr. Roblin. He went to the extent of making the same professions of loyalty that we hear so frequently from that side of the House, accompanied by the same actions of disloyalty. In a private circular letter under his own name, sent out on the 17th of September, to the Grit newspapers throughout the province, that was previous to the election of 1907, he wrote :

With regard to the flag incident, can you get any interviews from school trustees in your district as to what they think of the teachers being compelled to hoist the flag and take it down with the thermometer at 35° or 40° below zero. Comment yourselves editorially on the subject. If you do this, will you also send a specially marked copy to the 'Free Press' at once, so that they may quote your views?

Mr. Brown spoke on every occasion against this educative flag policy of Mr. Roblin. Every other Liberal who stood on a platform in any election compaign in Manitoba since that policy was inaugurated took the same stand as Mr. Brown. I may say that Mr. Roblin got more telegrams and communications of all kinds from prominent men all over the empire for the inauguration of that policy than perhaps any other public man got on any other occasion. My hon. friend from Pictou said that to-night was not an opportune time for bringing forward this resolution.

Mr. MACDONALD. I did not say that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will not say that the hon. member put it exactly in that way, but that was the sentiment that his words expressed. That may be his point of view, and the point of view of the ministerial side of this House ; but hundreds of thousands of people in Canada, many of them the staunchest Grits, think this is the most opportune time to show by a unanimous vote of this House that a certain measure now before this House called reciprocity is dangerous to the flag of Great Britain. For that reason I think this is a most opportune time for this House to vote unanimously in favour of this resolution. Parliament is omnipotent so far as law-making is concerned. If this resolution is passed to-night, there is nothing to hinder parliament from putting it in proper form to-morrow so that it can be enforced. For that reason I trust that the House will vote down the amendment of the hon. member for Pictou, which is evidently an evasion and quibble, getting away from the point and trying to becloud the matter before the House.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) has nothing but the sincerest motive in bringing this question before the House in the terms of the resolution now under consideration. I cannot say as much for some hon. gentlemen

on the other side who have spoken to the resolution, because it would appear to me, judging from their remarks—take my hon. friend who has just sat down as an example—that it is just as much or more to impress on this House and the country their loyalty that they so vigorously support this resolution as it is the national benefit that they are considering. My hon. friend from Pictou has moved the adjournment of the debate, and to my mind he has given a very substantial reason for doing so. It is quite true that in the terms of the resolution, if it were to carry, the government are called upon to make proper regulations, and necessarily they have power to make those regulations in whatever form would seem to them best, if they have power to deal with this matter in that way. But the purpose of the resolution is stated very clearly, and plainly, and whatever regulations the government might attempt to bring into effect as a result of this House passing the resolution, would help to bring about the result that is asked for by the resolution. The purpose of the resolution would have to be crystallized into legislation in some way. Now, I am sure that my hon. friend from London does not want regulations or laws passed that would bring into effect the purpose of this resolution in the way in which it is stated. This language, Sir, is very broad. These regulations must provide—

That where a foreign flag or ensign is displayed or used, either upon a flag pole, private residence, vehicle or in any other manner or place whatsoever within this Dominion——

I take it that that means even inside a private house.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. NEELY. The wording certainly gives that impression. Now, I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Beattie) does not want to make it a criminal offence for some American citizen, we will say, who comes here to spend a month or two, or who comes to Canada with the intention of becoming a permanent citizen, to tack the stars and stripes on the walls inside his residence.

Mr. BEATTIE. Would you call the inside of a house a 'public place'?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does not say 'public place.'

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It says 'display,' and the only way to display it is to put it in a public place.

Mr. NEELY. The hon. gentleman takes a different meaning out of the word 'displayed or used' from that which other people would take.

Mr. BRADBURY. It says 'upon.'

Mr. NEELY. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) had better read the resolution again, for it says:

—displayed or used either upon a flag pole private residence, vehicle or in any other manner or place whatsoever.

Now, if these hon. gentlemen accuse the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) of quibbling, surely they themselves are quibbling when they undertake to say that the words——

Mr. BEATTIE. The words are plain English, and all the hon. gentleman has to do is to read them as they are.

Mr. NEELY. I have read them exactly as they are. Now, as my hon. friend from Pictou says this is a serious question we are considering, I can only again state my position that, by passing this resolution, the House would be declaring that the terms of the resolution would have to be put upon the statute-book. If my hon. friend (Mr. Beattie) wished to effect anything, and not merely to promote this discussion, why should he not have introduced a Bill stating the objection he desired to bring about, and thus giving us something tangible instead of a crude resolution of this kind, which, if passed in its present form, might be very embarrassing, no matter how sincere the intention of the government in dealing with the matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. NEELY. Hon. members need not laugh. I say frankly it might be embarrassing to deal with the matter in the form in which it is put. There is one thing on which I congratulate my hon. friends on the other side. If they have no policy on any other subject, we may always be sure that they will have a policy on the flag.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. NEELY. Sir, this is one of many cases in which these hon. gentlemen have tried to hide their defects of policy or their lack of policy under a vigorous waving of the flag. I presume it is the sincere and honest desire of every man in this House to have the flag of his country shown due respect. I have many American citizens in my own part of the country and a great many in my own constituency. I do not know that any serious harm has ever come from the fact that a few of them bring a small sample of the stars and stripes across with them——

Mr. BEATTIE. I was not referring to the stars and stripes alone. The resolution says 'a foreign flag.'

Mr. NEELY. I am using this merely as illustration; my hon. friend admits, I sup-

pose, that the stars and stripes is a 'foreign flag.' I say I do not know that any great harm has come to this country because a few of these people from the United States bring across the stars and stripes. Perhaps, for a year or so, they decorate the walls of their houses with this flag. But they spend but a short time in this country in the enjoyment of the benefits derived from living under the Union Jack before they very gladly lay away the stars and stripes and adopt the Union Jack for display on all public and private occasions.

But I submit that this resolution in this form is much further-reaching and wider-spreading in its effects than my hon. friend (Mr. Beattie) probably intended. As I object to the terms of the resolution, I will support the resolution of the hon. member for Pictou that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH (East Algoma). Representing, as I do, a constituency that borders on the United States, I would like to say a few words in regard to this matter. I am astonished to find our good friends on the opposite side quibbling over a matter of this kind. I was wondering, while the hon. member from Humboldt (Mr. Neely) was talking, how long it would take the House of Representatives of the United States to deal with this matter if it were a question of our flag flying over their flags in the United States. I well remember on one occasion passing up the Sault Ste. Marie river and seeing the American flag flying on the flagpoles of the different houses along that stream. A friend of mine remarked as to one of the men occupying one of these houses that it ill-became them to display the stars and stripes without the Union Jack either in an equal position or on top. The man said he was impressed with the propriety of doing so. When, two or three days after, I had occasion to pass the same way, I found that he had complied with the request of my friend by putting up a Union Jack about the size of a postage stamp on the top of the flag pole, which I considered adding insult to injury. I really cannot understand the attitude of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has described the resolution of my hon. friend from London as crude. Of course, that is the usual treatment that a layman on this side of the House, gets from members of the legal profession who sit on the other side of the House. Everything that emanates from a layman of this side of the House, is crude, according to the lawyers opposite. I desire to say that whether it is crude or not, I would rather stand by the resolution of the member for London than to stand in the position of the hon. member for Pictou; and crude though it may be, I shall support the resolution, and I hope the member for London will not withdraw it.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk). I cannot understand the attitude of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, taking objection to a resolution of this kind. I can understand an objection on the ground that it is not properly framed, but I cannot understand any objection against its spirit. There is no question that the very first sentence in that resolution, makes it possible for the government to accept it, and to frame regulations to govern this matter. Now with regard to the flying of flags on public buildings, I was glad to hear the Minister of Public Works intimate the other night, that our flags would be flown on some of those buildings along the border towns. My opinion is that the flag should be shown on every public building, owned by the government of Canada, including the post offices. Regarding the Northwest, and my own province of Manitoba, this is an important matter. We have had an experience in the Northwest that perhaps the people of Ontario have not had. In the city of Winnipeg, on a holiday, as every man knows, who has been there, on such occasions, a stranger walking down the street would hardly know that he was in a Canadian city, he would suppose he was in an American city from the number of American flags that he would see flying. I remember an instance that occurred two or three years ago in Winnipeg, when an American citizen went into the city hall, took down the Union Jack and placed the stars and stripes on the masthead. That is only an example of what is happening every day in parts of Canada. On that occasion trouble was only averted by the coolness and wisdom of the authorities, who took charge of the man who had committed the outrage, and protected him from the men who were waiting at the bottom of the stairs to mob him. He was allowed to go free, there was no punishment meted out to him, because there seemed to be no law against it. I cannot understand the attitude of the government in trying to shelve a motion of this kind. If bloodshed has been averted time after time in Canada, it has been owing to the forbearance and common sense of our people, who have been deeply offended by the use which is made of American flags. Now we have a large number of Americans coming into our western country. We have no objections to their flag, I have no objections to the American flag flying in Manitoba, but I have serious objections to seeing it fly without the Union Jack alongside of it, or in the near vicinity. The resolution before us does not deny to any one the privilege of flying his flag, it

only asks that where a foreign flag is flown, a Canadian or British flag should be flown alongside of it, in an equally prominent position. That is a reasonable proposition, and I do not see how the government can object to it. American citizens coming to the western country, who are reasonable and self respecting men, cannot object to it. They admire their flag, and by the great honour they pay their flag, they have obtained the respect of the world. A man who respects himself, will be respected by others; a nation that respects its flag will see its flag respected by other nations. If we fail to respect our own flag, American citizens and other foreigners who come into this country, will also fail to respect it. I am satisfied that they would respect our flag more than they do, if we showed more respect for it ourselves. I would ask the Minister of Public Works to pursue the policy he has outlined, and that he cause the Canadian flag, the Union Jack, to be shown on every post office as well as other public buildings, so that foreigners coming to this country may learn to respect our flag.

Mr. MOLLOY. I must take objection to the remarks of the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell), regarding the attitude he says the Liberal party took in the election of 1907. I was a candidate in that election, the flag incident was one of those discussed by the people, and I won the election. I won the election against the Attorney General of the province, who went into a certain district of the constituency, inhabited largely by Germans, and told them that they would not be compelled to fly the British flag on their schools. These men swore to that fact, and I used that fact against the Attorney General of the province, on the ground, not that I was opposed to the flying of the flag, but I was opposed to any man or any party trying to make a political football of the British flag.

Mr. A. B. CROSBY (Halifax). I desire to congratulate the Minister of Finance on his change of sentiment, regarding the flag, and likewise the hon. member for Pictou, (Mr. Macdonald). To-night we have seen a rather peculiar condition of things. First, we had the Minister of Public Works undertaking to lead the House in this matter, and finding that things were not going right, the Minister of Finance took hold. He failed to set them right, and then the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), undertook to lead the House, and he simply told the House that if they did not do what he wanted them to do, he would move the adjournment of the debate. The First Minister, who has been accustomed to lead the House, has not seen fit to say anything yet. I congratulate the Finance Minister, because, when he was Premier of Nova Scotia, we never saw the Union Jack flying over the provincial building, the only flag we saw was the flag of Nova Scotia. Well, the flag of Nova Scotia is very good in its place, but since the province has become part and parcel of the Dominion of Canada, the proper flag to fly over the provincial building is the Union Jack. On many occasions during the time the hon. Minister of Finance was premier of Nova Scotia, resolutions were brought into that House calling upon the government to pass an Act to compel the schools to fly the British flag on the 1st of July, but these resolutions were never carried. I think I am quite safe in saying that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), was a member of the House at that time.

Mr. MACDONALD. No such suggestion or resolution was moved in the local legislature at the time when I was there, and I was there for six years, by any member of the Conservative party.

Mr. CROSBY. If the Minister of Finance would say that that is the case I would say that I am in error, but I think I am quite safe in saying what I have said.

Mr. FIELDING. I am quite willing that the hon. member shall keep on saying what he likes.

Mr. CROSBY. The Minister of Finance knows I am saying what is right. I do not propose to say anything but what I can back up, and if the Finance Minister will say that I am not right I will try to get the documents to prove that I am right. If I fail to do that I will be satisfied that I am wrong and I will apologize to him. But he knows I am right and therefore he will let me say what I like. It is not often he allows me to do it if he can help it.

The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) had a good deal to say about flag flying and he made a mournful cry about the people not being able to put up the stars and strips in their houses. In this country we are manufacturing wall paper and there is no necessity for people to use the stars and stripes with which to decorate their walls. Let them put up the paper that is made in this country. He also said that we on this side of the House could not do anything without bringing in the flag. The Conservative party had been noted for that. They never arrange any policy without including the British flag. We have had intimations on many occasions from men on that side of the House, men who, perhaps, do not sit on that side of the House now, men who have been superseded by others of the same opinion, that it was a cry. They have said that the flag did not make any difference to them, that it was a question more or less of business and

trade. It is strongly intimated by shrewd and careful calculators—whether they are right or wrong, I am not going to argue the question because it is not up for argument at the present time—that the only thing that the agreement that is before us now has to recommend it is closer relations, so close that the flag will be coming across and staying across and not going back at all. Our friend Mr. Ham says: What is the use of going anywhere because you only have to come back again?—but this will be a case of coming where it does not go back. Therefore, I am not surprised at the Minister of Finance trying to prevent this issue from being voted on squarely. The hon. member for Pictou says that this resolution does not mean anything. This resolution has been on the Order Paper for four or five days and if the hon. member for Pictou had been particularly interested in framing a resolution the grammar of which would meet with his approval, because he is a man of very great ability in his profession, he has had sufficient opportunity to do so. I feel satisfied that if he makes up his mind now to do it he and my hon. friend from London could get together and frame this resolution in such a way as would meet the situation and there would be no necessity for adjourning this debate. Adjourning the debate simply means that we vote down the resolution because there will be no other opportunity of bringing it before the House. This is the last private members day and even if it were not there would be no opportunity. Therefore, the adjourning of the debate means nothing more nor less than voting down the resolution and blocking the whole matter. The hon. member for Pictou went further and said that this would give the government an intimation as to what should be done. This government have been in power since 1896, we are now in the year 1911, and they do not yet know what they should do with the flag. That is a splendid condition indeed! The hon. member for Pictou has had to get up and tell the people on that side of the House that during all this time they did not know they had a flag. The hon. gentleman tells them something that they did not know before, that they have a flag, and he adds that they will take the matter into consideration and fix the flag. I will not be very well pleased with the way that they will fix it up, but I am quite willing to leave it to the members of this House to regulate it for them. Let us regulate it to-night. We have not very much to do, the government has nothing to bring down, it is private members night, let us fix the flag. In the morning we will be able to wake up and say that we have done something—we have regulated the flag. If they are able to steal our trade they cannot steal our flag. Let us fix the flag. I do not desire to take up more of the time of the House. I do think that the hon. member for Pictou should not vote against the resolution. If the grammar does not suit the hon. gentleman let us get the grammar into it. Let us get half a dozen grammars into it if necessary, but let us have the resolution voted upon. Let us show, every one of us, that we are true Britishers. I am not trifling with a matter of this kind to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CROSBY. There are a great many 'hear, hears' over there that have not much behind them. Still, I am willing to accept them on this occasion. There are many occasions on which I do not think much of their 'hear hears,' but, to-night, if they say 'hear, hear,' I say: Let them vote 'hear, hear.' The hon. member from Humboldt has come to the conclusion that it would not be fair to compel people, instead of putting the stars and stripes on the wall, to buy the paper manufactured in Canada with which to decorate their walls and thus stimulate the trade of the country. I trust that the hon. member who introduced this resolution will hold to his resolution as we hold to him. We have no desire to force the resolution upon the hon. member for Pictou or any other member. He can put more grammar or dictionary or any other additional conditions into it that he likes if it will make it any smoother for him, because sometimes it is very hard for him to swallow things and I hope that we may vote on the resolution to-night if he can fix it up.

Mr. M. CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Speaker, I can assure the House, that I detain it for one moment with the greatest possible reluctance, but this is to me an entirely new class of political discussion and I do not care to give a vote in which the flag is implicated without explaining my position. I am affected by this resolution exactly as I should be if any hon. member on the other side arose and proposed that we should record that it is right for all Canadians to show respect and love to their parents. If any hon. member proposed such a resolution I should feel that it was insulting. I am affected exactly so towards this resolution. I think it is a most undesirable thing in the interests of all that we hold dearest in this country to have a vote upon the flag at all. I must say that those who force such a vote incur what to my mind is a very great responsibility. There are no doubts on this side—who infuses the doubts on the other side, and why infuse them? I must say in regard to our American citizens who come into the west

in large numbers that my experience is that of my friend from Humboldt: that they are extremely easily assimilated; not because that in an assertive and what might be to them an offensive way we wave the flag in their eyes, but because we try to show them we have a country over which the flag waves in which they can have as great privileges and as great happiness and as great prosperity as are to be found anywhere in the world. They learn to love the country, they learn to love its institutions, they learn to love, if you like its lower tariffs, and then they love the flag. My hon. friend from East Algoma (Mr. Smyth) derives his inspiration in support of this resolution from the United States. I wonder he goes there for an example for anything. He told us the United States people would not wait an instant in a matter of this kind, and in that respect at least the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smyth) is a good States man. I have not found that the people of the United States are offensive in this manner. If I might venture to be egotistical I might tell the House that a few weeks ago I had the honour of delivering an address before the Canadian Club at Boston, and, in honour of your very humble servant the Union Jack floated from the Parker House to the other side of the street all the time I stayed at that hotel. But I differ from my hon. friend from East Algoma; I do not go to the United States for my thinking or inspiration on a subject of this kind; I would rather go to the other side of the water and I must say that I have never found any of what I would call this fussy self-assertiveness amongst the men who hold the historic position of being the greatest defenders of the flag. I recall the story of a fussy subordinate who in the days of the Indian mutiny went up to Sir Henry Havelock and said to him: Sir, I always carry out your orders to the letter, and Sir Henry replied: My good man, I never give orders, I only carry out those of the little lady (referring to Queen Victoria). A like fussy person met the Duke of Wellington outside of a church, long years after the day of Waterloo, and he said to him: May I have the great honour of shaking hands with the hero of Waterloo, and the duke turned to him and said: Don't make a damn fool of yourself. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether that advice would be unparliamentary if I repeated it to gentlemen on the other side of the House, but, I submit it as being well worth their consideration. It is because (and I say these words in all sincerity) it is because I have always found in my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie)—for whom I have as great a personal regard as for any member of this House—those very qualities of solid substantial manhood and the absence in his general deportment of what I have termed fussy self-assertiveness, that I regret extremely he did not accede to the very simple request, based upon good grounds as I think, that no great haste should be shown in pressing such a motion as this to a division.

Mr. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Text.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a word of explanation. I approve the principle of the resolution introduced by my friend from London (Mr. Beattie).

I do not come here to scream about the loyalty of my race towards British institutions; it is known!

We, French Canadians, respect, we love the British flag, and are happy, in our province, to see it flying side by side with the tricoloured flag. Moreover, we like to see these two flags mix together on our social and national holidays, we are proud of both our splendid flags. And we would not have waited for that motion to put it into practice in the province of Quebec.

I am paired with my friend from Kamouraska, otherwise I would vote for that resolution as its principle is written in the heart of every French Canadian.

Mr. BRUNO NANTEL (Terrebonne). (Text.) I shall say but one word, Mr. Speaker. I very cordially approve the sentiments which the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Paquet) has just expressed. I sincerely believe this resolution should not have given rise to so much discussion, and that it should have been carried unanimously as was the one which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) introduced the other day.

Last year, during a very important debate, the hon. the Prime Minister reminded the member for Jacques Cartier that he should not forget he was not only a Canadian subject, but also a British subject. Well, as a British subject, there should not be the least objection to the British flag flying together with the tricoloured flag which is dear to us.

As I am not paired, I shall with all my heart vote for the resolution of the hon. member for London.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). We have heard with some interest the remarks of the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) and of the nationalist members for Quebec, but it seems to me that the flag is in great danger when it comes to be placed in the care of these gentlemen. I might tell my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), whose remarks were very appropriate to this discussion, that he need not worry in the slightest over the remarks of these hon. gentlemen. The junior member for Halifax finds fault with the Liberal party in Nova Scotia because the flag did not fly over the citadel in Halifax on certain occasions, but I have yet to learn that he or his party have ever shown any endearing affection towards that flag, and

when he commented upon the remarks of the hon. member for Pictou and of the Minister of Finance, I was rather astonished that he should venture on such ground. He spoke of the 'dictionary' and the language of the hon. member for Pictou, but possibly he was not able to understand the dictionary that the hon. member for Pictou used. So far as the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) is concerned, nature has not endowed him with any very high intelligence, and he has not been favoured with an education which would enable him to stand up here to criticise the language used by members on this side of the House, and more particularly by the hon. member for Pictou.

Mr. CROSBY. I did not criticise the grammar of the hon. member for Pictou; I asked him if he would assist us in putting it in grammatical form.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I should say he could have put it in proper form without any suggestion, hint or opinion from the junior member for Halifax. I am sure he would not thank that hon. member for any suggestion from a grammatical point of view. As to his remarks about the member for Pictou and the dictionary, I think they are entirely gratuitous, and I would suggest that when he comes to waving the flag he confine himself entirely to the flag and do not give way to any criticism of any one else's diction.

Mr. BEATTIE. I am somewhat surprised, in fact, I am astonished, at the course this discussion has taken. I wish to tell the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) that I was not waving any flag; I simply put a quiet resolution on the Order Paper, wishing for an expression of opinion which would discourage foreigners coming into this country and waving not only one flag, but hundreds of flags. You cannot go to a theatre but on the stage, if the company have to wave a flag they wave the stars and stripes, or a foreign flag. I think it would be only common decency and politeness when these companies come here to take the money of our people that they should wave only the flag of our country. I have the greatest respect for foreign flags, but I think they might, in common politeness and decency, wave the flag of Great Britain. It seems to me ignorance on their part not to do so.

Reference has been made to flying the Union Jack on all our public buildings. I have no such intention; I do not wish it. There are certain buildings over which the flag should fly, such as customs houses. It flies on the customs house in London, but I had no intention of having it placed on all public buildings. I was not waving the flag; I simply wanted to discourage hundreds and hundreds of foreigners coming in here and bringing in not one, but dozens of flags, covering all their vehicles. The moment they go to a watering place they erect a flagstaff and on it place a foreign flag. Hundreds of children go to Muskoka and other places and find not a Union Jack, nothing but foreign flags. It is a great mistake, our own children get the idea that it is our flag and unfortunately many of our people do not understand the flag. The red ensign we fly on our buildings is a ship's flag and we have no right to fly it in that way. The Union Jack should fly on all private buildings. On our ships we use a Canadian flag, that is, a British flag, with a coat of arms in the corner to let the customs officers know that the ship is from Canada, and in Australia they do the same thing, but they are not national flags, and it is a pity that when our people want to use a flag they do not use the Union Jack, that the flag of the empire. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has been very polite, saying the resolution was crude and ungrammatical. I would like to see some of his documents. If we read them through, I believe we would find many of them much worse than that. Some of these professional men have got the idea that no one is fit to draw a resolution but themselves. I have no fault to find with that. I am surprised that the member for Red Deer should think I was waving the flag.

If I had been asked to withdraw the resolution at the proper time I would have done so, but after it has gone to the country now I would be ashamed to go back to my constituents and say I had withdrawn it. I would like to oblige the Finance Minister and the Minister of Public Works by withdrawing, but if I did so now I would become a laughing-stock. It is a resolution for which every man should vote. I simply want an expression of opinion from the House to discourage this promiscuous flying of foreign flags instead of our own.

House divided on amendment, Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

YEAS.

Messieurs

Allard,	Loggie,
Allen,	Lovell,
Aylesworth (Sir Allen),	Macdonald,
Beauparlant,	MacNutt,
Béland,	McAllister,
Bickerdike,	McColl,
Bureau,	McIntyre,
Carvell,	McKenzie,
Cash,	McLean (Huron),
Champagne,	McMillan,
Chew,	Marcile (Bagot),
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Chisholm (Inverness),	Martin (Wellington),
Clark (Red Deer),	Meigs,
Clarke (Essex),	Michaud,
Congdon,	Molloy,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Murphy,
	Nesbitt,

Delisle.
Demers,
Devlin,
Douglas,
Dubeau,
Ecrément,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Fortier,
Fowke,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gilbert,
Girard,
Graham,
Harris,
Harty,
Hodgins,
Hunt,
King,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lafortune,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Law,
Neely,
Oliver,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Rivet,
Robb,
Ross (Middlesex),
Rutan,
Savoie,
Sealey,
Sinclair,
Smith (Middlesex),
Sperry,
Templeman,
Todd,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turgeon,
Verville,
Warburton,
White (Victoria, Alta.) and
Wilson (Laval).—89.

NAYS.

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Arthurs,
Beattie,
Best,
Blain,
Blondin,
Borden (Halifax),
Bradbury,
Bristol,
Broder,
Burrell,
Campbell,
Chisholm (Huron),
Crosby,
Crothers,
Daniel,
Doherty,
Edwards,
Elson,
Fraser,
Goodeve,
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Henderson,
Herron,
Kidd,
Lake,
Lennox,
Lewis,
Macdonell,
McCall,
Meighen,
Middlebro,
Nantel,
Perley,
Porter,
Roche,
Schaffner,
Sexsmith,
Smyth,
Staples,
Stewart,
Taylor (Leeds),
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thoburn,
Wallace,
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox,
Wilson (Lennox and Addington) and
Wright.—49.

PAIRS.

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Brodeur,	Haggart,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Talbot,	Owen,
McGiverin,	Barnard,
Miller,	Sproule,
Gordon (Kent),	Lancaster,
Fisher,	Foster,
Lemieux,	Osler,
Borden (Sir F.),	Forget,
Paterson,	Northrup,
Brown,	Lortie,
Lapointe,	Paquet,
Smith (Nanaimo),	Cowan,
Tolmie,	Hughes,
Guthrie,	Clare,
Carrier,	Monk,
Schell,	Barker,
Emmerson,	Reid,
Conmee,	McCarthy,
Smith (Stormont),	Boyce,
Turriff,	Ames,
McCraney,	Crocket,
McLean (Sunbury),	Worthington,
Rankin,	Marshall,
McCoig,	Lalor,
German,	Stanfield,
Low,	Price,
Knowles,	Donnelly,
Martin (Regina),	Magrath,
Gervais,	Maddin,
Turcotte (Quebec),	Currie (Simcoe),
Parent,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Roy (Dorchester),	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Black.	Rhodes,
Boyer,	Thornton,
LeBlanc,	Jameson,
Ross (Rimouski).	Russell.

Motion for adjournment of the debate agreed to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can now give to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition the information as to all the days on which it is ordered that the flag shall be flown. They are as follows : March 17, St. Patrick's Day ; April 23, St. George's Day ; May 24, Victoria Day ; May 26, Queen's birthday ; June 3, King's Birthday ; June 23, Prince of Wales' Birthday ; June 24, St. Jean Baptiste Day ; July 1, Dominion Day ; November 30, St. Andrew's Day ; and now March 1, St. David's Day. These are in addition to the flying of the flag daily at all border towns and principal seaports.

THE MARKEY FISHING LEASE.

Mr. CAMPBELL moved :

For a copy of all orders in council, correspondence and other papers relating to the fishing lease granted to one Markey in the waters of the Nelson river and other northern waters; and of all correspondence with regard to the proposed cancellation of same, and a copy of the said lease.

He said : Mr. Speaker, in making this motion, I do not want to bring in any contentious matter. All I want is to have the information brought down, and I feel sure that the minister will bring it down. My impression was that he had assured me that these fishing leases had all been cancelled. It is a matter of grave import to this country that they should be cancelled, particularly this one. In the event of the Hudson Bay railway being built, this lease, which cost $10 a year, will be of immense value. For that reason I hope that the fullest information that can be given to this House will be given by the minister. Later on, when I have the information, I will bring the matter up.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing all applications for aid to the construction of dry docks under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, 1910, the location or situation of each proposed dock, the dimensions thereof as well as the extent of property and plant proposed, the amount of subsidy in each case, and full particulars of all applications which have been granted, and all those now under consideration.—Mr. Taylor (Leeds).

For a copy of all letters, papers, telegrams, and documents, vouchers and pay sheets, showing the names of all persons who supplied materials or worked, and the prices and rates of wages, and sums paid to each, in connection with the construction of a wharf at Deep Brook, N.S.—Mr. Jameson.

For a return showing respectively, the total trade, the imports, the exports for each year from 1846 to 1876, both inclusive, between the British North American possessions, except Newfoundland, and the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and other countries respectively.—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

For a copy of all orders in council, reports, correspondence, documents and papers touching the dismissal of the sub-collector of customs at Mahone Bay, Nova Scotia.—Mr. Taylor (Leeds).

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 4) to amend the Railway Act—Mr. Martin (St. Mary's, Montreal).

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. I desire to lay on the table a supplementary return in relation to the reciprocity agreement, containing additional letters received on the subject, for and against.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I desire to call the attention of the Prime Minister to an important measure on the Order Paper for the protection of children in the cities, known as the Juvenile Delinquents Bill, which stands for its second reading. I am sure that it will only take about ten minutes to dispose of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the Bill of my hon. friend were the next in order there would be no objection ; but there are several just as important on the paper before that of my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Before the House adjourns I beg to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that we are very close to order No. 8, the further consideration of the resolution in favour of a substantial reduction in the duties on agricultural implements which I had the honour to urge upon the House one month ago. At a later date, when we approached the order for resuming the discussion, the Prime Minister moved the adjournment of the House, so that the discussion was avoided at his instance. He assured me then that on the following Monday it would come up, but that again did not turn out to be correct. To-night the resolution is again shifted ahead by the motion of the Prime Minister, and I very much fear that the result will be that it will not be reached again this session, as I understand that this is the last private members' day.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 28, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 126) respecting the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Fortier.

BILL MINER.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Before the orders of the day are called I wish to put a question to the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) based upon the following despatch in to-day's Montreal 'Gazette':

BILL MINER ARRESTED.

Canadian Government may have him, if they want him.

Chicago, February 27.—That 'Old Bill' Miner, second only to Jesse James in notoriety as a train robber, was one of the White Sulphur, Ga., bandits arrested at Gainesville, Ga., last Thursday, was asserted at the bureau of identification of the Pinkerton National Detective Agency to-day.

The train robbery at White Sulphur occurred February 18 and several thousand dollars were secured by the bandits. Five days later three alleged robbers were arrested, among them, it is stated 'Old Bill.'

Unless the Dominion authorities seek Miner's return he will be tried on the White Sulphur charge.

I wish to ask whether it is the intention of the Solicitor General to take steps to have this gentleman returned to Canada.

Mr. BUREAU. The first information I have had as to this matter was from to-day's newspapers. I will see the Minister of Justice and ask him what course he intends to take, and I will communicate further with my hon. friend from New Westminster.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House again in Committee of Ways and Means.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Brandon). Mr. Chairman, I agree with what has been said by members of the House who have preceded me respecting the very great importance of the question we are now discussing. I have found it the most important question which has come before this House since I have had the honour of being a member of it, and when I say frankly to the committee that the result of my investigation has been to lead me to the conclusion that I cannot follow the leader of the party with which I have been identified practically all my lifetime it will be very evident that to me at least it is an extremely important question. A difference with the political party with which I have been associated all my lifetime must necessarily be of an extremely painful character. With the members of the government I am and always have been upon the best and closest possible terms politically and socially. Some of the members of the government I regard as my closest personal friends. And, away back in the county of Brandon there are a great many men who for 23 years have been my supporters, who, I am quite satisfied, will find great difficulty in understanding why I find it necessary to vote against the party with which they and I have been identified so long. It will be readily understood, Sir, under those circumstances, that my convictions upon the subject are extremely strong. Twenty years ago the Liberal party had as its policy a policy of unrestricted reciprocity. As a young man, young in public life at that time, I followed the leaders of my party; I took an active part in that election. There are I think some gentlemen in the House here against whom I spoke in that campaign, and to the best of my ability I endeavoured to convince the electors whom I addressed that the policy of my party was a wise and a prudent policy. I am free to say, Mr. Chairman, that almost before the campaign was over I had succeeded in convincing myself that we were wrong. From that time on my views have undergone, perhaps a gradual, but a steady and a certain change. When the tariff was revised in 1897 I was satisfied that the tariff as we adopted it at that time represented a good policy for the Dominion of Canada and possibly the best policy we could adopt. And, ever since 1898, when under the Joint High Commission efforts were made to secure some kind of reciprocity with the United States, my conviction has been strengthening in that direction. A couple of years ago I had the honour of delivering an address in New York in the Chamber of Commerce of that great city, and I indicated pretty clearly at that time, though to a somewhat hostile audience, what my views are.

Now, I am well aware, Mr. Chairman that it is a matter of possibly small concern as to when and how my opinion has been arrived at, but I will ask the House to pardon me for mentioning the facts which show that my opinion on this subject is not a spasmodic or suddenly formed opinion, but is the mature conviction which comes to me as the result of something over twenty years of pretty close contact with the affairs of Canada. Some of my newspaper friends have intimated that there was some mystery about my opinions upon this subject. I have not sought to make any mystery of them. I have perhaps avoided discussing the subject with my political friends because I did not desire that any of them should feel that I was endeavouring to induce them to adopt my opinions, and I did not desire to say anything to any of my Liberal friends except what I was prepared to say in the presence of the members of the government and in the presence of the House. But what I have to say about that is this. We have in the Dominion of Canada pretty strong party ties. We do not leave our party for small reasons. We do not leave our party because it happens to do something that we do not at the moment approve of—because it builds a bridge or a court house or a public building or even a railroad that we do not think necessary at the time. We have a pretty strong idea with regard to party allegiance, and my conviction is that it is a good thing and contributes to the stability of government that we have that idea. But it must be remembered nevertheless that, the reason why we adhere to a political party is that party in general represents the principles that we think ought to be applied to the government of the country; and when one's party is led to apply principles which are of fundamental and far-reaching importance, affecting the whole national structure, and one feels that he cannot conscientiously adopt or follow those principles, then, Mr. Chairman, his party allegiance is necessarily dissolved, and if he desires to retain his own self-respect, it becomes absolutely necessary for him to decline to follow that of which he does not approve. That is the position in which I find myself to-day; and, however, painful the process may be, I take the only course which I can take and retain my self-respect.

Getting away from that subject let me say a word or two in regard to the conduct of the debate by the government. I think the House has a little fault to

find, justifiably, with my hon. friends who have charge of the debate for the government. There has never been, since 1879, so important an alteration in the tariff as proposed in these resolutions; and when alterations of an extensive character are made, it has always been customary to make very thorough and complete inquiries of the most expert and detailed character. Otherwise it is impossible that those who are acting should really know what they are doing. When other countries undertake work of this kind, such inquiries are made. I wonder if the House is aware of the fact that when the last German revision of their tariff was made, 20,000 experts were employed for the purpose of collecting and collating information for the benefit of the government and for the benefit of the parliamentary body which subsequently had to act upon their report. In England the Board of Trade experts act. Here we have generally had a collection of detailed information which was available when the debate came on in the House, and which the ministers in charge gave for the benefit of the members of the House. Now, I think we should have had the information which is necessary for the discussion of this question given us by the government. I think we should have had a full and clear statement as to the effects of this treaty upon our relations with the favoured nations. Members of the opposition have, by questioning, elicited from our hon. friends a good deal of information; but I venture the opinion that there is not a single member of this House outside of the government who now knows whether he is in possession of the whole information or not. Then, we should have had, I think, some comparative statements of prices. This whole question relates to markets and to prices. It would have been a comparatively small matter for a body of experts employed by the government to have got for us a comparative list of the prices of the principal commodities, in the United States, in Canada, and in the other countries concerned. But we have not received it. Neither have we the information, unless we dig it out of the blue-books for ourselves, with great labour, and sometimes with the liability to make mistakes, as we have had evidence of once or twice in the debate already, with regard to the production of the various commodities by the countries concerned. Generally this has been done by the government and generally some member of the government has made it his business properly to place before the House the case for the government for the proposals that are made. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance never speaks except with that ability and cleverness which we all admire, and it was quite as much in evidence in the address that he gave us in introducing these resolutions as it ever was in this House. But I do not think my hon. friend would claim that in that address he undertook to argue the merits of these proposals in detail. Neither did my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. If the committee desires to know just what I mean by this criticism, let them look at the speech which the Finance Minister delivered on the Grand Trunk Pacific resolutions, or at one of the speeches which my hon. friend the Minister of Customs has often delivered in this House in the budget debates, and they will see the kind of a case which our hon. friends can make when they desire to do it and have the material. I would conclude that either our hon. friends in the government have not made the investigation and do not possess the facts, or else that the facts do not bear out the contention which they put forward.

Before going into this question of prices, I desire to say that I dissent altogether from the proposition that everybody in Canada has been in favour of reciprocity with the United States for the last forty years. I do not know of any warrant at all for the statement that both the parties, or that one of the parties, for the last forty years has been in favour of reciprocity. There can be no doubt that the Liberal party was in favour of reciprocity twenty years ago; there can be no doubt that in the platform of 1893 there was what might be called a look at reciprocity; and there can be no doubt that later on, I think it was in 1898, under the Joint High Commission, the right hon. leader of the government attempted to get some measure of reciprocity from the United States. But there is equally no doubt that when the Joint High Commission ceased to act, the right hon. gentleman expressly made his position clear, and that in the general election of 1900, in the election of 1904, and in the election of 1908, there was no mention whatever of reciprocity by either of the parties. As a member of the government in the first two of those elections I should be credited at least with having a general idea of the policy of the government of which I was a member, and I do not think there would be any individual in Canada more surprised than I if I had been told in either of those elections that it was a part of the policy of the government to seek reciprocity. If there was anything that was clearer than another in connection with the policy of the two political parties in those three successive general elections, it was that neither of them made any claim to advocate the policy of reciprocal trade relations with the United States.

I agree with what has been said that

the government has no mandate to make these proposals. I do not mention that point because of a desire to fill up the cup or to aggravate the argument against my hon. friends, and I furthermore say that I think oppositions very often say what can hardly be supported on grounds of reason or law in opposition to what is done by governments on the ground that they have no mandate. But I do not think the principles which often apply, apply in this case. We have not, it is true, a system of government by delegation. Our governments are not elected to do specific things; that is not the nature of our constitution. We are elected under a very wide system of parliamentary responsibility, and a great discretion is vested in the House of Commons, and in the government which is the executive committee of the House of Commons in connection with the transaction and new business, business which was not discussed when they were before the electors. They may do a great many things that were not discussed when they were before the electors, but they may not constitutionally or properly do everything, and I venture to say that when the fiscal policy of a country has been thoroughly canvassed and settled, discussed, debated and approved in the year 1900, discussed, debated and approved in the year 1904, discussed, debated and approved in the year 1908, that there is no constitutional warrant for the members of the government reversing that policy radically without any consultation and practically without the knowledge of the people. There is a discretion vested in the government, there is a discretion vested in the House of Commons, but Mr. Chairman, it must be remembered that the discretion that is exerciseable by those who occupy important positions under our form of government is not an arbitrary personal discretion, it is a constitutional discretion which must be exercised in accordance with the principles of the constitution, and the constitutional rights of the people we represent, and I want to say and to say it not as I said simply for the purpose of making another point against my hon. friend, but I want to say that I do not believe, speaking from my own experience and from the experience of many men whom I have met in various walks of life and largely members of the Liberal party, I do not believe that in the recent history of Canada anything has happened which has given to the thinking people of Canada so painful and so sudden a shock as the sudden realization that four or five gentlemen who, by reason of their ability, their years of service and their high position in their party, are in control of the affairs of the dominant political party, can suddenly, of their own motion, without discussion, without debate, without the knowledge of the country, commit the country to a radical change of fiscal policy. That is not, I am bound to say, the doctrine of constitutional government as I was taught it in the Liberal party, and I do not think that there could be possibly a more dangerous innovation.

Sir, what we are asked to do in these resolutions is to reverse the fiscal policy of the Dominion of Canada. It is interesting to note, although there has been very little discussion of that point, what is the policy which we are asked to reverse and why we are asked to reverse it. The policy was adopted in 1897 after the election which resulted in the right hon. the present leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) taking office. That tariff was described by its own friends, of whom I was and am one, as having first for its most outstanding feature the British preference, second, a readjustment of duties which largely reduce the duties upon articles commonly used by the farming community and, third, a substantial reduction in the duties on the raw materials of manufacturers. Now, it may frankly be said that the system of protection was continued by that tariff. Of that there can be no possible doubt. And it must further be said quite frankly and we can say it without disturbing ourselves particularly at this distance of time—that the tariff of 1897 did not fully implement all the promises or the suggestions which we, the members of the Liberal party, had made in regard to our future policy when we were in opposition. But, Mr. Speaker, the policy which we set forth in the tariff of 1897 was deliberately adopted. All these matters were canvassed and considered before we adopted it. We found, as people generally find when they take office, that there were some things that they thought they could do that they could not do, some things that they intended to do that would do harm to some people, and would not do any good to anybody, and so there were many things that perhaps might have been expected that were not done ; but the tariff of 1897 was deliberately adopted after full and careful consideration, we went to the country in 1900 upon that tariff and submitted it to the judgment of the people who had put us in office. We were open to attack then on the ground that we had not fully carried out our pledges, both by our opponents and by our political friends, and, speaking for myself as having conducted largely the discussion on behalf of the government in a very large section of the country which was committed to my charge, I say that no phase of that subject was left untouched. It was discussed and rediscussed at every campaign meeting that was held. We placed the matter before the people, we explained the reasons for the action we had taken, we submitted those reasons to the people, we submitted ourselves to their judgment, and

the result was that their judgment upheld us, and that the tariff was approved. It was my opinion then, whatever that opinion might have been worth, little or much, that it was the best tariff that we could adopt. It was only an opinion but as time has gone on, and that tariff policy has been practically unchanged in any very important particular since 1897, I have become thoroughly and completely convinced that the tariff policy which we adopted at that time, which embraced the principle of moderate protection applicable to all classes of the community, is the best policy that the Dominion of Canada can adopt, a policy that it will be most unsafe and most unwise to radically change. One feature, an especially important feature, of that policy, was the British preference. The British preference has been discussed a great deal. Some of our friends from the opposition side of the House have sought to minimize its effects because we were buying largely from the United States, but I do not think that that argument is a good or a sound argument. The imports from Great Britain under the British preference have grown from twenty-nine millions odd in 1897 to ninety-five millions in 1910 ; the increase has been 320 per cent, and it is no answer to the argument that that preference is an effective preference to say that for other and very special reasons we are importing large quantities of goods from the United States for the benefit largely of our own manufacturers. The British preference is a substantial preference. It is suggested that it is likely to be substantially increased, and on that point, while I am dealing with the general question of policy, I desire to express myself clearly and fully. Nobody was a more enthusiastic supporter of the British preference when it was adopted than I was, but I think that there are limits to the extent to which we can go even in cutting the tariff of Canada in favour of the manufacturers of Great Britain as against the manufacturers of Canada. And I am not disposed to say that I would support a substantial increase in the British preference, made, as I understand it, at the expense of deserving Canadian industries for the purpose of putting back into the hands of Great Britain trade which, by this reciprocity arrangement we are taking away and giving to the United States. I cannot see that there is any sound business wisdom in that operation. I cannot see that there is any possible ground for taking such steps as will result in the closing up of Canadian factories doing business at a small margin of profit, so long as they are furnishing their goods to the people of this country at reasonable rates.

What have been the results of the policy which we are following ? The figures which indicate the great progress and prosperity of Canada have been quoted in this House ad nauseam. I should not repeat them here. We know how the population has grown; we know how our public revenue, our foreign trade and the deposits in our banks have grown; we know that in the last twelve or fifteen years the Dominion of Canada has prospered more abundantly than any other country on the face of the earth. We know this, further, that, man for man, the people of Canada are better off than any other population of similar numbers that we can point to. Our farmers are prosperous; our labourers are well paid; there is no unemployment in Canada—almost an unknown thing in any country of the extent and population of ours—there is practically no poverty, except what is due to drink, vice, sickness or other cause which does not depend at all upon the prosperity or want of prosperity of the country; we are receiving an enormous immigration; there is a demand for every man who comes in the shape of a labourer, and still an insistent demand for more labour; and there is a rapid development of our resources. And there is one other thing which is of the utmost importance in the condition of our business position, and that is the enormous growth of the home market, which has been built up in Canada during the last ten or twelve years, and which, in my judgment, accounts more than anything else for the steadiness of prices which our farmers are receiving for their products.

Now, is this prosperity that we are enjoying, a sound prosperity? Very often the charge is made, when a country is prosperous, that its prosperity is unsound, that it is a hothouse growth; and that charge is almost always made if the country is working under a protective system. And that charge is generally true if the protection is excessive or not properly adapted to the wants of the community. Now, it is possible—by reason of the fact that an exhaustive inquiry has been made of an economic character under the direction of one of the members of the government—to collate a few facts which show conclusively what our position in that respect is. A volume has been issued under the direction of my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), dealing with the subject of wholesale prices, which work I regard as perhaps the most valuable contribution to the economic literature of Canada that I know of. That volume, setting forth the statistics of wholesale prices, enables us to follow accurately the movement of prices which affect the well-being of the various classes of the community. In the consideration of this question, the Minister of Labour and his expert assistants, took as the

basis for comparison, the decade which runs from 1890 to 1899. I find by this report, that, in the year 1909, the prices of the commodities to which I shall refer, have risen by the amount which I shall give as compared with the average of the decade, from 1890-1899:

Grain and fodder, including thirteen selected standard commodities, have risen in value 49·9 per cent; cattle and cattle products, hogs and hog products, sheep and sheep products, fowl and turkeys, have risen 48·6 per cent; dairy products have risen 33 per cent. Now, for the purposes of comparison, let us make a different division: Crude farm products have risen 37·3 per cent; manufactured farm products have risen 34·1 per cent; average for crude and manufactured farm products, of 35·7 per cent.

This is what the farmer sells. Now, consider what he buys. He buys imported foods, woollen goods, cotton goods, boots and shoes, metals and implements. The average increases of these commodities are as follows: imported goods, decreased 4 per cent; woollen goods increased 23·3 per cent; cotton goods increased 25 per cent; boots and shoes increased 25 per cent; metals and implements increased 2·4 per cent; an average of all these of 14·3 per cent.

Thus, we see that the staple lines of goods which account for at least nineteen-twentieths of the average farmer's expenditure, have increased 14·3 per cent, while the goods which he sells, have increased 35·7 per cent. There you have an absolutely conclusive demonstration of the position of the two classes of the community. There you have proof of the fact that the urban community is not living at the expense of the farmer, but the farmer himself is getting more than his share of the general prosperity of the community. So, then, we have prosperity, soundness, and—what else? Independence; an independent market for everything we raise and everything we sell. The local market of Canada takes from 80 to 90 per cent of everything raised in Canada by our farming population. Where do we send the rest? We send it to the great, free, open market of Great Britain, from which market nothing but our own foolishness can possibly exclude us. So, we have prosperity, soundness and absolute independence in our markets.

Now, the proposition is made that we revolutionize the fiscal policy under which these results have been attained. And what will be the effect of this proposed revolution in our fiscal policy? I do not intend to overstate it or to say anything which can possibly be regarded as overstating it. But I am surely within the mark, when I say that there will be a very great dislocation and disturbance of business, that there will be individuals who will suffer very great loss, and that even if these individuals succeed in rectifying their position, still, the disturbance for considerable portions of the community will be of a very serious character. As to the general progress of Canada, the production of Canada is so enormous, the immigration is so great, the impetus we have received so strong, the development of our resources so rapid, that no possible mistake of fiscal policy can prevent this country making enormous progress in the future. Nevertheless, the effects will be serious. Let me enumerate what I think will be a few of those effects.

Some industries will be destroyed,—there can be no doubt about that. What reason can be given for drawing your pen through an item of the tariff and thereby shutting up an industry which is not accused of combining as against consumers, of charging illicit prices, or of any other evils?—what reason there can be for selecting that industry and wiping it out of existence, I do not see. I am bound to say that it does not appeal to my common sense. I think that the meat packing industry of this country will be destroyed. I have given that subject a good deal of consideration. I thought when I saw and read carefully the memorial of the packers, that the meat packing industry would be injured, and I am prepared to say now that if this treaty goes into effect, and continues in effect for any length of time, the big packing industry of the Dominion of Canada will be wiped out. There is no more chance of the meat packing industry standing against the beef trust of the United States than there would be of my standing up against this building if it fell upon me. That is precisely the position in which the meat packers will be put.

I shall not say anything about the fruit and vegetable growers. They will be injured. Their case has been stated by men who know vastly more about it than I do. But I call the attention of my friends in the government to the fact that my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) made before this House a full and careful presentation of the case of the fruit growers and vegetable growers; no fairer, no better, no fuller case was ever presented to this House while I have been a member of it, and no answer of any kind has been attempted in connection with that subject. You ask me why I do not support this proposition. Surely, Mr. Chairman, if I had the intelligence to hear a case of that kind presented and no answer made, I must come to the conclusion that no answer can be made.

There will be other large industries affected. There is an enormous industry in existence in the town of Peterborough, the Quaker Oats establishment. The president

of the company has given an interview, and I have taken the trouble to have the interview verified, because it is not always safe to proceed upon what we see in the newspapers, with all due regard to my journalistic friends. I have taken the trouble to verify that interview with the president, speaking on behalf of the Quaker Oats Company, which is one of the very largest factories in Canada, and one of the largest consumers of farm produce in Canada, consuming, I believe—I speak subject to correction—40 carloads of farm produce per day. This institution manufactures in the town of Peterborough largely for export, the best possible kind of factory for us to have. It takes the farm produce, it grinds it up, ships it to foreign countries, collects the money, brings it back, and it goes into circulation. We can have no better industry for a farming community than the Quaker Oats industry of Peterborough. Now, eighty per cent of the business of this establishment is done for export. The president of the company says that in the conditions that will exist under the proposed changes in the tariff it will be more convenient and economical for them to manufacture in the United States for export. Their operations in Peterborough, therefore, will be curtailed sixty, seventy, or eighty per cent, with the result that the Dominion of Canada will lose accordingly. Now, I do not at all profess to be able to express an intelligent opinion respecting the business of the Quaker Oats Company, but I call attention to this fact, that these people are not Canadian manufacturers kicking about the duty being taken off when they are manufacturing for the home market. It is easy to understand why a manufacturer would object to a change in a case of that kind. But there is no reason for this company saying that this agreement is against them if it is not. They are not unfriendly to the United States, and they are not unfriendly to our negotiations, and there is no possible reason why we should not accept their statement as being given in good faith.

Will this proposition assist in transferring American capital to the construction of factories in Canada, which has been going on in Canada for several years past at a very rapid rate? Surely we cannot conclude that it will. These factories have been established because it was thought that the fiscal policy of Canada was settled, that we had settled down to a definite fiscal policy, and people came along and built factories here and built factories there, thinking they were perfectly safe. I have no doubt that those who are engaged in putting up factories will continue and complete their work; they cannot afford to do anything else. But is it reasonable to suppose that many business men with money to invest in factories will readily decide to do so unless they get some definite assurance that what has happened in this particular case is not going to happen again? I do not see how they can get the assurance; I do not see how it will be possible for parliament to prove that what has been done in this case will not be done in every case in which ministers, with the best motives, may see fit to do it.

Take the question of pulp and paper. The province of Ontario and the province of Quebec have decided, in their wisdom, that it is a good and patriotic policy for them to insist upon their pulpwood being manufactured at home. I am aware that some gentlemen who are of estimable character and good information have said that it is not a wise policy, but I do not believe there are many people in Canada who would agree with them. I believe that there is no policy, no item of policy which has been followed by any of the governments of Canada of late years which has met with more universal approval than the action of the government of Ontario, and later of the government of Quebec, in deciding upon the conservation of their resources by securing the largest possible revenue and benefit from the various resources which they possess. Well, that was the position. It is known of all men that the United States people would like to get cheaper paper made from Canadian pulpwood. Now, if there was anything that was perfectly clear in connection with our tariff relations with the United States, and if there was anything perfectly clear in connection with the paper and pulp question, it was that all the Dominion of Canada had to do was to sit down and wait, and leave the subject severely alone. That obviously was all that ought to have been done. We have not done that. We find this clause introduced into the treaty. What does it say? If it means what our negotiators intended it to mean, it means this, that there is a bonus put upon the abrogation of the regulations which the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario have made. It does not mean that the regulations are abrogated, because this parliament has no power to abrogate them; but it means that we put a bonus upon their abrogation, and that is the worst possible thing that we could do.

Take this question of our perishable products that we send to Great Britain. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) dealt with that. He is familiar with the subject, and my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), who, I understand is to follow me, is more familiar with it, perhaps, than any man in the House. But it is a fact that for years there was difficulty in finding a market for our perishable products. The country went to work and educated the farmers to prepare their products for the British market, instituted cold storage, under the Depart-

ment of Agriculture, upon steamships, induced the steamship companies to put it in, provided for connections in Great Britain, and did everything possible at great labour, trouble and expense, extending over a period of nearly twenty years, for the purpose of opening up markets for these products in Great Britain. The policy succeeded entirley. We are sending those products to Great Britain now, to a great, stable, safe, free market, from which we have never been excluded, a market that is improving all the time, a market in which we are finding fresh extensions and fresh points of advantage every year. What do we propose to do? We propose to ship our stuff to the United States instead and to throw away all the advantage of all the work that we have done, the whole of the cold storage facilities upon the steamships crossing the Atlantic provided for in past years, to break down the business connections we have made, to allow our competitors to go in and take that market, buttress it around in such a way that we can never get into it again, and put ourselves in dependance upon the markets of the United States. How long will they remain open? Nobody knows. It may be one year or five years. Nobody knows. A year ago the United States were brandishing a club over our heads and threatening to impose the surtax upon our goods—only one short year ago. Now, they say that the United States is friendly. Well, perhaps it is. What will it be in a year from now? Does anybody know? Nobody knows. The United States is at the present time, I am told, abrogating the Blaine treaties of reciprocity which were made with the Latin republics a few years ago, without even the courtesy of negotiation or discussion as to the reasons for the abrogation of those treaties. How much better will our position be at any time when an occasion for irritation may arise? There are dozens of things which might happen to cause irritation between the United States, Canada and Great Britain. I could mention to my right hon. friend who leads the government, if I desired to do so, but I do not desire to do so—it is a matter within everybody's knowledge—some things that might cause irritation between the United States, Great Britain or Canada, not serious enough to have important international consequences but serious enough to make it very desirable for a political party in the United States to court popularity by doing something which might be of an unfriendly character to Great Britain and Canada. Then, when our market is closed, when we have shut ourselves out from Great Britain, what is the position? Sir, we are putting our head into a noose.

What are the compensations? It is said that the farmers will have better prices and better markets. It is very difficult for a private individual to make an exhaustive examination of prices. He can only be expected to go into a limited number of subjects, and his information must necessarily be limited. I have made as careful an examination as I could of the prices of the various staples which the farmers of Canada sell in the open markets, and I have before me the result of that examination. It is not necessary that I should enter into any considerable number of details, but will give you a few of the conclusions which appear to be absolutely established by the facts. First, I will take hogs, one of the most important products of the province of Ontario. The average price in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec is better than it is in the United States. As far as cattle are concerned the prices are variable, and as far as eggs are concerned the prices of the better grades are higher, and of the other grades, lower. It is said that the market for lambs will be good if we get reciprocity with the United States. From the 1st of December up to the present time lambs have been cheaper in Chicago than in Ontario. The best creamery butter sells at a higher price in the United States, but all the lower grades are cheaper, and it seems to be quite clear from an investigation of the market conditions by those who are familiar with the subject, that we shall lose our local market for butter and eggs—in the case of eggs to the United States and in the case of butter to countries like New Zealand, Denmark and possibly Australia. While we may get some advantage by selling a small portion of the higher grade of the product to the United States, we shall lose upon a great portion of the lower grade, which, as everybody knows, is the greater proportion of the product. In poultry the higher grades will be higher and the lower grades will be lower. Hay is one product that is substantially higher in the United States than in Canada. Barley is higher and oats lower. Looking over the whole case, it is not possible to figure out any general advantage to the farmer in getting these markets even if we take prices as they are without having any reference to the general effect upon the market which may take place in other ways. As to the quality, everybody knows that there is a perfectly good market for all that our farms produce. There is no glut in the market of Canada if the produce is reasonably prepared, and if it is not reasonably prepared for the market then the United States market will be of no assistance to the man who allows himself to be in that position.

Then, there are some general features of the case which require to be considered.

This, Mr. Chairman, is a conclusion which you cannot possibly escape: Under this arrangement, which means free trade in farm products, the markets for farm produce will be absolutely dominated by the United States and favoured nation countries. There can be no possible question about that. The meat packing industry will be destroyed. What is happening in some other places? I have taken a clipping from the Ottawa 'Citizen' of February 25, which has since been confirmed by other information. It is not a political article, but a Canadian press cable, and it is as follows:

London, Feb. 25.—A despatch to the 'Chronicle' from Melbourne says the federal Minister of Trade and Customs declares that the Australian commonwealth will spare no expense to 'oppose sinister operations of the American meat trust in seeking to control the Australian trade.'

The meat trust in Australia and New Zealand is so sinister in its operations that the government of the commonwealth has to take the field against it, and we are here taking down the barriers and inviting it to come in and dominate the market of Canada. That trust will oppress our farmers, it is not a beneficent institution, it is not a philanthropic institution, and when it dominates the market, we will say of Ontario, and any hon. gentleman on this side of the House or on the other side of the House finds that the farmers of his constituency are not getting fair play in the matter of prices, may I ask what that gentleman will do, may I ask what his remedy will be, may I ask how he is going to apply that remedy if he has any? I do not know what the remedy will be. The head office of your trust will be in Chicago or New York, it will be outside of our jurisdiction and there is only one thing we can do, just one thing—we can put the duty back where it is now and start all over again to build up the local industries which we are threatening to destroy.

The whole tendency of this arrangement is to induce the farmer to adapt his raw product to the United States market. The whole tendency is to do away with the by-products which are so essential for intensive farming, the whole tendency is to break down the system of interrelated industries which makes the present prosperity of the province of Ontario and the other provinces. Under that system, Mr. Chairman, brought about by the policy which my hon. friends upon the Treasury Benches have pursued for the last 13 years, the great province of Ontario raised $250,000,000 worth of farm produce last year and nobody heard that there was no market for any of that produce.

Take the province of Quebec—my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture is going to follow me, I believe, and he of course knows infinitely more about farming in the province of Quebec that I do—but I am going to ask him to address himself to one question in connection with this agreement, because I have not been able to get any light on it in favour of the treaty, and if there is any light to be thrown on it I would like to get it. The province of Quebec has bright prospects before it at the present time. Our transportation system is growing so enormously; the city of Montreal is growing so enormously; the prospects of the pulp and paper industry are so good that unquestionably in the province of Quebec in a few years there will be an enormous home market—perhaps the largest home market of any province in the Dominion. The province of Quebec is not very well farmed at the present time—there is good farming in some parts of it, there is poor farming in a good portion of it, and moderate farming in other portions of it. The agricultural problem of the province of Quebec is to induce the farmer to keep his hay at home and to follow a system of intensive farming. That is the agricultural problem of the province of Quebec. Lately we had the Deputy Minister of the Department of Agriculture for Ontario at Quebec; he came there at my special request to deliver a carefully prepared address upon the subject of the improvement of agriculture in the province of Ontario, explaining at great length and with great care the magnificent system of agricultural education and improvement which has lately developed in the province of Ontario as the result of 20 or 25 years of laborious work, which is now approaching its period of fruition in that province and beginning to make its influence felt. We wanted it explained in the city of Quebec, and we had it explained and we are printing thousands of copies of Mr. James' address in the French language and circulating them in the province of Quebec for the purpose of getting the authorities of the province of Quebec to undertake an aggressive movement for the improvement of agriculture. What happens—comes along this treaty and puts a bonus on poor farming by inducing the farmers of the province of Quebec to ship their raw products to New England, and deplete the fertility of their soil.

Take the prairie provinces—I am perfectly aware of the fact that there are a great many people in the western provinces who think that this treaty will be a great thing for them. I have before seen premature conclusions arrived at in the course of 23 years in public life during which I have had an experience that not many members of the House have had because I have had the honour of representing to-day in this House the same people who elected me

first as a young man to the legislature of Manitoba, and in the legislature or in this parliament I have been their representative ever since. During that time I have seen a good many questions of this kind come up as to what was going to benefit the farmer and as to what would be in his interests, and I am not so sure, when this question comes to be discussed, that the farmer of the Northwest will be impervious to reason and common sense and good judgment when he gets the case put before him. It was first said: Well, but the farmer of the Northwest is going to get more for his wheat; the price of wheat south of the line in Dakota is higher than it is in Manitoba. That is true. It is a little higher; it always or nearly always rules a little higher, and they said: If the farmer can get into that market he will get more for his wheat. Now comes along Mr. Hill, the president of the Great Northern railway who is a great advocate of reciprocity and a very fine man and in a way a friend of my own, and he says: The duty does not make any difference; it is true the Dakota farmer gets a little more for his wheat but it is not on account of the duty, it is on account of the local circumstances. Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hill is either right or he is wrong; there are just two ways to look at it. If he is right and the duty does not make any difference, then the Manitoba farmer will not get any more for his wheat when the duty is taken off. That's clear. If he is wrong and the duty does make a difference what is going to happen? Why, what is going to happen is this: That so soon as the immense exportable surplus of the Canadian Northwest is let into the Dakota market then the Dakota man's wheat goes down to the export level, and the Dakota man gets less, but the Manitoba man does not get any more. There is no doubt about that; it has happened already. Here is the New York 'Evening Post' of February 16, and as everybody knows the New York 'Evening Post' is a most reliable paper, and this is what it says, speaking of wheat:

As matters stand now values are off over 24 cents from the season's top. The range on May wheat this season has been from $1.15 to 90⅞ cents, the highest price having been made November 4. With the adoption of the treaty there would be about 13,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat now in sight which would be available for moving into the United States provided it is needed. This, with the 43,000,000 bushels in the United States, visible supply would make 56,000,000 bushels available. Part of the Canadian wheat has already been hedged by sales of futures in the different markets and considering the drop of 12 cents in a month, it would seem as though any possible effect of the treaty on values had been largely discounted.

Of course nobody would suggest that it went down all of 12 cents by reason of the difference between the markets on the two sides, or by reason of the difference between the Dakota price and the export price, but every one knows that when the price of wheat gets a shock in that way it keeps on going down on account of the panic on the market.

There is, however, another factor to be considered in the shape of a surplus of 133,000,000 bushels in the United States that must be taken care of. This means that values must go to an export level at which a liberal disposition of the wheat can be made. With the adoption of the Canadian treaty it is expected that the prices will be kept on an export level most of the time.

There is no doubt about the position so far as the price of wheat is concerned. I say here that I deliberately give it as my opinion, representing a constituency of Manitoba farmers and having represented them for 23 years, that the Manitoba farmer will get less for his wheat in the long run as the result of this agreement.

Now, what have we been trying to do for years past in regard to this question of wheat? We have been trying to keep the wheat of the Manitoba farmer pure. We had an Inspection Act—upstairs in the House of Commons here we laboured for weeks, yes for months to get that Inspection Act into good order so that the wheat might be properly inspected and properly graded with the object that it should be kept pure and placed upon the English market in a pure condition. And why? Because we know that if the Canadian wheat is put upon the English market in a pure condition it will bring on an average of from three to four cents per bushel on the higher grades, more than any other wheat in the world. A few years ago we revised the Inspection Act, and the result was that our wheat was put upon the market pure for a year or two, but somebody found out how to get around the Act, and the grades began to go off, and the grades have been off for several years past, and the farmers have been complaining and properly complaining in regard to the condition of things in the terminal elevators. These terminal elevators have been in the hands, to some extent, of men who are themselves buying and selling grain and handling millions of bushels of other people's grain, while they were buying and selling their own. What happened—grain mixed, grades have gone down, and the farmers have lost and lost very heavily, and they have a just and proper right to complain. Now, the government has introduced in the Senate a Bill to appoint a commission for the purpose of taking charge of that wheat, and I believe the government policy is good. And if the commission takes charge of this business as they ought to there is no reason why they should not keep control of that wheat. And, Sir, they

can only solve the trouble by taking control of the elevators first, not owning them, but controlling and inspecting them properly and keeping control of the wheat right through until it gets to Liverpool. There is no other way. It is not difficult; it is not half as difficult as it looks; it can be done by a competent commission of men without any trouble at all. And in addition to that, if that is done the commission in the working out of the system by which they can do that, can give a very substantial preference to the Canadian routes so that we will get advantages in that way as well, and they can give advantages to the Canadian routes without it costing any more to get the wheat to Liverpool. Here is the position in which we are. If we keep control of that wheat and that market, we shall be able to get for the western farmer, by a proper system of handling, a better price than he will get in any other possible way. More than that, with the increase in the volume of business from the Canadian Northwest, our railroads will in a short time be in such a position that we can reasonably ask to have the rates substantially reduced on export grain; so that instead of the Canadian farmers getting a bonus of three cents a bushel for sending their wheat by the eastern Canadian channels, as was tentatively suggested by the hon. member for St. Anne if the inspection and transportation matters are properly handled by the commission which is to be appointed by the government, and the question of the freight rate is dealt with, we will secure for them within a reasonable time, not three cents a bushel, but six or seven cents a bushel more than they can get in any other possible way. But if that is to be done, you must keep the control of the trade in your own hands, otherwise you can do nothing.

Now, what is to happen? I wonder if my hon. friends of the government have thought of that, in connection with this treaty. The Grain Exchange has met in Winnipeg and has passed a resolution to the effect that the Inspection Act must be changed. What must be done under this treaty? We must change the Inspection Act, and we must make the grades the same as the American grades; that is, we must permit of mixing; and to all intents and purposes, we must hand the control of our grain market over to Minneapolis. That is the position. To get a better price? No.

Then there is the question of cattle and that is one question in respect of which there is no doubt that the western farmer will get a benefit under this agreement, for the present at least. There is no doubt that the market for the second grade of cattle in the prairie provinces, is a poor market at the present time—why? Because it is a new country. It is only a short time since the country was sufficiently settled to have a sufficient production to organize this business. In fact, we have hardly got to that point yet. The result is, that there is at the present time a very poor market for cattle in the western provinces. But that is no reason for throwing the country away, or for considering that we can never have a market. That is a reason for taking up the subject and dealing with it in an intelligent way. The farmers' delegation, which came here recently, said to the government:

> We wish also to draw attention to the danger we are in while we leave the opportunity open for the United States meat interest to capture and control the export trade from our country.

What are they going to do now? They will capture and control all the cattle of the Northwest—the very last hoof will be controlled from Chicago. What I say is, that we should establish a chilled meat industry. It has been done in Australia and New Zealand. Dr. Rutherford has reported in favour of it. There would be no great difficulty in the government doing this, and it would be worth while taking the trouble when you have a country like the Northwest of Canada. We could afford to hire ten men at $10,000 a month rather than lose this business. The members of this House know that I am an enthusiastic friend of the Northwest. The best years of my life were given to the settlement of that country, and I cannot tell you how I feel about that great country being made a backyard to the city of Chicago. I have differed with my friends in my own constituency, and I do not know, but that there are many men who have supported me for years, who differ with me on this subject; but I take the liberty of thinking that I know as much or more about it than they. I have studied these questions all my life with the object of learning the way in which the affairs of that country should be organized so as to be of some benefit to themselves and the rest of the country, and I say that we should organize that country in a business way. If we do, we shall have duplicates of the stock yards of Kansas City, Omaha and Chicago in our own Northwest.

What is the general effect of this treaty? The general effect is, that we put the Dominion of Canada on an absolutely free trade basis, so far as farm products are concerned. The farmers of Canada are on a free trade basis for what they sell and on a protective basis for what they buy—protection for the purchaser, free trade for the seller. Do you think they are likely to stand that for any length of time? I do not. I tell you, that if you have had delegations from the Northwest, you will have them again if this

treaty goes through. After it has been in force for a few years, I venture to say that there will not be any question of the duty on agricultural implements or on any other manufactured goods, for we shall be compelled to take all those duties off, and have practically commercial union with the United States. As men of common sense, let us apply to this question the same business rules that we apply to any other business matter. We open our market to the world. Read the list of favoured nations along with the United States, and if there is in that list of countries of production anybody who can raise any one of the commodities in this list, cheaper than it is in the Canadian market, a commodity unsaleable and unmarketable, it can be shipped and dumped into the Dominion of Canada. I cannot conceive of what our friends in the government were thinking of. I leave this question of markets and prices, and record my conviction, that if ever a government made a monumental mistake, if ever a government got in wrong on a subject from first to last, my hon. friends have got in wrong on this subject. The House may think that I am very much in earnest about it. Sir, I would not break away from the political party with which I have acted for 23 years, practically all my life, if I were not in earnest about it.

What is the commonest phrase in the mouths of the people of Canada ? We hear it in the speeches of public men, we read it in the editorials of newspapers; we even see it in the compositions of our school boys—what is it ? Binding the scattered provinces of Canada together. I would like to know if this treaty is intended to bind the scattered provinces of Canada together. It binds, but it binds the other way; it binds British Columbia to Oregon and to Washington and to California; it binds the provinces of the Northwest to the states immediately to the south of them; it binds Ontario and Quebec to the states south of us; and it binds the maritime provinces to the states of New England. And we are expected to believe that a policy of that kind is a broad national policy, one to promote a broad and strong nationality. What have been the main features of our transportation policy ? We have spent scores of millions of dollars for what purpose ? What has been in our mouths at all times, Liberals and Conservatives alike, on every platform? Send our goods through Canadian channels, from one province to another, and from the eastern provinces across the sea. What did Sir John A. Macdonald mean when he nailed his colours to the mast and said that the Canadian Pacific railway must be built around the north shore of Lake Superior, and appealed to the people of Canada on that policy and got their support ? My right hon. friend the leader of the present government later came before this House and said: We shall build another line of railway from ocean to ocean, every foot of it on Canadian soil, and he appealed to the people of this country for their support, and they supported him in doing it. They said: Yes, we believe in that policy. Why should we turn from that policy now?

If it does not make any difference which way the traffic goes, why spend $50,000 or $60,000, or $133,000 per mile to build a railway from Quebec through to Moncton and duplicate the Intercolonial, which we had before? Why do that, if it does not make any difference whether or not the traffic goes over Canadian soil? For my part, I can see no reason. What is the reason for the right hon. gentleman's change of view? I could take the 'Hansard' and read to you the strong words of the right hon. gentleman when he said, in this House, that of all things in connection with the policy of Canada as related to the United States, the one thing we must do is to be independent of the Americans. That is a policy, Sir, which I believe in. He never said a word in the whole course of my close association with him with which I agreed more fully than I did with that statement, but the difference is that I believed it then and I believe it now, and so long as I have the honour to have anything to say about the public affairs of Canada in the most humble capacity I shall continue to support what I believe to be the loyal policy that the people of Canada desire to have followed. We know why it is that the other policy is being supported. We know why the milling trust of St. Paul and Minneapolis are in favour of this proposal; it is because they want to get the hard wheat of the Canadian northwest without paying duty and drive our millers out of the export market. That is just as easy as adding two and two together. The northwest miller of the United States gets $2 or $3 a ton more for his offal than the miller in Canada, and that makes the difference; the Canadian miller has no chance in the world in the competition which is brought about in this way. The northwest miller of the United States would get the wheat free now if he could. The meat trust would get meat free if they could. We have often been told that they might take the duty off if they wanted to, but they cannot take the duty off, because they have a population of farmers who do not propose to permit these gentlemen to manipulate the duties to suit themselves. But we understand why the milling people would want this arrangement in regard to transportation, why the meat trust would want it and why the United States Steel Corporation want to get into our markets. We can understand why the Chamber of Commerce in New York, always in favour of reciprocity, should

favour this arrangement, because in this last year they have been conducting an inquiry to ascertain why Montreal has been growing so rapidly and becoming a rival of theirs in connection with the export trade. We know why it is that the New England States, looking jealously upon the commercial development of our St. Lawrence route, should support this treaty to get the great trade which is building up Montreal and the St. Lawrence route down by their own channels. But can anybody in the world tell me why a Canadian, devoted to the interests of Canada should support the arrangement which we have here?

What will be our future relations with the United States? I read the argument presented by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) upon that aspect of the case. I see no possible answer to it. It seems to be perfectly clear to me that every day in which we adapt ourselves to the markets of the United States, that every day in which we cater to those markets, that every day in which we adapt all our arrangements to catering to those markets strengthens the grip of the United States upon Canada. And while everybody, of course, repudiates as absurd the idea of any conscious interference either with our political independence, or with our commercial independence, I do not believe that if this treaty goes into effect there will ever again, so long as it goes on, unless a rupture takes place, be a revision of our tariff in which United States interests, United States lobbyists, and United States pressure will not be brought to bear on this parliament. What is the only possible effect? The only possible effect is domination of the smaller by the larger, and if you say you do not think there is any danger of any domination I say that I think the domination has come now, that we have it in the discussion of this treaty. How did it get here, what brought it about? For 30 years the United States had nothing to say to us, and then, when we have finally, definitely won our commercial independence and put ourselves into such a position that we were perfectly independent, what happened? They shook a club over our heads, they threatened a surtax. It was threatened a year ago. Then our friends of the government were asked to make concessions in order that this surtax might be avoided. The government made some concessions. I think they were very trifling in character; I do not think they were of much importance, but I do think it would have been as well if the government had stood its ground at the start. Nevertheless, we all know that in international matters it is necessary to leave a great deal to the government. You cannot know everything that passes, and you must leave a great deal to the discretion of the government in international matters. But I am prepared to say now that I think we all made a mistake. I think the time to have stood our ground was the first time the club was flourished. What has been the history of our relations with the United States? For the last 30 or 40 years we have been ignored and buffeted by them, and during all that time we have taken our way secure, firm, serene under the strong arm of the British Empire. Now we come to the point when we are of some use; we are just beginning to be of some use. Up to nearly the present time we have been more or less of a nuisance to the empire; now we are beginning to get to the point when we add something to the prestige of the British Empire, to the point when, if necessary, we can send some men, or some ships, or some money; we can be of some use to the empire that has given us our liberties and all the traditions of our citizenship. When we get to that point what happens? The United States beckons from Washington and we are asked, the first time anybody beckons, to turn from the path that leads to the capital of the empire, and to turn towards the path that leads to Washington. I say, so far as I am concerned: Not for me.

What is the reason, I ask you gentlemen of this committee, representatives of the Canadian people, trustees of the Canadian people, of their highest and their best rights and liberties, I ask you what is the reason that is being put forward by the representatives of the people of the United States for proffering to us the terms which they are giving. There is the representative, Mr. Clark, of the Democratic party. I decline to discuss for a second the suggestion that he was not speaking seriously. If it had not been for Mr. Clark and the Democratic party this treaty never would have got through the House of Representatives; it was he who put it through; let him speak for himself. He says that he and his party are in favour of this proposal because it leads to annexation. What did Mr. Taft, the leader of the Republican party, say? The Dominion of Canada is a strong country; it has a great storehouse of natural resources. He says it has been pursuing a strong and successful policy of development, but it has got to the parting of the ways. He says: Now, before the Dominion of Canada is irrevocably fixed in the policy which leads to the consolidation and the strengthening of the British Empire, we must turn her from her course. Is there any dispute about it? It cannot be disputed. I say to my hon. friends of the Liberal party, as well as to my hon. friends of the Conservative party: Stop and think; you are all grown men, you are all men of wisdom and discretion. Is it a safe thing for the representatives of seven and a half

millions to say to the representatives of ninety millions of people: You may say what you like; we will take your terms, but we will not take the price? Sir, for my part, I say that I do not think such a course is wise, and I do not think it is possible. I say that if we accept the terms we shall assuredly be called upon to pay the price.

Sir, I oppose these resolutions, because, in my judgment, they reverse the great and successful policy under which the people of Canada, fighting against poverty, against natural obstacles, against geographical conditions, have made of their country one of the most enviable in the world. These resolutions, in my judgment, spell retrogression, commercial subordination, the destruction of our national ideals and displacement from our proud position as the rising hope of the British Empire.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Mr. Chairman, I venture, before undertaking to present some facts and observations in regard to this reciprocity arrangement to say a few words of introduction in reply to my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton). Let me at once accord to him my meed of praise for the manner in which he has presented his views to the House. It is only what we might expect from his experience, his ability and his position. I value political allegiance and party feeling as much as he does. I appreciate the fact that party feeling must not be allowed to carry one down to the point where, on important questions, one differs with one's party ; and I say frankly to him that if he differs with the government on this question, it was not only his right but his duty to come before the House and the country and declare that difference. Sir, I am not myself in the same position, because I believe that, in this arrangement with the United States, the government of the day have continued and carried on that wise and careful administration of the tariff of Canada which has characterized their work since their first tariff legislation in 1897. But did I agree with my hon. friend from Brandon, I would leave the government of which I am a member—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FISHER. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh. I suppose they cannot conceive that a man would do such a thing. They have just been cheering the hon. member from Brandon for having left his party and joined them. Because I do not choose to leave my party on this question and join them, they jeer at me. But I venture to say that if I had followed the hon. member for Brandon, they would cheer me as they have cheered him.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). You promised to, on the temperance question.

Mr. FISHER. I never found anybody on the other side of the House to follow on the temperance question. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt of the importance of this question. There is no doubt that a change in the tariff, embracing a considerable number of items as this does, is a matter of importance, of sufficient importance for anybody to change his party allegiance upon it. But one or two things that my hon. friend said, I would like to refer to at once. Very early in his remarks, he said that there was no general demand in Canada for reciprocity in the last forty years. I venture to take direct issue with him on that point. He acknowledged that the Liberal party had been in favour of reciprocity for many of those years. But he implied, though he did not say it, that the Liberal party, in that respect was alone in the country. But I am within the judgment of the House and the country when I say—and before I sit down I propose to prove—that the Conservative party of Canada has always been in favour of reciprocity with the United States. Therefore, when my hon. friend from Brandon says the Liberal party have been in favour of reciprocity, and I can prove that the Conservative party have been in favour of it, it is idle for him to say that Canada has not been in favour of it.

My hon. friend speaks about comparative prices. I propose, in a few minutes, to give comparative prices in Canada and in the United States of things which are affected by this arrangement. But I am going at once to express my difference with him in his statement that the government of the day were not informed upon this question, and had not taken the utmost pains to inform themselves in regard to every detail of this arrangement. In the first place, this arrangement was in the hands of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) of Canada. It is well known that on two occasions especially, the government of Canada, through a committee of its members, held an exhaustive and careful examination into the tariff affairs of the country. Before the tariff of 1897 was brought down to the House, the government adopted the policy, which had never been adopted by our opponents, of taking the people into counsel, of going through the length and breadth of the country and affording every class and every interest an opportunity to come before them and give their opinions upon the question at issue. In 1905, before the last revision of the tariff took place, the same thing was done. I venture to say that in no way could men obtain a more complete grasp of the tariff conditions and tariff interests of Canada than by such means. And the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs took a leading part in both those investi-

gations. In addition to that, year by year —I might say week by week—the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs receive representations, by delegation and otherwise, of industries which are interested in the tariff. That is a privilege which nobody else to the same extent can possibly enjoy, an advantage which they only possess; and it is infinitely superior to any information which can possibly be obtained by any other men in the Dominion, I care not who they may be. It is true—my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) has spoken of it—that certain manufacturing interests may know their own business and may come before the ministers and deal with those particular interests. It is true that the transportation companies know their own particular business as well as the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Customs. But not one of these people can know the whole interests of the country in anything like the degree that these are known by the ministers who have charge of these interests on behalf of the government and the country. There is this difference between responsible ministers of the Crown and these people who come here and make representations to them ; the latter come, as is the fashion of business men, looking at the subject from their own particular standpoint ; whereas responsible ministers of the Crown have to look at these things from all sides, and make comparisons and institute investigations as to what may be the incidence of each change in the tariff, not only upon a particular item but upon all the items, and all the interests of the country. That is the position of the gentlemen who negotiated this arrangement at Washington, a position which is not only absolutely defensible, but which is altogether unassailable.

The hon. member spoke about a reciprocity policy as having been abandoned by the government for many years back. That is very easily explained. My right hon. friend the leader of the government, after negotiations in Washington in 1898-9, came back having failed to obtain that reciprocity from the American government and people which we had hoped for, and my right hon. friend said, wisely, I think, there will be no more pilgrimages to Washington. I think it may be said that the whole Canadian people were at his back in that stand. But that did not mean that the people of Canada would not be ready to accept overtures from Washington. My hon. friend from Brandon was a member of the government and one of the leaders of the Liberal party, when that government declared through its head that there would be no more pilgrimages to Washington, that Washington would have to come to Ottawa. It did not mean, if Washington came to Ottawa in a reasonable and friendly spirit that Ottawa would reject the offered hand, that Ottawa would not be glad to enter into an arrangement that would promote friendly sentiments and greater commercial intercourse between us and our great neighbours to the south. Sir, what has led up to this? My hon. friend seemed to say that we were entirely to blame for the initiation of this question. Nothing is further from the case. What was the condition of affairs last session between Canada and the United States? There was no question then of reciprocity. But we had this condition of affairs, that the Payne-Aldrich tariff of the United States contained an article which empowered the president, nay, which commanded the president, in case other countries has legislation discriminating against the United States, to proclaim against those countries a maximum tariff, a tariff which meant absolute non-intercourse, in the case of Canada. Now I would like to ask my hon. friends opposite, I would like to ask my hon. friend from Brandon, whether they think that this government, responsible to the people of Canada, would have been justified in allowing that non-intercourse to come into effect if it could be avoided, that they would have been justified in casting back into the teeth of the executive of the United States, the greatest commercial nation in the world, the invitation which was made to us to come to some arrangement which would avoid the necessity of proclaiming non-intercourse? Surely neither the leader of the opposition nor the member for Brandon would dare to take that position. I think they have not studied the effects that were sure to follow from such a course upon the prosperity and progress commercially of the people of Canada.

In this connection I may refer to another incident in our history, an incident which occurred some years ago at a time when the Conservative party ruled this country, and when a threat of non-intercourse was held over our heads then as there was last year. What was the action of the Conservative government on that occasion? Did they lightly defy the threat of non-intercourse? Did they say to the people of the United States: We do not care what you do? I allude to the condition of affairs in 1888 when, by reason of the seizures of American fishing vessels on our Atlantic coast a non-intercourse Act having been passed by Congress, the government of Sir John A. Macdonald did not wait for overtures from the United States, but they appealed to the executive of that country to enter into negotiations which would obviate the imposition of a non-intercourse edict. What was that non-intercourse edict? I have it here. After covering a large number of

points in regard to the fisheries, the edict went on to this effect:

And also to deny the entry into any port or place of the United States of fresh fish or salt fish or any other product of the said Dominions or other countries coming from the said Dominions to the United States.

It was absolute prohibition. Now what was the conduct of the then Conservative government? I remember it well, I was in the House at that time, my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was here also, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was sitting on the government side of the House, as were also the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), and the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I remember well when Sir Charles Tupper, then Finance Minister, came back from Washington, and in his speech which I have under my hand, advised the House of Commons to accept what is known as the Chamberlain-Bayard Treaty in regard to the fisheries. They did not ignore the situation, they did not defy the Americans on the contrary they sought to reach a treaty between Canada and her great neighbour. Let me say a word or two about that. Sir Charles Tupper was joined in Washington by Mr. Chamberlain in the negotiation of the treaty. They had some difficulties, and as Sir Charles Tupper said, they had to make concessions, and they did make concessions. We have today in existence one of the concessions which they made, it is what is called the modus vivendi.

That was made not as a part of the treaty, but as an adjunct to it; so that, if by chance the treaty itself did not go into effect, the modus vivendi would continue for the purpose of removing friction between the two nations and of preventing a recurrence of the situation with regard to the fisheries. Sir Charles Tupper went to Washington and this is what he says about the condition of affairs:

After the statement of the President of the United States in his message of 1885, asking for a commission, after the letters which passed between Mr. Bayard and myself, you will readily understand that I went there expecting and looking forward to a settlement of this question on very much the same lines as those upon which it had been settled in 1854, and to some extent, in 1871.

You see that Sir Charles Tupper declares his intention of securing a fisheries and reciprocity treaty on the lines of the treaty of 1854.

I am right in saying that the instructions with which I was charged by this government were to obtain, if it was possible, as near an approach to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 as I could obtain, that is, the policy of carrying out free exchange in the natural products of the two countries.

And yet my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton), a few minutes ago, said that Canada was not in favour, and had not been in favour of reciprocity. Here is the evidence of Sir Charles Tupper, that in 1888 he went to Washington for the purpose of getting reciprocity.

I was to urge that policy, and I think you will have no doubt as to the course pursued by me after reading the proposition that I made in the conference on the 3rd December, 1887:

Sir Charles Tupper begged leave to submit a note containing the following proposal from the British plenipotentiaries. That with a view of removing all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington, in consideration of mutual arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Newfoundland.

I have proven up to the hilt that the condition of affairs in 1888 was just about what it was last winter, with the exception that in 1888 Canada went to Washington, whereas, last winter, Washington came to Canada. Sir Charles Tupper says again:

He turned our attention to the means by which it could be averted——

That is non-intercourse.

—and those were the removal of the causes of irritation between the United States and Canada (for it was Canada rather than Great Britain that was referred to) and by removing those causes of irritation, and giving free scope to this policy to which they were committed, we believed that it would at a very early day give us everything that we could desire in the way of greater freedom of commercial intercourse.

Now, Sir, I said a few minutes ago that last winter we were face to face with a situation involving the possibility, in fact, almost the certainty of non-intercourse by reason of the maximum tariff of the Payne-Aldrich Bill being imposed upon Canada, if we did not give some excuse to the President for not proclaiming Canada as a country liable to have that part of the Bill applied to it. What was the condition in 1888? I have described it to you; it was practically the same. What did Sir Charles Tupper say when he came back and recommended the adoption of his treaty to this parliament of Canada? I do not think that I could as eloquently myself, describe what the results were——

Mr. HUGHES. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton says 'hear, hear.' I am glad to agree with him. I sat for many years in this House with Sir Charles Tupper, and I recognized him as one of the

greatest statesmen of Canada at that time, a man who took a statesmanlike view of public affairs, a man with a great gift of expression, a man who could express himself clearly, and I take no shame to myself in acknowledging that I cannot express what I desire to place before the House, as well as Sir Charles Tupper has expressed it in the words which I am about to read. These words, I hope, will carry conviction to my hon. friend from Haliburton (Mr. Hughes), and other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who, perhaps would not be convinced by any words which I might utter:

I have told you what position Canada stood in with regard to the United States of America before the initiation of these proceedings. I have told you that we stood face to face with an enactment which had been put on the statute-book by a unanimous vote of Congress, ratified by the President, providing for non-intercourse between the United States and Canada. I need not tell you that that Bill meant commercial war, that it meant not only the ordinary suspension of friendly feeling and intercourse between two countries, but that it involved much more than that. If that Bill had been brought into operation by the proclamation of the President of the United States, I have no hesitation in saying that we stood in the relation to that great country of commercial war, and the line is very narrow which separates a commercial war between two countries from an actual war. Speaking a year ago, I pointed out in my remarks, with a view to prevent the possibility of such an Act going into force, all the advantages that in our present position we could avail ourselves of to protect ourselves against such an unfriendly act on the part of the United States. I said then that it would be a mad Act. I say so now. No man who knows anything of the intimate commercial relations which exist between Canada and the United States could contemplate such an Act going into operation without feeling that it would tear up from the foundation those intimate social and commercial relations which exist between these two countries, which, in friendly commercial rivalry, are making rapid progress which has attracted the attention of the civilized world. It would produce a condition of things the end of which no man could foresee. If that Act had been adopted, we had no means of looking to any increased commercial intercourse between that great country and the Dominion of Canada. Under those circumstances, it behooved the government of Canada to adopt any means in its power to avert such a disaster, which, great as it would have been to Canada, would have been still greater to the United States. But it would be a very poor compensation for the injury which we would sustain, to know that we had a companion in misfortune suffering more than we suffered ourselves.

Those words, with some slight change, according to the circumstances and conditions, might be applied absolutely to the state of affairs last winter as between the United States and Canada. I venture to think that if the Liberal-Conservative party to-day do not appreciate and understand those words and are not imbued and impressed by them, they have fallen far below the statesmen of the older generation, who led the great Conservative party of that time, and who, I grant fully and freely to-day, did good things and did great things for Canada, according to their lights and according to their policy. At the time that Sir Charles Tupper used those words, he was standing at the right hand of Sir John Macdonald—Sir John Macdonald, the great flag-waving First Minister of Canada, the man who, all through his career, said that he was a British subject born and that he would die a British subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, hon. gentlemen say 'Hear, hear.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER. Yet, at the time when Sir Charles Tupper said that and when Sir John Macdonald himself, was waving that flag, both of them were trying to get from the United States just exactly the arrangement that we have got to-day. They were trying to get it by going on their knees to Washington, while we have Washington coming to us. They failed and we have succeeded. Probably that is one of the great causes of complaint. These hon. gentlemen opposite, are envious of our success and of the prosperity which it will bring to the country.

I have not finished yet with some words from Sir Charles Tupper. He didn't get his treaty but he did accomplish a friendly act with the administration at Washington, and this is what he said:

That was the condition of things when I went down last Easter to see Mr. Bayard at Washington. If you compare the condition of things to-day with the condition of things that existed then, there is no man, I care not how partisan he may be, how unfriendly to this government he may be, who can judicially look at the position of this question then and now, without coming to the conclusion that we have emerged from midnight darkness into the light of day under the auspices of this treaty.

And that though they did not get a treaty. In regard to what was meant by that treaty, he says:

We have made concessions, as I have said, but we have made them with the avowed object of placing all our people, not only the fishermen, but the agriculturist, the lumberman, every man in this country in a better relation with the United States than he was before.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) referred to me as having

been present in the House when Sir Charles Tupper made these remarks. I would like to ask him if he did not oppose Sir Charles Tupper at that time?

Mr. FISHER. Not upon that point. On that point the Liberal party in this House supported the then government. There were details of the treaty that we did criticise.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). My hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) was here then?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I certainly understood that you opposed Sir Charles Tupper then.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend understands lots of things that are not so. My hon. friend is mistaken if he thinks that the Liberal party at that date in any way opposed such a reciprocal arrangement or the desire for reciprocity with the United States which was then professed by Sir John Macdonald and his government. At that time, Mr. Mills was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, the Democrats being in power. Almost before the ink was dry on that treaty, Mr. Mills proposed in the House of Representatives at Washington, and it was carried, a reduction of duties upon articles coming from Canada, and which reduction made a difference of something like $1,800,000 on the duties collected on the volume of these articles then imported from Canada. Sir Charles Tupper glories in that and he says:

> The ink is barely dry upon this treaty before he, as the representative of the government and Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, brings forward a measure to do what? Why, to make free articles that Canada sends into the United States, and upon which last year $1,800,000 of duty was paid.

Later on:

> I do not intend to insult both the great political parties of this country who have since 1854 and long before maintained that the interests of Canada—the interests of British North America—were intimately bound up in obtaining free intercourse with the United States for our natural products—I do not intend to insult the two great political parties in this country by telling them that they were fools, that they did not know what they were doing. Down to the present hour we have adopted the policy on both sides of the House, and we have pledged ourselves to the people to do everything that lay in our power to obtain a free market for the natural products of our country with the United States, and I say you must answer me the question as to whether that was an act of supreme folly or whether it was wise statesmanship on the part of both parties in this country to adopt that policy.

I might ask the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) if he still thinks it is an act of supreme folly to obtain free entry for Canadian natural products into the greatest consuming market in the world.

Mr. GOODEVE. That was thirty years ago.

Mr. FISHER. What I am speaking about is as to the consistent policy of Canada in this respect. My hon. friend from Brandon said it was not reciprocity, and my hon. friend opposite said it was not reciprocity, but I will come in a few minutes to another proof that if in 1888 this was their policy, later on they still had the same policy and kept it up.

Mr. GOODEVE. No.

Mr. FISHER. Does my hon. friend say no?

Mr. GOODEVE. Give us any proof after 1891.

Mr. FISHER. I will give some proof in 1891.

Mr. GOODEVE. I said after 1891.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad my hon. friend has asked that because it gives me an opportunity of telling him a little something about 1891 that perhaps he does'nt know. I am afraid there are many young Conservative members a little fresh in this House, who to-day forget the traditions and the policy of their own party. They have come upon evil times in the last ten years for the Conservative party.

Mr. LENNOX. Evil government.

Mr. FISHER. I said evil times for their party; but not evil times for the country.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister allow me?

Mr. FISHER. Let me finish—hon. gentlemen opposite all through this debate have been saying that the country is very prosperous. and that we don't want reciprocity, and that there is no need of it, and that being so it must be a good time for the country but it obviously is an evil time for the Conservative party.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not say there were evil times for the country; I said there was an evil government for the country.

Mr. FISHER. Well, we will see about that in a moment or two. I have been invited to give a little later history of the Conservative party and I shall do so now. During this debate my hon. friends opposite have frequently said: Let well enough alone.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER. 'Hear, hear,' says the hon. gentleman opposite, but I have a word to say in regard to that. Was it well enough to have an edict of non-intercourse with the great nation to the south hanging over our heads? Was it well enough to possibly have a maximum tariff face us which would have shut out all the products of Canada from the markets of the United States? I say again, Sir, we were in a situation identical with that which Sir Charles Tupper described, and we took the same course as he did, with the one difference that he went to Washington, whereas Washington came to us. Sir, it is easy enough for people who are not responsible for the affairs of the country to say that they would lightly and recklessly reject the hand of fellowship and friendship from a great nation of nearly a hundred millions of people whose lands border ours for 4,000 miles and who, notwithstanding high tariffs on both sides of the line, constitute with us the greatest intertrading people on the whole earth. It is all very well for those not responsible for the government of the country to declare that the Canadian government should have said to the representatives of this great nation: We will have none of you; go back to Washington; we refuse your overtures; we reject you lock, stock, and barrel. It is easy enough for irresponsible men who have not the destinies of the country on their shoulders to advise in that way, but I venture to say that had the Conservatives been in power to-day they would have tried to follow in the footsteps of their great former leaders, Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper. It was said by somebody in the course of debate the other day: we cannot stand still, we have either to go forward or backward. And, Sir, when we had the offer, was it not infinitely the better and more sensible and more reasonable course to grasp the hand of fellowship than to reject it. Now, an hon. gentleman opposite asked me what was the condition of affairs in 1891, with respect to the policy of reciprocity. When the Postmaster General was speaking the other day he said that in 1891 the government of Sir John Macdonald went to the country to get a mandate from the people on the question of reciprocity, and my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) interrupted: We needed it then; we don't need it now.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER. 'Hear, hear,' says my hon. friend, and he endorses the sentiment that we needed it then and do not need it now. What is the meaning of that? It means that at that time, when Canada was in a depression and comparatively weak and struggling, and when the bonds of empire, which hon. gentlemen opposite are so fond of talking about, were not so strong as they are to-day——

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Much stronger.

Mr. FISHER. That is not the universal opinion of the country; that is not the evidence of the press or in accordance with the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite and everybody else in Canada. But the hon. member for East Grey says that at that time they needed this kind of reciprocity. They were willing then to risk the rupture of the empire; they were willing then to risk annexation and the diversion of trade from the mother country to the Union to the south of us. At a time when Canada was not so strong or so able to resist any blandishments from the United States, or so able to stand on her own feet, or to assert and maintain her own position, the hon. member for East Grey thought it would have been all right then, when a Conservative government was doing it; but he thinks it is all wrong now, and leads to annexation and everything that is bad, because a Liberal government is doing it. Now, I have looked up with a good deal of interest what the platform was on which the Conservative party at that time went to the country. It is said by hon. gentlemen opposite that the Liberal party went to the country on the question of unrestricted reciprocity. So we did, and why? Because in the first place, we had full confidence in our own country, and did not believe that would lead to annexation; in the second place, the country was in a desperate plight, and we thought it required a desperate remedy. Our hon. friends opposite wanted, not an unrestricted reciprocity, but a restricted reciprocity, a reciprocity in natural products and as little else as they could get. Do hon. gentlemen opposite deny that? Do they contend that the Conservative government did not in 1891 go to the country on the question of reciprocity and ask for a mandate? I will prove to them what I have said. I have before me the address to his electors, written at that time by the then Minister of Finance, now the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and in that address he went on in this fashion:

> In its trade policy with the United States, the government have always favoured a fair and just measure of reciprocity, and has made repeated propositions looking in that direction. Until lately, however, the United States have made no favourable response.
>
> Now, however, in the course of diplomatic correspondence, the government of that country, through its Secretary of State, has intimated its willingness to enter into a conference upon this matter with the Dominion government, and has declared its readiness to commence this conference after March 4.
>
> The trade issue is the great issue in this

contest, and it is of the utmost importance that each elector should have a clear idea of the points of difference between the two parties.

The President said that after the 4th of March, he would be ready to begin his negotiations; and what happened? The elections took place on the 5th of March, when Sir John Macdonald went to the country with the avowed object of getting a mandate to continue the negotiations. Mr. Foster in his address, goes on to denounce the unrestricted reciprocity proposals of the opposition, and then he explains the policy of the government in five items. This is the first item:

To continue to develop home industries, and the agricultural, mineral and other resources of the country on the lines laid down since 1878.

We have been encouraging and looking after some home industries, and the agricultural, mineral and other resources of the country, not on the lines laid down in 1878, but on far better lines—on lines which were indicated in our tariff of 1897, on lines which received the endorsement of my hon. friend from Brandon this afternoon, on lines which we are continuing in the present arrangement, on lines which embodied, first of all, a considerable reduction in the tariff, largely on those materials which are needed by the labouring and agricultural classes, on lines which reduced the duties on raw materials to enable our industries to flourish, and on lines which introduced a British preference for our mother land in the markets of Canada. We substituted a better policy for the policy laid down by our hon. friends opposite in 1878, and I would point to the results as indicated in the different conditions of Canada to-day under our improved policy as contrasted with the condition of Canada in 1896, when the National Policy was done away with. I can speak by results; I need not go into details. Hon. gentlemen opposite and their press and everybody in the country, who is opposed to this reciprocity arrangement with the United States, are the best witnesses of the results of our policy. The industries of Canada to-day are flourishing; but they have only been prosperous since we changed the policy of 1878 and introduced our improved policy of 1897. I say, therefore, as far as that item of Mr. Foster's election address is concerned, we have not exactly followed, but we have improved upon, what they did. The second item he mentioned, was:

To keep in our own hands the power of framing our own tariff according to our own necessities.

Does not this arrangement with the United States do that? In what way does it hamper us? Hon. gentlemen opposite, before the arrangement was made, talked about a treaty and objected to a treaty. I remember my hon. friend from North Toronto, in the early days of the session, dilating at considerable length on the danger of tying ourselves down to a treaty. That was the burden of their song; but when they found that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, had arranged what is not a treaty, but an arrangement, under which we retain absolutely in our own hands the power of framing our own tariff, according to our own necessities, they threaten us with the danger that it is not permanent, and that it may be changed at any minute by the United States. It may be changed at any minute by us too. We have just the same power to modify it that the United States have, and the same power to abrogate it. We retain by it absolutely in our own hands, the framing of our own tariff.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FISHER. Hon. gentlemen say no I know that they are appealing to that bogey, to that prejudice, but there is absolutely no foundation in fact for their appeals on that point as there is no foundation for most of their appeals on this question.

Sir, what is the third?

Not to discriminate against Great Britain—our mother land and the great market for our products.

Sir, I read that with a great deal of gusto. I am very much pleased, indeed, to find that at that time that was the policy of that party, but I cannot help remembering that in 1897 when we brought down our tariff of preference the gentlemen on the other side of the House, headed by Sir Charles Tupper, then their leader, followed by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) then and for a while afterwards, until that county and that province rejected him, member for Kings, N.B., threw the burden of reproach on us, saying that we had given a preference to the mother land without demanding a quid pro quo, without bargaining, without forcing our mother land to do something which she did not want to do as the price of getting our preference in our market. Sir, we gave the preference without price, we gave the preference without bargaining.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). To every country in the world as well as to Great Britain.

Mr. FISHER. To Great Britain and other countries as we chose.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). You could not help it.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend talks about the German and Belgian treaties, He has forgotten that although for a moment the arrangement gave the benefits of the prefer-

ence to Germany and Belgium we were influential enough in the councils of the empire to denounce the German and Belgian treaties, and we gave the preference to Great Britain alone or to such other countries as we chose to give it. We have chosen to give it to British countries.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The Argentine Republic.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend does not know what he is talking about, the British preference does not go to the Argentine Republic.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It goes to some twelve countries.

Mr. FISHER. No, it does not.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Yes, it does.

Mr. FISHER. The British preference goes nowhere except where we tell it to go, in British countries.

I go on to the next item in Mr. Foster's appeal:

To raise our revenue by indirect taxation, on customs and excise and not by direct taxation.

That was brought in because they thought that with unrestricted reciprocity they would be obliged to have direct taxation. We have never proposed to have direct taxation and do not propose to do so to-day. The fifth item is the gist of it:

To meet the United States in a friendly way, and negotiate with them for a reciprocity arrangement on lines that shall be just and equitable, and in accord with the honour and best interests of Canada, so far as it can be done without infringing upon the lines above laid down.

Again, I must plead guilty to my hon. friend, that I am not able myself to put the description of our reciprocity arrangement into as concise and complete a definition as was done at that time by the present member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). That is an absolutely true description. We have made an arrangement which will——

Be just and equitable, and in accord with the honour and best interests of Canada, so far as it can be done without infringing upon the lines above laid down.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) when he brought down the arrangement declared distinctly that if in any way it interfered with the preference to Great Britain, we not only would not discriminate against Great Britain, but would see to it that there was still a substantial preference for Great Britain on every item where there was a customs duty.

To keep in our own hands the power of framing our own tariff.

That is done by this arrangement absolutely, and if hon. gentlemen opposite undertake to maintain that it does not, they are simply undertaking to say that the people of Canada do not know how to manage their own affairs, at a time when Canada is prosperous, rich, progressive, at a time when Canada is receiving an influx of people from all over the world who think so much of Canada that they are eagerly rushing to her shores and are bound to become citizens of this country. It is true that Canada with 8,000,000 of a population is face to face with a population of 90,000,000 or 100,000,000 south of the boundary, but that population of 90,000,000 or 100,000,000 to-day recognize and acknowledge the power, the strength, and the influence of Canada on this North American continent. Their views are voiced in the words of Mr. Taft in explaining the reason for this arrangement in Washington; he pointed out the advantages of friendship, amity and trade arrangements with Canada and gave us the best compliment our rising young nation has ever received in its history. My hon. friends opposite would not like to be asked what was their policy in 1891. What was their policy in 1891? It is well known that they went to the electors in 1891 and won, and parenthetically, I am very glad they did. But they went down to Washington, they opened negotiations with Washington in 1891 and tried to negotiate a treaty on the lines laid down by Mr. Foster. They failed again, they are envious because where they failed we have succeeded; that is the only difference.

I shall only add that the other day I was talking to a gentleman who was a friend of Sir John Macdonald in his lifetime. He made this remark to me: You have made the best trade arrangement that could possibly be conceived in the interests of Canada; I would like to see my old friend, Sir John Macdonald jump with both hands outspread at such an arrangement if he had ever got the chance. I believe that that gentleman, who was an intimate friend of Sir John in his lifetime, gauged him pretty correctly. To-day if Germany or France could make an arrangement of this kind with the United States, either of these great commercial nations would jump at it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER. We know that Germany was trying to secure better commercial relations with the United States. She has, to a certain limited extent, succeeded, but she has not succeeded half so well as we have, and we know that the disappointment at not having been able to go further in improving her trade relations with the United States is very acutely and keenly felt.

One word with regard to a matter brought up by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). It may be a taking argument, and I dare say some people in the country have

been captivated by it. It is that we have no mandate to do this.

My hon. friend described the general mandate of the party and government in power. My hon. friend was a party to and endorsed the British preference of 1897. That legislation followed the election of 1897. I fail to remember a single statement on the part of the present leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), or any member of the party placing before the people of Canada the principle and details of the British preference brought down to this House in 1897. Did anybody at that time say that we had no mandate for that policy? I can remember well that when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) announced his British preference in this House, it was like a thunderclap to the House and to the people; nobody expected it; nobody dreamed of it. The secret was well kept, so that, with the exception of the men who sat at the council board of that day there was not a single individual in Canada who knew that we were going to bring down a proposal for a British preference on the lines that were announced. My hon. friend from Brandon was one who knew it, and he accepted the responsibility of that step without a mandate from the people, just as we to-day have brought down this arrangement, which he criticises on the ground that we have not the mandate from the people for it. I think we may fairly say that we have some mandate from the people for this arrangement. Reciprocity with the United States has been a demand of the people of Canada for years. Everybody in Canada has said: Give us reciprocity in natural products if you can get it. But people thought we could not get reciprocity in natural products without sacrificing our industry, because the United States would not give us reciprocity in natural products unless we included also a large list of manufactured articles. But in this arrangement we have secured reciprocity in natural products without sacrificing a single interest of our manufacturing industry. (I will speak, a little later, of the packing houses and some other matters to which my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) refers. I say again, we have accomplished what the people of Canada have been asking for, but had almost given up hopes of. The propitious time arose in the conditions of the United States, and we should have been derelict in our duty if we had lost the opportunity to gain that for which the people of Canada have been seeking and hoping for for years. Again, we have a mandate in this: reciprocity has seemed to many people difficult, or impossible because it was said the Americans must come down to our range of duties before we can discuss things with them. The American tariff has been high; our tariff has been lower but everybody in Canada was ready to trade with the Americans if they would come down to our range of duties. Under the present arrangement there is not an item in which the duties on the American side of the line are not made the same, or lower, than on the Canadian side. The Americans have come down to the Canadian range of duties, and we have taken the opportunity to fix them there and make an arrangement which is so favourable to us. There are two items in which we have not even come down to their duties. The first is the item of cement. The duty on the American side is 8 cents and on the Canadian side 12½ cents. We reduced to 11 cents, but the American duty is still three cents lower than ours. In regard to coal, there is a slight discrimination—so slight that it is hardly worth going into. But the Americans have come down to our scale of duties, and we have clinched the bargain.

The hon. member for Brandon said we had no mandate, and that we had committed the country. Why, Mr. Chairman, the present debate, the hon. gentleman's own stand on the question—everything goes to prove that we have not committed the country. We have committed the country if the representatives of the people ratify our bargain, and only in that case.

An hon. MEMBER. They won't do it.

Mr. FISHER. I do not intend to prophesy. My hon. friend from Brandon says he is obliged to leave his party on this question. We have a majority on this side of the House of about fifty, and even if the hon. member for Brandon votes against us we shall still have a majority of 48. I venture to say that the members on this side of the House are just as well able to gauge public opinion in this country as anybody on the other side of the House—

Mr. GOODEVE. Am I to understand by the remark the hon. minister has made that it is not the intention of the government to put this arrangement into force until after they have appealed to the people? Did he say it was to be ratified by the people before it should go into force?

Mr. FISHER. I said ratified by the representatives of the people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FISHER. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Goodeve) a representative of the people?

An hon. MEMBER. He sure is.

Mr. FISHER. On what ground does he say so? I suppose, because he was elected to this House. Hon. members on this side were elected also and in larger numbers

than hon. gentlemen opposite. If these hon. gentlemen opposite arrogate to themselves the honour of representing the people, then the majority in this House may fairly claim to represent the people.

Mr. GOODEVE. The hon. member for Brandon explained clearly that this question was not an issue in any previous election.

Mr. FISHER. And I have just pointed out to the committee that my hon. friend from Brandon himself was a party to putting through the British preference without any better mandate. It is true that, throughout this country, there is being worked up an agitation against this arrangement. It is true that there is very considerable talk of it in the press. I have even seen the names of gentlemen connected with this agitation, who, when that fact came to be known, repudiated what had been attributed to them. I had a rather remarkable instance in Hamilton the other day, when at a meeting, the names of two gentlemen were used as moving and seconding a resolution against this reciprocity arrangement, and the next day both these gentlemen came out and stated over their own signatures that they were not present at the meeting, had not authorized the use of their names, and had not drawn up the resolution. Hamilton is rather favoured in that respect. We have been told that the industries which came over to Canada from the United States and established themselves here to supply the Canadian market would all disappear, and that their big buildings would be emptied and their workpeople left out of employment.

But we had a day or two afterwards a statement that the Oliver Plough Company, which was one of those industries in Hamilton, was not only not going back, but was going to add a plant of $600,000 to serve the increased demand by the Canadian market under the tariff which has just been arranged in regard to agricultural implements. I might mention many other instances, but I will not go into details. Hon. gentlemen opposite may quote newspaper paragraphs and statements of individuals, but I am content to rest on the common sense and the intelligence of the electorate of Canada, and we know on this side of the House that we represent on this question the men of Canada to-day who sent us here two years ago. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: Go to the country. We have heard that cry over and over again. There has not been a parliament since this government came into power when hon. gentlemen opposite have not called upon us to go to the country on the most trivial occasions. But, Sir, we have some responsibility to the country, we have some responsibility to the electorate, and we do not propose to go to the country until we feel the need of a fresh appeal, or until this parliament ends. When we have gone to the country in the past, in election after election, this government has been endorsed by the people, and on the ground of its tariff policy perhaps more than on any other ground.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

IMPERIAL STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the Imperial Steamship Company.—Mr. McKenzie.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I would like to ask the government whether any arrangement has been recently closed with any of the steamship companies in connection with carrying the mails from Canada to Great Britain?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. None.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 130) for the relief of Matilda Emo.—Mr. Hodgins.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House again in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, before dinner I dealt with some aspects of this question, and with some of the remarks of my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton). Amongst other things he took exception to the manner in which this arrangement has been made, and gave it to be understood that the representatives of the government of Canada had taken no care or pains to inform themselves as to the point at issue, and as to the details of the trade of the country which would be affected by this arrangement. I take direct issue with the hon. gentleman and I tell him, and I tell the country, that the government did consider these things, went into them carefully, that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) employed those advantages which, as ministers of their departments, they had to obtain information, that when they went to Washington and met the representatives of the United States, who were assisted by their tariff experts, they too had tariff experts

from Canada in the person of Mr. McDougald who has now been for about twenty years, I think, Deputy Minister of Customs, and therefore, has at his fingers ends every detail of the customs administration and all the incidents of the customs tariff, and in the person of Mr. Russell who is an expert in these matters, he having been also for many years in the Customs Department, and having been transferred, some years ago, to the Finance Department as a special expert and adviser of the department on the details connected with the tariff administration. Therefore, I say that the hon. member, in making this accusation against the government, did so without full knowledge or without thought and absolutely without foundation in fact.

The hon. member referred to my following him to-day, and said that no doubt as a farmer the Minister of Agriculture knew something about these things. I do not presume to say that I do ; I prefer to leave it to the farmers of the country themselves to put their side of this question to the public at large. Hon. gentlemen who have approached this question on the floor of this House and elsewhere have been very willing and glad to accept the statements of various interests in the country as being the obiter dicta with regard to their particular interests, but they assume to themselves and to everybody except the farmers to give information with respect to the interests of the farmers. Personally I prefer to let the farmers do that for themselves. We had here a little while ago a large demonstration of farmers.

It is the custom to say that they were solely representatives of the Northwest, but as a matter of fact of the 800 delegates, probably 200 were from Ontario, 100 from the Quebec and the eastern provinces, and 500 from the Northwest, and they were not merely individuals expressing their views but most of them represented organizations of farmers throughout the country and came to place before the government the resolutions of representative agricultural bodies. I believe that this great delegation truly represented the farmers of the country. I do not pretend to say it represented the manufacturers, I do not pretend to say it represented the transportation interests, but I can safely say that it represented the agricultural industry of this country, and its views and aspirations, far better than any man not engaged in agriculture himself, possibly could. The farmers of Canada have ever had the advantage of free entry for their goods into the British market, it is the glory of the mother and that she allows food products to enter her market without discrimination or customs duty. There is no good reason to believe that our farmers will in future lose that advantage in the British market because Britain has decided to keep to free trade, and even though she did resort to certain customs duties, those who advocate such a policy, at all events pretend that the products of the dominions beyond the seas would still have free entry. Well, Sir, there is not in this arrangement a word or a line, and there is nothing in the spirit of it, that would tend in any way to cut us off from entering the British market under the same conditions as in the past. The hon. member from Brandon (Mr. Sifton), said in effect that we were throwing away the British market for the purpose of getting the American market, but that is an absolute misrepresentation of the fact. We are not throwing away the British market; we are simply adding to it the American market for the products of our farms, and, we have still the home Canadian market which nothing can take away from us. Again, there is strong evidence that in the near future, if not actually to-day, the American market will be, or is, the best market in the world for agricultural products. My view in this respect may be disputed, but having for some years investigated agricultural problems and the markets of the world, in respect thereto, I believe it is coming about slowly, but surely, that the market of the North American continent is the best market of all markets. The prices on the British market are not so superior as they used to be over the prices in our own market, and they are not in most instances as good as the prices obtained in the United States.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Is it not a fact that you are practically throwing open to the whole world, the home market which the farmer of Canada formerly possessed?

Mr. FISHER. I will deal with that in a moment. My hon. friend from Brandon, speaking of the province of Quebec, did me the honour of saying that I knew as much of the agriculture of that province as anybody else, but I may tell the hon. gentleman that the farmers of Quebec are quite well able to speak for themselves, and the farmers of Quebec are not objecting to the free entry of their hay and dairy and other products into the New England market; on the contrary, they are delighted with the opportunity which this agreement gives them. My hon. friend from Brandon stated, as is quite true, that he has lived in the Northwest during a large portion of his life, that he knows the Northwest, and that he has been enthusiastic for its welfare. That may be, but I venture to say, that he does not to-day so truly represent the feelings and opinions of the Northwest as he did, before he left there. For many years he lived in Ottawa, as a minister of the Crown, and since he left the government

he has continued to live here, and I am inclined to think from the information I have received from the Northwest, and from the public expressions of opinion by western farmers, that the hon. gentleman has got out of touch with his people and that the views he expressed in his speech to-day, did not represent them as well as do the views of others whom I could name. I have in my hand an interview with Mr. James Bower, the first president of the Canadian National Council of Agriculture and of the United Farmers of Alberta. Mr. Bower was a member of the great delegation that came here some time ago, and he has come again to Ottawa to specially represent the farmers and to deal further with the government and parliament in regard to their interests. Mr. Bower said, among other things:

> The agreement is a good one and a wise one. By opening up new markets it will without question give a great impetus to the agricultural industry, particularly in western Canada, and will prove equally advantageous to the farmers of eastern Canada, especially in dairy products and hay.
>
> The speeches I have heard in the House of Commons during the past week by those who are opposed to reciprocity indicate to me that the speakers are either entirely ignorant of how the agreement will affect farmers or they are trying to mislead the public. They appear to be very solicitous as to how it will affect the welfare of the farmers, but the farmers have a few ideas of their own about this matter. At any rate, the anti-reciprocity speakers are absolutely wrong as to how it will affect western farming conditions.
>
> But perhaps the greatest boon reciprocity will confer upon the farmer of the west will be its indirect results in reducing freight rates, which will mean increased production all along the line. This will, of course, mean a greater demand for manufactured articles in the west, and a greater ability to pay for them.
>
> As far as the agreement goes, it meets with the unqualified approval of the western farmers, but much dissatisfaction is expressed at the smallness of the reduction in the duty on agricultural implements.
>
> 'What do the western farmers think of the annexation talk?' Mr. Bower was asked.
>
> 'They think it is all nonsense. If there was any danger of any of the western farmers wanting to be annexed by the United States, it would be because they did not get what they wanted. We want reciprocity, and we shall not be any less loyal if we get it.'

Mr. BRODER. Did the members of that deputation ask for reciprocity when they were here?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BRODER. I do not think they did.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly they did; the largest measure of reciprocity.

Mr. FISHER. Now, with regard to the general situation of our agricultural products, my hon. friend from Brandon said to-day that we had not investigated these matters, and had given no facts to the House and the country. I will, if the House will be patient for a few moments, give some facts, and I think I shall be able to show that hon. gentleman, and the rest of the country that we have done this with our eyes open and for good and sound reasons. There is an effort being made at the present time by certain interests in Canada to influence the farmers against this arrangement. I do not wonder at it—why? Because this arrangement interferes with the control and monopoly which these people have over the purchasing of our agricultural products in Canada. By this arrangement there will be competition with them in their present preserve. They will have in future the competition of the American buyer, who will come in here and buy from the farmer what he has to sell if he can give a higher price for it, and these gentlemen will have to meet that higher price or go out of their business. I do not think, Sir, that the farmers of Canada will object to having two men coming to buy his products instead of one. My hon. friend from Brandon spoke particularly about wheat; he also spoke about the packers; he did not speak, but I will, about the dairymen and those who have to buy the dairy products of this country. With regard to wheat, I do not profess to be an expert; but I am going simply to meet what the people who oppose this arrangement say with regard to wheat, and am going to point out what I think to be the fallacy in their argument. I do not intend to dispute the facts which they put forward. My hon. friend from Brandon spoke about our wheat being in future taken across the line, and he quoted Mr. James Hill as saying that the duty has nothing to do with the higher price of wheat in the American market. Now, I would just like to ask that gentleman and those who think with him, why is it that the American Congress made arrangements for the Minneapolis millers to grind Canadian wheat in bond for export instead of bringing in the wheat, paying the duty on it, and grinding it in the ordinary way? Because the duty is not only a deterrent and impediment, but an absolute prohibition of their getting the Canadian wheat and grinding it at Minneapolis, and mixing it with their own flour. If, as my hon. friend from Brandon and other opponents of this arrangement say, this is going to result in our northwestern farmers selling their wheat to the United States market, why will they do it? Simply because the price which the American miller will pay for it will be higher than the price which the Canadian miller has been willing to pay for it—I do not say able to pay for it,

but willing to pay, in the present restricted market, in which the miller and his representatives in the grain exchange of Winnipeg have controlled the purchase of all the wheat in the northwest. What is the reason that the American millers will want our wheat and be willing to pay for it? The reason is, first, that it is a stronger wheat which they need to mix with their own weaker wheat. It is stronger in the protein qualities, and makes a better baker's flour. They have been buying it and grinding it in bond, at the Canadian price; but when the duty is removed, they will buy it at the American price; and if they do not, others will come in and buy it from the Canadian farmer at the American price. The price will become equalized in the northwestern states and in Canada. It is a fact that the price is higher in the United States than in Canada. If the duty has nothing to do with it the hon. member for Brandon gave no explanation of it. I have no doubt that the two-fold result will take place, that the price will go down a little in the northwestern states and come up a little to the Canadian producer, so that the prices on both sides of the line will be practically the same. If that is the case, I can quite understand that the millers of Canada object to have the competition of American buyers in their preserve, which, with all due deference to them, they have worked to their utmost capacity. A well known miller in Montreal, Mr. Meighen, has written to the press about this matter. Mr. Meighen heads his communication: 'Preserve the Integrity of the Empire.' That is a very common prelude to a very poor argument. I would rather head it on the part of Mr. Meighen: 'Preserve my market for the benefit of Mr. Meighen.' Mr. Meighen destroys his own argument, like some others. He says that the milling plants in Canada can mill for thirty million people. We are giving it an opportunity to mill for ninety million people. If the millers of Canada, who are well established in their business, who have modern up to date plants, as the Ogilvies and the Lake of the Woods and other milling companies have, they ought to be glad to get that market. They ought to be willing to compete, and they are, I believe, quite capable of holding their own in that market. But, like many others, they are timid and do not desire to change. The change could come about in a moment without our intervention, because the United States Congress have the power and the right to take off the duty on wheat at any moment they choose. We are only getting something sure in return for a thing we might have had to face within a month or two—it looked much as if we should have it without compensation. Mr. Meighen says:

> This preaching of the doctrine that by taking down the bars the Canadian farmer would receive a higher market value for his wheat is entirely erroneous.

That is a statement with which, I confess, I do not agree. It does not seem to me possible that if the farmer has two markets, one of them a market in which the price of wheat is higher than in his own, he is not going to get a higher price. Here is another thing Mr. Meighen says—and I suppose this is 'preserving the integrity of the empire':

> I again repeat that the governments of Great Britain and the colonies should grant to one another a substantial preference in duty, and that in so far as their respective revenues will permit the principle of free trade within the empire should prevail. If the Dominion of Canada takes a firm stand on that policy, we will yet see that system adopted in the near future.

I mould remind Mr. Meighen of the fate which met his resolution in 1909 in the ultra-loyal, highly imperialistic Board of Trade of Montreal. Mr. Meighen is the gentleman who, with his friend Mr. McFee, on a certain occasion, secured the passage of a resolution embodying the principle of free trade within the empire. Just two weeks afterwards, the board of trade held an emergency meeting, and those who shouted imperialism—but took precious good care not to do anything for it—rescinded Mr. Meighen's resolution for free trade within the empire. But Mr. Meighen is not discouraged. I admire his pluck—perhaps a little more than I do his judgment. He still harps on this idea, though it was beaten in the stronghold of his friends, the Tory, imperialistic Board of Trade of Montreal.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I ask the hon. minister a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the hon. gentleman does not wish——

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister tell us what the 300 small mills in Ontario will do under this arrangement, and whether the flour milled in the large mills in the United States will not come into competition with that of the smaller mills in the markets of the world?

Mr. FISHER. In the same way that the flour of Mr. Meighen and the other great millers of Canada comes into competition with that of the small mills, and just as the many small mills scattered throughout the United States live and flourish under the competition of Minneapolis.

Sir, we have and shall still have the English market. And let me point out that

if this arrangement takes the duty off Canadian wheat going into the United States, it takes the duty off American wheat coming into Canada. Our mills can import American wheat and mill it, and they have the whole continent to draw from and to sell to, as well as the home market which will still be theirs as it has always been.

My hon. friend from Brandon spoke of the necessity of maintaining the purity of our wheat. He gave us credit for a Bill to improve the Inspection Act, an Act which has already been improved by this government. I cannot, for the life of me see why, if the Inspection Act is enforced in Canada, exactly the same conditions in regard to Canadian wheat, Canadian milling and Canadian flour will not continue as exists to-day. The hon. gentleman says our wheat will go to the United States and be mixed and deteriorated. If so, it will command in the market the price of deteriorated wheat. But, if the Canadian grower, dealer and miller choose they can still keep and maintain the quality of Canadian No. 1 hard, and can send it forward pure and unadulterated, and we propose to give them an Inspection Act by which they can maintain that purity. And that wheat should, more than ever, outsell American wheat and Canadian wheat that goes through these channels, and is deteriorating. That is another of the ad capitandum arguments by which the handlers of goods are trying to pull the wool over the eyes of our farmers and cause them to believe that their interests are being injuriously affected.

As I am on the cereal question, I should deal with the point in regard to Quaker Oats which the hon. member for Brandon brought forward. The present arrangement allows oats to go freely either way. There are oatmeal mills in Canada. Their complaint is not that they object to buying American oats, or that they object to the competition in the Canadian market for the purchase of Canadian oats, but that the offal of their mills, the by-products of their manufacture of oatmeal, is not allowed to enter the American market free. Well, while we think we got a most complete arrangement in the interests of Canada, we could not dictate to our great neighbours, every detail of the agreement. In some cases, we got all we asked for, and in some cases only part; while in some cases—very few—the Americans insisted upon what they wanted, which, had these been the only points at issue, we might not have granted. They did not grant us the free entry of this offal into the United States. The plea is not that our people cannot make oatmeal as well as those of the United States, but that they will not have as good a market for the sale of their offal. I believe the duty is 12½ cents per one hundred. The American maker of oatmeal will be able to sell his offal to the American farmers, our rivals in stock feeding. I venture to say that there are no people in the American union who are as capable and successful stock feeders as the farmers of Canada. We have proved this over and over again when we have gone into competition with them in the great exhibitions of the world and have carried away prize after prize. It is true that there is not, at the present moment, as good a market for that offal as in the United States. But I venture to say that, if this arrangement goes through in its entirety, the encouragement to stock keeping in Canada will, within a year or two, develop as good a market for that offal in Canada as in the United States. Our people will want to feed ten, fifteen or twenty head of stock where to-day they feed one, and they will be able to consume all the offal of the mills in Canada, and will afford as good a market for this by-product of the mills as the American farmers afford for the similar product of the mills of the United States.

Mr. STAPLES. Why does not the minister apply that to hay and barley?

Mr. FISHER. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very anxious to make my argument for me, and to arrange it to suit themselves, but I propose to go through it in my own way.

To-day, Canada does not produce anything like the quantity of agricultural products, especially of wheat and other grains, that the United States does. But I wish to give a few figures to show what the development of our Northwest will lead to in a few years. In 1909—I have not the figures for last year—about 1,000,000 people in our three prairie provinces produced 147,000,000 bushels of wheat off 7,000,000 acres. In passing I may say that in comparison with other parts of the world, our production per acre was far ahead of any of them except the intensively cultivated countries of Europe. In round figures, we have in the hands of settlers 58,000,000 acres; last year something under 14,000,000 acres were cultivated—about one-quarter of the total in the hands of settlers. Then, we have 32,000,000 acres in the hands of railway and other corporations; and 39,000,000 acres surveyed and still owned by the government. Then we have, roughly speaking, about 84,000,000 unsurveyed within the area of possible wheat production. This makes a total acreage in our Northwest of 213,000,000 acres within the wheat producing area. I do not mean to say that all this land will produce wheat, or will ever be under wheat, but I do not think it would be out of the way for me to say that, in the course of 15 or 20 years, one-quarter of that land, say 50,000,000 acres, will be producing

wheat. Well, if 1,000,000 people in 1909, cultivating 7,000,000 acres of wheat, produced 147,000,000 bushels, what will the people of the Canadian Northwest produce when that country is fairly filled up and we have 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 between the Great Lakes and the Rocky mountains? That estimate of the future population of the Northwest is not an extravagant one, nor need we look very far ahead for these results. When that time comes, the Canadian Northwest will produce 1,000,000,000 bushels of wheat. I venture to say that the farmers will need not only the home country and the American market, but also the European market in which to sell that wheat. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to say: 'Let well enough alone', because, for to-day, and for the moment, we have markets for what we produce. But the acreage of Canada is capable of producing so enormously that we must see to it that we have every market of the world open to us for the sale of our surplus production. When that time comes, there is no doubt, there will be in the United States from 150,000,000 to 200,000,000 people, and they will need at least 250,000,000 to 300,000,000 bushels of wheat from us. Are we to forget the future? Are we to slap in the face that great nation, and tell them that we will have none of them and their market, when, in the not distant future, their market will be an essential to the consumption of our surplus production? In the last three years we have increased our population by 273,000, or 35 per cent. At the same rate, in 10 years, we would increase by about 2,500,000 people. And our increase of crops has been commensurate with our increase of population.

Now, I wish to say a word about barley: Everybody knows that before the McKinley Bill of 1890 barley had cheap entry into the United States and that our Ontario farmers were then growing barley with large profit and gratifying success. We have the report of the United States Department of Agriculture that the Canadian barley in quality was the best in the world with the possible exception of some grown in Bavaria. It is well known that the American brewers and malsters wanted our barley. The old duties imposed by the United States on barley enabled the farmers of Canada to send to that country in 17 years, from 1876 to 1892 inclusive an aggregate of 135,250,000 bushels of barley, valued at $90,000,000. But the high duties of the succeeding 17 years brought the aggregate export down to 7,000,000, valued at a little less than $3,000,000. In the first period, the average price was 67 cents under a tariff rate of 15 cents a bushel. But, in the second period, under duties varying from 30 cents a bushel to 30 per cent, the average price was 42 cents. Under this arrangement, we shall have free entry of Canadian barley into the United States market. The farmers of Ontario who were struck by that McKinley Bill, with the pluck, energy, self-confidence and natural pride of a people whom I respect, and whom I consider to be the backbone of this country, took that blow —complained a little, I grant you—but buckled to and overcame the difficulty.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend says, hear hear. But they have overcome it, and they are quite ready to take the advantage again, to reap the profit, and to make the immense sum of money they would have made in the past if free barley had never been taken away from them.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you think that nearly all the barley raised in Canada would not have been kept at home instead of exported?

Mr. FISHER. I think the farmer who raises barley knows enough to sell it to the best advantage for his pocket. If he finds that he can make most by selling it for malting and buying American corn for his stock he will do so. If he finds that it is more profitable to feed it to his stock instead of selling it for malting he will feed it to his stock. But I want to give him an alternative, and I trust to his judgment to make use of the best alternative.

Now, I want to say a word about potatoes and fruit. In twelve years of high duties the United States accepted from Canada $11,000,000 worth of potatoes more than they sent into Canada. Surely if we can get those potatoes into the states without duty, it will be to the advantage of our potato raisers. We sent a large quantity of fruit to Great Britain, which she accepted free, and as the United States had a heavy duty against it, the consequence was that we only sent to the United States $3,000,000 worth of fruit. We imported from the United States two and a third million dollars worth of apples, and we sent her in the same time a much larger quantity.

I would like to contrast the condition of the market gardeners and fruit growers with that of barley growers. The market gardeners and fruit growers, in the last twenty-five years, increased their exports of these articles to the extent of $70,000,000. The farmers in seventeen years lost $90,000,000 on the one export of barley alone. I give this as an instance of what the two peoples suffer.

Now, I want to say a few words with regard to the meat trade. My hon. friend from Brandon says that the packing industry will be destroyed. I say emphatically, no. Why should it disappear? My hon. friend says that the meat trust of the

United States will come in and control the packing industry of Canada. He forgets, or does not choose to realize, that while, I grant, the meat trust of the United States seems to be able to defy the courts of that country; no trust in Canada can defy the courts of Canada. We have on our statute-book a Combines Act which forbids the operation of trusts like the meat trust of the United States. We have the machinery by which we can easily deal with them. I will give an instance of what it can do, and it is in regard to a United States organization. Just the other day a court in the city of Quebec declared that the United Shoe Machinery Company must submit to a decision of a board as to whether its actions as a trust are illegal. The United Shoe Machinery Company is one of the most powerful organizations in the United States, it controls the machinery which is used in the boot and shoe trade. They have patents, and a practical monopoly of certain machines. They do as they like in the United States. They came into Canada and tried to do as they liked here, but some of their victims appealed to the courts, and the courts of Canada have ordered them to show reason why they should not be compelled to deal fairly, and not as a trust, with the users of their machinery in Canada. This shows what the meat trust or any other trust in Canada will have to contend with in the future. I can only say to my hon. friend that if the meat trust of the United States undertakes to come into Canada and to act as trusts are generally supposed to act, they will be hauled up short by the Act. The courts of Canada will see to it that they do not carry on the nefarious practices which they are said to carry on in the United States.

Mr. AMES. Is it not a fact that the United Shoe Machinery Company is a Canadian corporation, and that it is against a Canadian company that these proceedings are taken?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but they are an offshoot in a way of the American company.

Mr. AMES. They have absolutely nothing to do with the American company, so far as their business in Canada is concerned.

Mr. FISHER. But so far as their patents and their machinery are concerned, they are all one. It is their operations in Canada, which are the exact counterfeit of their operations in the United States, of which the courts are taking cognizance, operations of which the American courts do not take cognizance and do not control.

Mr. AMES. Does the minister imagine that the beef trust will come into Canada and be incorporated so that it can be reached by the Canadian courts?

Mr. FISHER. When they do come into Canada and operate, they will be subject to the laws of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the Standard oil trust that has been carrying on operations here for years?

Mr. FISHER. The Act I refer to was only passed last year. I said a moment ago that the packing houses would not disappear. I think my hon. friend had in mind particularly the packing houses in Winnipeg. I have heard it said that the packing houses in Winnipeg would disappear, because Chicago would swamp them when the whole west is thrown open and made subservient to the Chicago market. What is the condition of affairs to-day in the United States? Does the Chicago packing business swamp the packing houses in Kansas city, in Omaha or in South St. Paul? We know, if the hon. gentleman does not know, that these cities are doing a large packing-house business. I have here some figures to show what that business is in comparison with the packing-houses of Winnipeg. In Kansas city last year the local killings of cattle were 1,284,000 ; of sheep, 1,186,000 ; of hogs, 1,900,000. The local packing and abattoir establishments of Kansas city showed, of cattle, 773,000 ; of sheep, 1,256,000 ; of hogs, 1,656,000. In South St. Paul, the local killings were 169,000 cattle, 207,000 sheep, and 823,000 hogs.

Compare Winnipeg:

Cattle—80,000; half of those in St. Paul; one-tenth about of those in Omaha; one-fifteenth of those in Kansas City.

Sheep—30,000; one-seventh of those in St. Paul; one-fortieth of those in Omaha; one-thirty-fifth of those in Kansas City.

Hogs—91,000; one-ninth of those in St. Paul; one-twentieth of those in Omaha; one-twentieth of those in Kansas City.

Sir, I believe that with the same price and with the same opportunity of supply, the Winnipeg packers can do as well as the Kansas City, Omaha, or St. Paul packers. I believe they can compete with Chicago just as well as these others can, and I see no reason to suggest that our Winnipeg men are not quite the equals of the business men of these three great American western cities. Why are these cities able to do so well? Because they have a tremendous field to draw upon, because they have the cattle ranges of the whole western states. Our Winnipeg men to-day have only the ranges and farms of our own northwest, and their supply is limited and small. With the opening of the American market, one of two things will happen. Either the price of the western cattle to these killers in these cities will be higher

and the Winnipeg men will have to come up and pay a higher price, or if it is not higher, the Winnipeg men, with this arrangement, can go across the line, compete there, and draw cattle from there to Winnipeg just as well as they can be drawn to St. Paul or anywhere else. Our Winnipeg packers are flourishing in a local way. Practically the whole of the 80,000 head of cattle in Winnipeg are slaughtered for local consumption. There is no export of meat from the Winnipeg packing houses. The whole is for local consumption, and the reason why they are not able to do an export business, the reason why they are not able to increase their work, is because of the short supply of cattle in our own northwest. I will deal with that in a few minutes. But, with this arrangement there is no reason whatever why Winnipeg, instead of staying where she is, away down in the list of those cities west of Chicago, should not be able to keep up and range herself with them. Chicago is and will be probably forever the great centre of the trade of the middle of this continent. Her geographical position, her start and everything else have taken her far ahead of the other American western cities, and there is no doubt that she will stay there. But the fact that Chicago is at the head of this great business is not inimical to the chances of a great number of other cities doing well, flourishing and advancing. I believe that Winnipeg and the Canadians in Winnipeg and other cities in Canada are quite as well able to do that as those cities which I have named.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the minister be good enough to tell us the profits made by these American firms last year. They are given in their annual reports.

Mr. FISHER. You mean in those American cities?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. No, I have not got that.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that in some cases they made 25 per cent.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. As the hon. the minister has not permitted the question, I cannot allow it.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) talks about the profits they make. With a greater market and with more competition their profits might probably be a little less. I grant with regard to these different interests that are objecting to the farmers getting competition from buyers from the United States that they may have to raise their prices, and, therefore, the farmers of Canada will get the benefit of it. I do not wish to set class against class, but I think the farmers have as much right to a free show and a good opportunity of selling in any market in which they can get more, as the people have who wish to buy from them, and who claim a monopoly of purchase.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, do I understand you to object to me asking the minister a question?

Mr. FISHER. I will allow you.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I merely want to ask the minister if it is not a fact that these large meat packing firms in Kansas City, Omaha and St. Paul are a part of the meat trust. I have visited these cities frequently and I know what I am talking about.

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend says that he knows they are I will not dispute it. I do not know that they are, and I, therefore, will not say whether they are or not. But that does not make any difference. They exist outside of Chicago, and it is the Chicago market that hon. gentlemen are holding up as our bogey. My hon. friend from Grey, earlier in the session, spoke about our live stock trade going down. We have the Canadian and the British market. We have had a great many conditions favourable to our development otherwise, and yet the hon. gentleman made a long speech to prove that the Canadian live stock trade was going down. If that is the case I think the Canadian live stock trade might very well answer hon. gentlemen opposite when they say: 'Let well enough alone' by saying: It is not well enough. My hon. friend, when he says that the Canadian live stock trade is going down, says that it is not well enough. We want to give them another market, we want to give them a better opportunity, we want to give them competition for the things they have to sell, and this arrangement does that. If my hon. friend is correct in saying that the live stock trade is going down then I say it is well that we should help those engaged in that trade in this way.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister says that he proposes to give them another market. Is he aware of the fact that $160,000,000 worth of meat products are shipped out of the United States annually?

Mr. FISHER. I am sorry, but I am afraid that I will have to refuse to respond to these interruptions. I do not object to being asked a pertinent question, but when they are foreign to what I am talking about I cannot allow myself to be interrupted any more. The farmers of the northwest will sell to the American buyer, if he will give them a better price than the Canadian

buyer will, otherwise they will not. They will sell to the Canadian buyer if he gives them a fair and just price—the best price they can get—and he will sell to whoever else will give him that price. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) said that the only good market was the British market, that it was a stable and free market. I grant that it is a stable and free market. We have had it. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) says that our live stock business is going down, notwithstanding our possession of that market. I want to give the farmers something that will bring that trade up, and I believe the American market will do it.

Now, Sir, I am going to speak a little bit about the province of Ontario. The hon. member for Brandon said that in Ontario the prices were as good as in the United States. I take direct issue with him. Prices in the United States are higher than they have been in Ontario for the last year on these products that I have been talking about. The hon. member for Brandon reproached us because we had not given statistics, because we had not carefully compared the prices. I beg to tell him that we did compare the prices, that when we made this arrangement we knew what the prices were in the American market, and here, and that is why we wanted to get free entry for agricultural products into the United States. I will give some prices. I have here a few statements. I have a statement with regard to the cattle slaughtered in the west. I have a statement of market quotations for live cattle in Buffalo and Montreal each fortnight from January 5, 1910, to December 2, 1910:

I shall not read each price, but I may say that between January 5 and December 2, 1910 the market quotations in Buffalo every week were higher than in Montreal. It was not an occasional quotation, but taking the whole trade of the whole year, every week the quotations in Buffalo were materially higher for live cattle than were the Montreal quotations. I have another statement here which I need not trouble the House to read, but I will send into 'Hansard,' which gives the market quotations for live hogs in Buffalo and Toronto and Chicago and Montreal. Taking the price of live hogs from January 19 to December 2, for every week in the year with three single exceptions the prices were higher in Buffalo than in Toronto; and in those the difference was very small in favour of Toronto. On January 26 the Buffalo price was $8.75 to $8.85, and in Toronto it was $8.90; on February 2, the Buffalo price was $8.50 to $8.70, and in Toronto $8.65; on June 1 the Buffalo price was $9.75 to $9.85, and the Toronto price $10. Only on these three occasions during the whole year was the price of live hogs as high in Toronto as in Buffalo, and these figures, which I believe to be absolutely correct, and which are taken carefully from the market reports, contradict the statement of the hon. gentleman that the price of these is higher in Ontario than in the United States.

Mr. WRIGHT (Muskoka). Before the hon. gentleman leaves that point I want to ask a question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member who has the floor has been interrupted very frequently. I have allowed these interruptions because there was no indication on his part that he objected, but since he has objected I cannot allow the hon. member to be interrupted.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. WRIGHT (Muskoka). I want to make an explanation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must resume his seat when the chairman of the committee rises.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to ask whether it is proper to put in 'Hansard' tables of figures that are not read to us and as to which we have no idea what they are like. The Minister of Agriculture has tables there which he says he will send into 'Hansard.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have no control over what may be published in 'Hansard,' but, I understand 'Hansard' does report what is said in the House.

Mr. FISHER. I suggested that these figures might be printed in 'Hansard' without my reading them so as to save time, but since the hon. member (Mr. Armstrong) does not wish to know them, I will not ask that they be put in 'Hansard.' One feature of the live stock trade is worthy of notice, and it is that in recent years there has been a large decrease in the numbers of live stock in proportion to the numbers of people occupying the land. That is a very serious situation. There is more live stock in Canada at the present time than there was ten years ago, but after careful investigation, I have no doubt that there are now fewer animals in Canada in proportion to the population than there were then. The English authorities on the question point continuously to the fact that the supplies from America are decreasing and they are looking more to Argentine and to Australia and to New Zealand for their supplies of meat. Still, America, and the United States especially, send them large supplies. The reason for the falling off in the cattle export from America is that the continent of America

affords to-day a better market than does the old country for these products. It is, therefore, very important for us to see to it that the whole market of the whole continent of North America is open to our farmers, and if we do not do that we shall be face to face with the fact that our farmers will be flooding the English market with these supplies and knocking down the price of these products below what is perhaps a living price. Here is another statement which I have no doubt is absolutely correct:

The high prices prevailing during the last two years have evidently not been determined by the prices obtainable for export bullocks, but rather by the strong and growing local demand. Packers and butchers have given expression to this conclusion in different ways and it is a fact that with prices in Great Britain no higher than they are at present there remains no particular temptation to shippers and exporters to direct their purchases across the Atlantic. On the other hand, packers in the east have found a very profitable outlet of late for their cured and fresh meat products in the growing markets of the Canadian west.

Sir, I shall now refer to another matter which affects particularly the province of Quebec, and to a large extent Ontario as well. The hon. gentleman from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) stated that in the province of Quebec there was some good farming, a great deal of bad farming, and some middling farming, but, I know the province of Quebec better than he does, and I may tell him that the fact that the farmers of Quebec export large quantities of hay is no proof at all that they are not good farmers. This may seem paradoxical because it is generally speaking true that the hay should be fed to stock on the farm, and in this way the fertility of the soil maintained, but, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) is not aware of the fact that there are areas of land in the province of Quebec from which hay has been sold to the American and the English market for from 50 to 75 years steadily, and the crop of hay on these lands is just as abundant and as excellent in quality as it was half a century ago. These hay-growing lands are lands which are frequently flooded, and on which there is a constant succession of alluvial deposits, and the land is in that way specially adapted for the growing of hay. That hay has hitherto been shut out of the American market by a duty of $4 per ton, and every one knows that the Quebec farmer, when he did send hay into the United States had to pay a large proportion of that duty, depending on the demand whether he paid more or less. I read in a newspaper a short time ago that a New England farmer told a newspaper reporter that if this arrangement were carried into effect he and his sons would be driven out of their farming in New England because the Quebec hay would undersell them and secure the market in the New England towns. So, in New Brunswick and some parts of Nova Scotia on the dyke lands around the Bay of Fundy, hay has been grown for I do not know how many years.

Mr. BLACK. Two hundred years.

Mr. FISHER. Quite so ; these lands are periodically inundated by the overflow of the sea, and consequently with respect to these particular farms it is good farming, and not bad farming, to grow and sell the hay. Hon. gentlemen from the northwest will tell you that the northwest farmer would be foolish if he did not grow wheat after wheat and wheat after wheat and sell it, and so, in the case of the hay-growing lands I have mentioned it would be foolish for those who cultivate them not to grow and sell a crop of hay. If the farmer in the northwest were to manure the land the wheat would grow and grow and keep green, and would not ripen, and that would be bad farming, and in like manner it would be useless to manure the hay-growing lands in Quebec and the lower provinces because the hay would lodge, it would not cure as well, and the farmer would not get as good a price for it as he does now. Good farming is to avail of the natural conditions of the particular soil you are tilling to the best advantage, and what would be good farming in some localities might be very bad farming in others. Therefore, that is one point in which the member for Brandon maligned the farmers of the province of Quebec. He spoke as a lawyer about farming and not understanding the business he was unable to deal with it intelligently. Again, I want to tell my hon. friend from Brandon who was born and bred in Ontario and lives there now, and seems to identify himself with that province, that in the dairying business the province of Quebec has made more advance than any other part of the Dominion of Canada in fifteen years. The production of butter and cheese has increased more rapidly than in any other part of Canada, and the quality of Quebec butter and cheese stands at the top of the markets of the world. Dairying is very prosperous in the province of Quebec and in dairying I include the production of milk and cream as well as the manufacture of butter and cheese. And why is dairying in the province of Quebec extremely prosperous? It is because for the last two seasons the farmers living along the border —and this is true also of our counties in eastern Ontario which lie along the St. Lawrence river—have been selling cream to the American market, and not as formerly making it into butter and sending it to England. The farmers of the eastern town-

ships were visited the other day by some gentlemen from the city of Montreal, Messrs. Brice, and Maclagan and others, who handle the goods of the dairy farmers, and they told them how bad it would be if American buyers should come across the line and dispute with Messrs. Brice and Maclagan the purchase of dairy products in the eastern townships. Well, the farmers of the eastern townships know their business well enough to know why these gentlemen came to tell them that, and the farmers of the eastern townships know their business well enough to appreciate the advantage of having somebody besides the dealers of Montreal in the market to purchase their products. We have been making butter and cheese in the province of Quebec for many years, and a good deal of it was sold in the home market and the bulk of it was sent to England, but for the last two years American dealers have been coming across the line, and purchasing the cream from our farmers, and taking it to the northern parts of New Hampshire and Vermont, and from eastern Ontario into New York state, and making it into butter for the American market. Now, our farmers who sold that cream had full and free access to the market of Great Britain for their butter, but they found it more profitable to dispose of their cream in this way. These gentlemen opposite will tell you that our market in Great Britain is the great market for Canadian produce. True, it has been, but during this year the price of butter in the New England and New York markets is so high that they could afford to take Canadian cream across the line, pay five cents a gallon duty on it, then make it into butter and pay our farmers a higher price per 100 pounds for their milk than they could get by making it into butter at home, and selling it to these gentlemen in Montreal who forwarded it to the English market. The farmers in the eastern townships do not need any compilation as to the difference in prices on each side of the line to tell them what the truth is. They can see that with their own eyes ; they are selling their goods and pocketing the profits even though these goods have to pay a duty going to the American markets, and by this arrangement they will have free entry to the American market, and they will reap a larger profit. If cream can be bought in Canada and five cents a gallon duty paid on it, and made into butter in the United States, and sold in the great eastern cities, why cannot butter be made in the eastern townships, and eastern Ontario, and all over Canada and sold in these same markets at the same price if there is no duty on either cream or butter? There, the hon. member for Brandon has the answer of the farmers of the province of Quebec as to how they can look after their own interests. Last year there was sent from Canada to the United States $1,677,000 worth of cream, and we sent also a few thousand dollars worth of cheese, and a few thousand dollars worth of butter. The average value of the cream was about one dollar a gallon, and a gallon of cream made about 25 cents a pound for the butter without any expense of make up. The United States have for several years past, imported of dairy products, butter, cheese and cream, to the following extent—in 1907 they imported $6,000,000 worth, in 1908 $5,000,000 worth, in 1909 $6,000,000, and for the 11 months of the last fiscal year $8,500,000 worth, which increase was largely accounted for by the importation of Canadian cream.

Cheese will now be put upon the free list. The United States last year imported nearly $7,000,000 worth of cheese. Now, I want to be perfectly fair. Most of that cheese was brought from Europe; most of it was what is called fancy cheese. But I am glad to say that the dairymen of Canada are rising to the occasion, and are making to-day a very fair quantity of fancy cheese; and under this arrangement they can expand and increase that product, which is the most profitable way to utilize their milk product, and there is no market in the world equal to that of New York, Boston and other large cities of the United States Atlantic sea-board for these fancy cheeses. They are dainty, appetizing things which the rich people want, and will pay fancy prices for; and, while I do not say that the whole of our dairy output can be turned into these products, there will be many opportunities for our scientific farmers to enter into that business, and, instead of being confined, as they are to-day, by a severe duty on cheese, to our own markets of Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto, they will have the cities of New York, Boston, Philadelphia and other large American cities to cater to, and the record of our Canadian dairymen which is writ broad on this continent, shows that they can carry on that higher kind of farming better than the Americans can, and beat them in their own markets, if we have a free entry into them.

Mr. hon. friend from Brandon intimated that the prices of butter and cheese were better in Canada than in the United States. I have here quotations of the prices of butter taken on the same day of every month, from January to December, 1910, in Boston, New York, Chicago, Montreal, and Toronto, and in every month of the year in every one of these three American markets, butter was materially higher than it was on the same day in either Montreal or Toronto. The hon. member for Brandon wants statistics and information. Here again are the prices of cheese on the same

day in every month in Boston, New York, Chicago, Montreal and Toronto, and in every month the prices in Boston, New York and Chicago were higher than they were on the same day in either Montreal or Toronto. I took also eggs, and here our hon. friends opposite may get a little comfort. The egg prices vary. In January they were higher in the three American markets; in February they were a shade higher in Montreal and Toronto; in April, they were about the same; in May the price in Boston was higher than in the Canadian market, but Montreal and Toronto were both a little higher than New York and Chicago; in June and July the Canadian markets were a shade higher; in August, Montreal was a little higher, but Toronto a little lower than the American market; in September, they were practically the same; in October, Montreal was a little higher and Toronto equal; in November and December, all three American markets were higher than either of the Canadian markets. I also inquired as to dressed poultry, taking Montreal, Toronto and New York, and I found that in every month of the year dressed poultry was higher in New York from one cent to five cents per pound, than it was in either Montreal or Toronto. I will not go into further details. I think I have given some information and statistics. I think I have been able to show that we did not enter into this thing with our eyes shut, but were able to find a justification in the advantages to the Canadian farmer of a free entry into the American market.

The hon. member for St. Anne, and I think the hon. member for Brandon, said: oh, but you do not say anything about the Americans coming in here. Well, I think I have disposed pretty well of the idea of the Americans coming in here, by showing that their own market is higher than ours. The Americans are shrewd, and are not going to send goods into Canada and knock down the Canadian prices, when they can get higher prices at home. But the hon. member for Brandon says: You allow goods to come to Canada from Argentina, Australia and New Zealand and other countries. Quite true, we do. But I would like to point out that for many years, in that free and stable market of the home land mentioned above we had the competition of Argentina, Australia and New Zealand, under conditions that were less favourable to us and more favourable to them, than they would have in attempting to sell their products in Canada, and we have been able to hold our own with them in the English market. We have been able, as a general rule, with the exception of live cattle, to command higher prices than Argentina has—why? Because our products are better in quality, and I venture to say that in the future, as in the past, the Canadian farmer, educated, informed, clean-living, sensible, will be able to produce a better article than the Italian or the Spanish or the Portuguese or others farming in the Argentine. History has told us that we need not fear competition, and I do not think that we need fear it in the future. But my hon. friend from Brandon says they will dump their products on the Canadian market. Well, Buenos Ayres has cheaper freights to London than to Canada, and it has with England, a large trade established, with a return freight, and it can take its goods and put them on the English market much cheaper than it can on the Canadian market. The Canadian has to send his goods to compete with them in England, where the price is regulated by the price of goods in the open stable market of England, and not where they are produced, and we have been able to meet the competition of these people there.

With a market at our own doors, does any person say that these countries can beat the Canadian farmer in his home market? It is absurd on the face of it. Hon. gentlemen opposite are simply raising a bogey to frighten the farmers into thinking that this arrangement is a bad one for their business. So far as cattle are concerned, the Argentine, for many years, has suffered, like ourselves, from an embargo on cattle going into Great Britain, by which their cattle allowed to land are slaughtered in the lairages. This continued till 1900, when any landing was absolutely prohibited. In February, 1903, a change was made under which Argentina cattle were allowed to be landed for slaughter in the lairages. In consequence of disease being found, the embargo was reimposed in May, 1903, three months after its partial removal. Now, I would like to point out that this reciprocity arrangement does not interfere—no trade arrangement does—with quarantine. Under our quarantine regulations, Argentina cattle will be shut out of Canada as well as out of England. We cannot allow diseased cattle to come in alive—in England, they do not allow Argentina cattle even to enter to be slaughtered at the port of entry as Canadian and American cattle are. For the three months of which I have spoken, they did allow Argentina cattle, as they allow ours, to be entered and slaughtered at the port of entry. But they had to give that up, and at the present day, not a head of Argentina cattle is allowed to land on the quay in Britain. And I can tell my hon. friends opposite that, until the Argentine can show a cleaner bill of health than they have been able to show for some time,

cattle from that country will not be allowed to land in Canada. Not because my duty as administering the quarantine laws calls upon me to interfere with markets or trade arrangements, but because it is my duty to see to it that the flocks and herds of Canada are not contaminated by disease from any outside country.

Mr. AMES. Does the minister——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. minister (Mr. Fisher) has objected to interruptions.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a question of order. Mr. Chairman, is a member of parliament not allowed to make any observation when a gentleman is speaking? I wish to know what are a member's rights?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has the right to rise to a point of order, but not to discuss it.

Mr. SPROULE. I have the right to make an observation, and I distinctly refuse to be controlled by anybody

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has the floor, and no other member has the right to speak while he has the floor. He has been interrupted very frequently. I have told the committee that I allowed these interruptions because the minister did not himself object to them. But when he objected, it became my duty to prevent any interruption. No member except the hon. gentleman who has the floor has the right to speak. The point of order raised is not a sound one.

Mr. LENNOX. May I ask a question of the Chair? Are we to understand that a member of parliament has not the privilege of asking a minister of the Crown a question while he is addressing the House?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A member has not the right to ask the minister a question while he is addressing the House unless he has the permission of the minister. The minister has distinctly refused to be interrupted, and no member has the right to interrupt him.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. There is no point of order before the Chair. The Minister of Agriculture has the floor. Unless a point of order is brought before the Chair, the minister must be allowed to continue his address.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Unless the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) arises to a point of order, I cannot hear him.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to a point of order. I want information for my guidance. I have no question to ask the minister at this time——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Unless the hon. gentleman has a distinct point of order to raise, he is not in order in speaking.

Mr. LENNOX. It is a distinct point of order. I want your ruling distinctly. Am I to understand that, if I have a question to ask the minister, I am not at liberty to ask it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. While the minister is addressing the committee, no member has the right to interfere with question or interruption. With the permission of the member addressing the House, it may be done, but, the hon. member having distinctly stated that he desires no more interruptions, it is my duty to see to it that he is not interrupted.

Mr. FISHER. I think I was patient under interruptions. I would be glad to answer questions, but, on several occasions, questions have been put to me almost in the middle of a sentence, and in a way to interrupt the thread of my remarks—questions sometimes entirely irrelevant. Therefore, I feel I must decline to be interrupted. I do not desire to appear discourteous, but I am afraid I shall have to maintain that position.

Adding to what I was saying with regard to quarantine, I may point out that we have dairy laws for this country which have the same effect as quarantine. I do not know that anybody has raised the point in the House, but in different places it has been raised that, in consequence of the free entry of American butter into our markets, oleomargarine, butterine and other things of that kind may be introduced into the country. I have only to say that the Canadian laws which forbid the manufacture, importation or sale of these articles in Canada are as much in force and will be as much in force after this arrangement goes into effect as they are now and have been for years past.

My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) did not say much about conservation, but the question has been raised by some hon. members opposite on several occasions. Conservation at the moment is an attractive and rather popular appeal. We are all anxious to preserve the natural resources of Canada. I think I may say that I have been as prominent in that respect as anybody in this country. I was one of those, with my hon. friend from Brandon, who attended the international conference at Washington called by President Roosevelt to discuss this question. It was I who introduced and put through the Bill for the creation of the Commission of Conservation, and have encouraged, and am a member of, that commission. As I said a moment ago

about our animals and dairy products, so the question of conservation is a question of regulation and administration within our own country of our own resources. Conservation is the preservation of our resources from waste, the utilization of our resources under wise and proper management. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) gave a very good illustration of conservation when he talked about the steers and 'what we have we'll hold'. Conservation of forest resources, for instance, does not mean to forbid the cutting of any tree in Canada; it means the cutting of the trees that are ripe to be cut and the proper preservation of those that are not yet ready for cutting from the destructive influences of fire, insects and other enemies of our forests. If conservation means that we are to stop lumbering operations in this country, if it means that we are to keep our trees until they fall from age and rot upon the ground where they will be a hiding place and breeding place of insects injurious to the forests and a means of spreading fire, then, conservation means putting an end to the utilization of our forest resources. It does not mean anything of the kind. Conservation means that we shall so regulate the cutting of our trees that no tree too small to be cut shall be cut, that no tree when it is cut shall destroy other trees around it, that when the tops and the debris of the trees which are cut are left in the forest, they shall be taken care of so that fire may not spread among them, and thereby generate those destructive fires which are the worst enemies of our forest resources. Conservation means that we shall see to it that the insect pests that infect our forests and trees shall be fought and combatted, that fires shall not be allowed to spread, whether originating by settlers, or by hunters, or by trappers, or by railroads. Forest conservation means that forest areas shall be set apart as forest reserves, to protect the sources of our water supply, the sources of our streams, in order that water may be procured for agricultural and manufacturing operations and kept at a continuous flow. Sir, we have done all that. We have set apart large forest reserves. My hon. friend at Quebec the other day, in a conservation meeting, praised this government for the fact that the Minister of the Interior this very session is introducing a Bill to make statutory what was done last year by order in council, namely, setting apart the whole eastern slope of the Rocky mountains as a forest reserve, which will be the greatest on the continent of North America. I think we know fairly well how to conserve our natural resources. The regulation of all these things remains in the hands of the parliament of Canada, and it is only by parliament becoming recreant to its duty in this regard that our natural resources can be depleted.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say, Oh, but these horrible Americans will come in here and eat up our natural resources. I do not know but that to-day a good many Americans own many of our forest reserves, I do not know but that they own some of our mines and some of our water-powers. I am quite sure that a Canadian who owns any one of these resources in fee simple, if an American came along and offered him a higher price for it than he could get from anybody else, he would sell it to him. I think that perhaps our hon. friends opposite would do just like any of the rest of us in that respect. But if an American has bought a natural resource of Canada, he is just as much subject to the rules and regulations of Canada, and to any safeguards we may establish for their conservation and utilization, as any Canadian, or any Englishman, or anybody else in the world. When Americans come in here to invest in our natural resources and to operate them they will be controlled by the laws and regulations of Canada just the same as anybody else. This is the meaning of conservation, and this arrangement has no effect upon conservation at all.

In speaking upon fruits and vegetables, the hon. member for Brandon said that the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) had presented an argument in that respect which was unanswerable. I am afraid I must differ with him a little in that. That argument of the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo, like a great many others, is the argument of a man interested in that business alone. I am not going to attribute any selfish motive to the member for Yale-Cariboo, he is entirely in his right in what he is doing. He spoke of his own interest as a fruit grower, and he spoke of the interests of a majority probably of his constituents. Now I am going to say frankly that it is possible that the fruit growers of the dry belt of British Columbia may suffer by this arrangement a little more than any other interest that I know of. They are to-day growing fruit in the dry belt somewhat similar to the dry belts of Washington and Oregon to the south. They are starting out on a large scale in an industry which has been well tested and well established on a small scale, and they are probably at a stage when for the moment keen and superior competition may stagger them. But I do not believe it will knock them down. I do not believe for a moment that my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo himself is going to sell out his orchards and leave the business. I think he and his friends will con-

tinue to grow fruit. They have exactly the same opportunity under this tariff arrangement that their competitors to the south of them have. They are not at the moment quite so well established in business, but I am glad to say that they are becoming established. I am glad to see that for a year or two back they have adopted the best methods of packing that are known, and have been getting a good repute for their fruit, just as good a repute as the people to the south of them. The Okanagan Valley fruit has just as good a record as the fruits of Washington. They can grow just as good fruit, and probably a little better, and they can grow as much of it to the acre. They have beaten their American neighbours time and again in exhibitions by reason of the superior quality of their fruit. They have not had so many acres under fruit as their competitors to the south, and for the moment that competition may be felt. But I have confidence enough to believe that the people of that region, like other Canadians in the east, like the people of the west who have to compete on wheat, will hold up their head and enter into the fight, and show the same results that other people have been able to show in competition between Canada and other countries. I observe that some gentlemen in the fruit business take the same view as themselves. A little while ago I read an article in regard to the fruit growers of that country, and I think the Minister of Customs has read it. It is taken from the Vernon 'Okanagan,' which I understand is a Liberal paper. The article is written by a Mr. Lee. Mr. Lee, this paper says in another number, is the secretary of the Okanagan Farmers' Institute. A few weeks ago he supported a resolution at the annual meeting of the central institute which strongly advocated that not only should the duty on fruit be retained, but that the duty should be raised to a parity with the United States tariff. Mr. Lee spoke warmly in favour of that resolution, which was carried unanimously and forwarded to Ottawa. They go on to say that he ought to be consistent. Mr. Lee, I think is consistent, and I think he occupies about the position many other people occupy in this country. When he moved that resolution he did not know the terms of the arrangement. When he moved that resolution for keeping the duties on a parity, he meant to raise the Canadian duty to the American duty. While the American duty existed that perhaps appealed to a good many people.

But we have put the duties on a parity, they have disappeared and, to-day there is no duty on our fruit going into the United States any more than there is on the fruit of the Americans coming in here. But later, when he knows the details, Mr. Lee writes an article of a page and a half, in which he points out the advantages of the American market to the Okanagan fruit grower. He says that he understands and knows the details of this arrangement and that he believes it is in the interests of the Okanagan fruit grower. That is the spirit of the Okanagan fruit grower, which I anticipated and hoped for, and which I am glad to find in Mr. Lee, although we did not find it in the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell). Sir, we have in eastern Canada too, fruit growers who seem to be a little afraid. I will only speak in very general terms, but I will say this, that if anybody in the world can raise fruit and succeed in open competition with anybody in a good market, it ought to be the Niagara and Lake Shore fruit growers in Ontario. They have every advantage which their competitors to the south have. They have the advantage of teaching from the Department of Agriculture in Ontario, and the Department of Agriculture here, which is superior to anything that there is in the United States. They have quantity of production, they have every opportunity of co-operation and organization, and I am glad to know that to-day the fruit growers of the province of Ontario are organized and are able to put their fruits on the markets either of the United States or Canada equally well, with the fruit of any other producers. Hitherto they have had the Canadian market alone. The Americans had to pay duty to come in here, and our people had to pay duty to go into the United States. Notwithstanding that duty, our people have sent hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of fruit into the United States markets of Buffalo, and places across the line every year. With a free market, with the opportunity of sending their fruit into Buffalo, down to New York and to other big cities south of the line, they will have an abundant market that will stimulate fruit growing in the Niagara peninsula. I have no doubt that it will do so, and that the result will be an immense increase in the business of fruit growing in this province. We have another fruit growing district in the Annapolis and Cornwallis valleys of Nova Scotia. They send out every year hundreds of thousands of barrels of apples. They have been looking with longing eyes to the New England market, but they have been forced by the United States duties to send all those apples across the Atlantic to the London and other English markets. They can do so still, but they will have in addition, free entry to this great market in the New England States. We know that the quality of Ontario and Nova Scotia fruit, especially apples, is superior to that of the United

States producers, and that our apples, even with the duty, are sought for there, as being the daintiest, prettiest and the most tasteful of any apples that are put upon the American market.

The hon. member for Brandon stated that prices in the United States were lower than they were in Canada. He referred to the tables which have been published by the Labour Department as being most excellent. I thought I had a general table of the prices of products in Great Britain, United States and Canada, but I am not able at this moment to put my hand upon it. The table shows very clearly that the general trend of prices in Canada and the United States, while varying occasionally, is the same, but that as a general rule, the prices of the articles of ordinary life, are higher in the United States than they are in Canada. It is a truth which I wish to impress, that the continental market is better in the United States than it is in Canada, and that if we can get entry into that market we have a better continental market than we have to-day. The same table shows that the general trend of prices of the same articles is lower in Great Britain than it is in the United States and that, therefore, the American market is one that we will be likely to cater for in the future. We will cater for it, because it is the best paying market and for no other reason.

This brings me naturally to the last thing that I am going to say. Hon. gentlemen opposite and their press especially, have talked about this as being a movement which is going to lead to annexation. Perhaps what I have just said with regard to a continental market here, the American market and the English market, may confirm them in that. I have yet to believe that the people of any country are bound to their allegiance, to their King, or to their flag, by any feelings or influences of commercial ties. I do not believe it. I believe that Canada is loyal to herself, to the empire and to the King, from feelings of sentiment, of attachment to the institutions of this country and of the empire, and inspiration from the traditions of the empire, and consequently the people of Canada are proof against any relaxation with regard to their enthusiasm, loyalty or patriotism which might occur, because of any change in commercial relations. I do not believe it, and I do not think that anybody else believes it. They raise this cry and they wave the flag because they think it is going to bring some votes. I cannot imagine for a moment that the hon. member for Brandon thinks that, because a man in the Northwest, or in Ontario, or in Quebec, gets a little higher price from a Yankee for the goods that he sells him, he is going to want to join that Yankee country. On the contrary, the free entrance of commerce into the United States market removes the only possible inducement to annexation. If we were going to be influenced by commercial reasons, the fact that we were shut out from the American market which we find to be the best market, might induce us to ask for annexation, but when we get free entry into that market without annexation, in the name of goodness, why should we think of annexation? Hon. gentlemen opposite did not think of annexation, or at any rate, they pretended that they did not think of it, and they continued to wave the flag when they were asking for reciprocity. Then they did not think it meant annexation. I did not think it would mean annexation then and I do not think that it means annexation now. They have changed their minds, while we have consistently and continuously maintained our confidence in the loyalty and patriotism of the Canadian people.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). What did Edward Blake say?

Mr. FISHER. Edward Blake ; I have dealt with that and I am not going to go back to it now. My hon. friend from Brandon was not so afraid of the Americans a few years ago. Perhaps, if there is one thing more than another that is striking in his political and public career it is the magnificent inauguration and carrying out of the immigration policy into the Canadian northwest. I give him all credit for it. I have always admired what he did, and I know he did it in the true interests of the country, and with an eye to the advancement of Canada. He succeeded beyond expectation, but the striking part of his immigration policy was the campaign in the United States, and the effort directed to bring Americans into our northwest. It was carried on against great obstacles but with magnificent success, and to-day we have in the northwest hundreds of thousands of American-born citizens the great majority of whom, being here only a few years, have sworn allegiance to our King and our institutions, and are to-day good British subjects. That is the kind of annexation we want, and I venture to think that when those former American citizens, knowing that the only difficulty they experienced in settling in our country was exclusion from their old market, find that the barriers are thrown down, they will be followed by tens of thousands of their former friends, and in a few years we will have our northwest more and more filled by that class of immigrants which the member for Brandon over and over again has admitted were the most progressive and intelligent settlers. And why should they not come to Canada? They

tell us they have higher priced lands in the United States ; they say they have harder conditions under which to live ; they say that their labour there costs them more; they say their transportation rates are higher, they say they cannot grow as good crops there; they come to Canada and henceforward they will have the same market exactly as they had before they left their own country. We are removing the last obstacle to the immigration of Americans into our northwest. I suppose some of our friends on the other side of the House may say that the immigration of Americans into the northwest is dangerous, that it is disloyal, that it is improper. I ask them to take the view of their friend the hon. member for Brandon as to that. He has often told us that the American is the best settler in the northwest, because he comes there ready to go to work at once, and he is able to immediately add to the production of the country.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Nobody has ever said anything to the contrary.

Mr. FISHER. No. In that respect I say that this agreement will bring about greater progress, greater trade, greater earnings for the people and consequently greater earnings for our railroads and transportation routes. For a long time we have been developing the St. Lawrence trade route and we have made every endeavour to direct the trade of our own northwest to Montreal and other Canadian ports. Will the lowering of the duty on either side of the line tend to interfere with that? On the contrary I venture to say it will facilitate it, and that in the future the St. Lawrence route will have more of the trade of the northwestern states than ever before. In addition to that, if we get settlers into the northwest who will produce and produce and produce, we will have a great deal more to carry by the St. Lawrence route. I believe that the great St. Lawrence highway is the best route for trade; I am not afraid that any competition will injure it. Our railroads are not afraid. Have we had a scream from the Canadian Pacific railway? No. I saw the other day a paragraph in a paper in which an officer of the Canadian Pacific railway was reported to have said that this arrangement would stimulate immigration into the northwest and increase the value of the land. We all know the Canadian Pacific Railway company has great quantities of land, and we all know that Canadian Pacific railway stock has been going up lately, possibly because of the expected increase in the value of these lands. Sir Donald Mann says he is not afraid of it ; the Grand Trunk Pacific is not afraid of it. Mr. Smithers the president of the Grand Trunk railway in England says he approves of the arrangement and believes it to be a good thing for Canada. And yet, these gentlemen opposite pretend to be very solicitous about the railroad interests of the country. The hon. member for Brandon said that Sir John Macdonald built the Canadian Pacific railway round the north shore of Lake Superior so as to be able to carry Canadian goods through Canada without touching the United States, but the Canadian Pacific railway was built in 1882, 1883, 1884, and 1885, and in 1888 and in 1891 Sir John Macdonald sent to Washington to ask for reciprocity. He evidently thought that the building of the Canadian Pacific railway round the north shore of Lake Superior was no impediment to reciprocity. Sir, we have in this country national aspirations, and the policy of the Liberal party has always been directed towards building the country up. The Liberal government commenced with the British preference in 1897, and we have consistently ever since tried to develop feelings of loyalty to our common country. And, how has this been done? Simply by removing restrictions from the trade, and the enterprise, and the business of our people so that they may develop to the best advantage, so that they may reap all the possible advantages in any market in any country in respect to their outward trade and in their internal trade. A contented people is a loyal people; a prosperous people is a patriotic people. We do not believe for a moment that our patriotism and our loyalty would not stand a strain, but at the same time I would prefer not to put a strain upon it. If we can make the world believe that Canada is a good country to live in, that Canada within the empire is prosperous and successful, we will be doing what is best for the empire and best for ourselves. Does trade interfere with loyalty? These gentlemen opposite say they speak for the manufacturers of Canada, but let me ask what class of our community does the most trade with the United States. Is it the farmers? No. I have here a list of the main items of our imports from the United States and I find among them, anthracite coal, $14,300,000 worth, and products of the forest $7,900,000 worth. Is it disloyal, is it leading to annexation that our manufacturers and railroad people in Ontario should buy their coal from Pittsburg instead of going to Nova Scotia or British Columbia for it?

I do not think so. I think they are quite right in their trade to buy where they can get it best and cheapest. Indian corn, $4,600,000. Our farmers buy that chiefly to feed to their stock. We cannot raise Indian corn for grain to advantage in this country, and our farmers go to the United States and buy that large quantity. Are they disloyal, or tending to annexation by doing that? Nothing of the kind. If trade

leads to annexation and inspires to disloyalty, they must be disloyal. We know they are not. Tobacco, unmanufactured, $3,000,000. Are all the smokers of Canada disloyal? I am not a smoker myself, and, therefore, I am not going to boast about it, but Sir William Macdonald, in Montreal, I believe, imports from the United States nearly all the tobacco he manufactures. He is not a disloyal man. Cotton wool and raw cotton, $9,361,000. Are all our cotton manufacturers in Canada disloyal and tending to annexation, because they buy their raw cotton in the United States instead of going to India and Egypt and buying it from the cotton producers of the empire? I do not think they are disloyal, but, according to the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite, they are. Copper, $2,300,000; wire, $1,250,000; gutta percha, $3,500,000; settlers' effects, $7,300,000. Are we disloyal because we allow settlers to come into the country? Is that tending to annexation in any way, shape or form? My hon. friend from Brandon, through the whole of his administration, exerted his splendid powers to bring all the immigrants into the country he possibly could, and he did not then at any rate believe it tended to annexation. No, Sir; annexation does not follow trade; loyalty does not depend on trade.

Look a little at England's trade. In the last six years she imported from us an average of £18,000,000 and exported to us an average of £15,000,000. As we are a part of the empire, her trade with us no doubt was loyal and anti-annexation, but what did she do with the United States? She imported from the United States £127,000,000, or nearly seven times as much as she did from us, and exported to the United States £47,000,000, or over three times as much as she exported to us. Again, take Germany. Great Britain imported from Germany £55,000,000, or three times what she did from us, and exported to Germany £50,000,000, or three and a quarter times as much as she did to us, Is there any danger that Great Britain is going to be annexed to Germany? Is there any danger that she is going to annex the United States because she trades with them? It is not any accusation of disloyalty against the British merchant and British shipper that he does this enormous trade with Germany and with the United States. Nor is it against us in Canada, equal citizens in the British Empire with the British shipper and merchant—citizens the same as the men of Wales, or Scotland, or Ireland, or England. It is an insult to the Canadian people to say that they will be influenced by the trade of the United States, when our fellow-citizens in the mother land trade with the United States to ten times the amount that we do, and yet are not disloyal and have no tendency to annexation.

My hon. friend says this is not a good enough arrangement for him. I can tell him that it is a good enough arrangement for the government of Canada. It is a good enough arrangement for the people of Canada. It is more than that. The government of the mother land have declared not only that Canada has the right to do this, but that she is wise to do it, and that if it is in her interest, as they seem to believe it is, the better it is for the interest of the whole empire. The government of the mother land represents the mother land. Some hon. gentlemen opposite may question that; some of their friends in England may question that, but I can only say that in the last few years the present government of England has three times appealed to the people of Great Britain and has been sustained by a large majority, and certainly represents the public opinion of the mother country.

I regret that this question has been dragged into the party politics of the mother land by the opposition there, because I think that each part of the empire ought to deal with its own fiscal and other questions on its own merits and in its own yay. I want to leave the people of Great Britain to decide what they will do with their tariff and their other fiscal arrangements as they see fit. I want Canada to do the same. That is the opinion of every man in public life in Canada to-day, and the man who undertook to deny it would go down and out of public life in a very short time. The same is true of Australia, and it is inimical to the best interests of the empire that the arrangements with regard to the domestic concerns of one part of the empire should be dragged into the party politics of another part of the empire.

Sir, I have detained the House at considerable length. I have been obliged, however, partly by the course of the debate, partly by the vast interests that are concerned, and partly by the very widespread effect which this arrangement is going to have on the destinies of the country. I agree that it is an important question. I want to say that it was approached on the part of the government with the utmost care and consideration, viewed from all sides and on all details. There is not one single item in the arrangement the effect of the introduction of which it was not considered with a judicial mind and with reference to all other cognate interests in the country, by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs. It was an international arrangement. As Sir Charles Tupper said in 1888, we may have had to make some concessions. We did make a few concessions. I confess that my only surprise is that we did not have to make

many more to get the free entry of Canadian agricultural products into the great market to the south of us. The reasons, however, are obvious—I will not detain the House with them.

Sir, I appreciate that on a question of this kind it is quite within the judgment of any man to leave his party and divorce himself from his political friends. I believe this arrangement is in exact accord with the general policy of the Liberal party of Canada, that it is in full accord with the Liberal principles which have actuated us in our administration of the affairs of this country. I believe that this arrangement does not in any way materially hurt or injure any class or any industry in the country. I believe that it does give an enormous boon to the agricultural class of the country; and, as it helps them and gives them more markets and more riches, it will affect favourably every interest in Canada. I appreciate, Sir, that my hon. friend from Brandon does not view this arrangement in the same way. He has stated that in consequence of it he is obliged to cut himself off from his former colleagues and friends. Nobody regrets that more than I do. I had anticipated from him the ablest possible statement of the views of those who are opposed to this arrangement. I have no doubt that we heard that this afternoon. I know the hon. member for Brandon well enough to know that there is no man in the Conservative party who can put a case better, abler, more intelligently and more clearly. We have seen what he has done. I can only say that I do not agree with him that any of the arguments or any of the facts that he has put forward called upon him in any way to divorce himself from his former associates and from the party with which he has worked for many years. The thing that we are doing is not in any way antagonistic, but, on the contrary, falls in exactly with the principles in which he has been brought up and which he has followed for many years in his public life—the principles of Liberalism, the principles of freedom, the principles of seeing to the interests of the masses of the community, and at the same time trying, and I think succeeding, in doing no injury to any of the classes or interests in the country, and if the arguments which he has put forward, the details which he has given, have been sufficient to justify him in the course he has taken. I think they will not justify him in the eyes of the great mass of the people of the country, who do not see eye to eye with him and will not follow him in that course.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 10.43 p.m.

Mr FISHER.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 2, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ORDERS DISCHARGED.

Mr. MACDONELL. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that order No. 49, of Public Bills and Orders, for the second reading of Bill (No. 78) to amend the Railway Act, be now called, for the purpose of enabling me to move that it be discharged from the Order Paper, because it is quite obvious that an opportunity will not be afforded me to bring this Bill before the House as long as it remains on Public Bills and Orders, but in the event of the Minister of Railways bringing in an amendment to the Railway Act, I may have an opportunity in that way to bring the matter before the House.

Motion agreed to, and Order discharged accordingly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On behalf of Mr. Beaubarlant, I beg to make the same motion with regard to Order No. 28, for the second reading of Bill (No. 12) to amend the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908.

Motion agreed to, and Order discharged accordingly.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

BONDED FREIGHT IN GUYSBOROUGH.

Mr. MADDIN:

What amount of bonded freight was checked to, or delivered at, during the last ten years, each of the following ports in Guysborough county, N.S., Sonora, Port Hillford, Oyster Ponds and Country Harbour?

Mr. PATERSON. The Department of Customs has not any record of bonded freight checked to or delivered at the places mentioned. Sonora, Port Hillford, Oyster Ponds and Country Harbour are not points on which the manifesting of bonded goods is authorized.

THE CORONATION CONTINGENT.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe):

What rule is being observed in the selection of officers and men for the coronation contingent?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

Attention is directed to a reply given, on the 9th instant, to a similar inquiry. (See

pages 3345 and 3346, unrevised 'Hansard.'

So far, however, as the conditions governing the selection of non-commissioned officers and men are concerned, the following have been added to those already specified:

(a) The non-commissioned officers and men selected are to be chosen from the most efficient companies of infantry regiments, and each representative must be from a different company.

(b) No application from any one who has already taken part in former contingents on such great occasions as the jubilee of the late Queen Victoria, or the coronation of the late King will be considered.

(c) Preference is to be given to those who have served in the field.

THE PETAWAWA CAMP.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew):

1. What branches of the permanent forces and the active militia respectively, will encamp for training at the Petawawa Military Camp during coming season?

2. When will this camp open and what will be the duration of same?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Cavalry, artillery, engineers, infantry and departmental corps.

2. (a) The camp will, in all probability, open about the first week in June.

(b) It is expected that troops will be in camp at Petawawa during the months of June, July and August. The exact duration of the camp has not, as yet, been definitely decided upon.

THE CENSUS.

Mr. MONK:

1. Have the enumerators for the coming census been named?

2. When will the taking of the census begin?

3. When is it expected that the results, as to population, will be known?

4. How many enumerators will or have been named for the city of Montreal?

Mr. FISHER:

1. No.

2. June 1, 1911.

3. About the end of November, 1911.

4. Approximately 300.

WEST INDIES STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. LEWIS:

1 Has the government renewed the contract with Pickford & Black for a fortnightly steamship service from St. John and Halifax to the West Indies?

2. If so, in granting such renewal and subsidy, have Canadian interests been protected and provision made that the mails, passengers and freight will be carried in Canadian bottoms?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Yes, subject to the concurrence of the British government.

2. The contractors are required to employ steamships of British register.

INTERNATIONAL RAILWAY TRAFFIC.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

1. At how many points on the International boundary do United States railways and Canadian railways cross said International boundary, west of Port Arthur and east of Port Arthur, respectively?

2. What is the average distance of the Great Northern railway from the Canadian boundary?

3. Apart from the Great Northern railway, at how many points west of Port Arthur and at how many points east of Port Arthur do United States railways extend to a point within 30 miles of our southern International boundary?

Mr. GRAHAM:

List of railways crossing the International boundary, west of Port Arthur. Canadian railways cross at eight points, United States railways cross at fifteen points, viz.:

Canadian railways:

1. Canadian Northern, at Lake of Woods.
2. " at Rainy River.
3. " at Fort Francis.
4. Canadian Pacific at Emerson.
5. Canadian Pacific at North Portal.
6. Alberta Railway and Irrigation Co., at Coutts.
7. Canadian Pacific at Ginsgak, B.C.
8. Canadian Pacific at Huntingdon, B.C.

United States Railways:

1. Great Northern, at Pembina.
2. " at Gretna.
3. " at Wakeham.
4. " at Bannerman.
5. " at Gateway, B.C.
6. " at Bedlington, B.C
7. " at Waneta, B.C.
8. "
9. " at Laurier, B.C.
10. " at Carson, B.C.
11. " at Ferry, B.C.
12. " at Molson, B.C.
13. " at Chopeka, B.C.
14. " at Huntingdon, B.C.
15. " at Blaire, B.C.

List of railways east of Port Arthur. Canadian railways cross at 23 points, United States railways cross at one point.

Canadian Railways:

1. Grand Trunk railway at Sarnia.
2. Grand Trunk railway at Windsor.
3. Canadian Southern at Amherstburg.
4. Grand Trunk railway at Fort Erie.
5. Canadian Southern at Fort Erie.
6. Grand Trunk railway at Niagara Falls.
7. Canadian Southern at Niagara Falls.
8. Ottawa and New York at Cornwall.
9. Grand Trunk railway at Dundee.

10. St. Lawrence and Adirondack at or near Kelso.
11. Grand Trunk railway at Mooer's.
12. Grand Trunk railway at Rouses Point.
13. Quebec, Montreal and Southern at Noyan.
14. Rutland and Noyan, at Noyan Junction.
15. Canadian Pacific at Abercorn, Quebec.
16. Canadian Pacific at Mansonville, P.Q.
17. Massawippi Valley at Stanstead Junction.
18. Grand Trunk railway at Stanhope.
19. Hereford railway at Conaus Mills.
20. Canadian Pacific at Lowelltown.
21. Canadian Pacific at Aroostook, N.B.
22. Canadian Pacific at Debec Junction.
23. Canadian Pacific at Vanceboro, N.B.

United States Railways:

1. Washington County near Princeton. Passes for five miles over Canadian territory in the province of New Brunswick.

The department has no official information to answer questions numbers 2 and 3. They relate to matters entirely within the United States.

SHIPPING IN GUYSBOROUGH COUNTY.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

What is the number of vessels arriving at and departing from the following ports in Guysborough county, N.S., during the year ending March 31, 1910, viz.:—Sonora, Port Hillford, Country Harbour, and Isaac's Harbour; and what is the registered tonnage of such vessels?

Mr. PATERSON:

Isaac's Harbour and Country Harbour—Vessels arrived, 246; tonnage, 40,790; vessels departed 252; tonnage, 42,260.

Port Hillford—Vessels arrived, 112; vessels departed, 113.

Sonora—Vessels arrived, 9; departed, 9.

Port Hillford and Sonora, being preventive stations but not outports, the tonnage of vessels arriving and departing is not given in the Trade and Navigation tables.

IMPORTS OF EGGS.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew):

1. How many eggs were imported into Canada from foreign countries during the last fiscal year, and the present fiscal year to date, respectively?
2. What quantity of the above were imported from each country, respectively?

Mr. PATERSON:

1 and 2. The quantity of eggs imported into Canada, by countries, during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1910, and the ten months ended January 31, 1911, respectively, was as follows:

	Fiscal year ended March 31, 1910. Dozen.	Ten months ended Jan. 31, 1911. Dozen.
Great Britain... ..	7,226	12,040
Hong Kong..	41,245	52,739
China..	87,075	29,129
France..	9	.....
Germany..	.....	48,000
Japan..	453	125
United States... ..	757,316	341,916
Total..	893,324	483,949

RECIPROCITY—PULP AND PAPER.

Mr. PERLEY:

Is the alteration in the pulp and paper schedule of the reciprocity arrangement, as passed by the United States House of Representatives, one that is permissible and satisfactory to the government under the tentative agreement made between the government of the United States and the government of Canada?

Mr. FIELDING:

The pulp and paper item in the schedule has not been altered by the Bill which has passed the House of Representatives. There was an obvious error in the drafting of the Bill as respects that item. The error has been corrected and the Bill as passed is in accord with the agreement in that behalf.

PAPERS ASKED FOR.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called. I want to ask the attention of the Minister of Finance. The papers in respect to the Farmers' Bank have been brought down, and I supposed that the motion was broad enough to have covered another piece of information that I wanted to get, but it was not among the papers, and the Finance Minister may not have thought it necessary to include it. What I would like to have is a rescript of the meeting of the Treasury Board on the 30th of November, 1906, and the names of the components of the Treasury Board at that time—that is, the whole minutes.

Mr. FIELDING. I see no objection.

APPLAUSE IN THE GALLERIES.

Mr. J. D. REID. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the government to a letter in the Ottawa 'Citizen' of this morning, which reads as follows:

Editor Citizen.—I understand now that it is a rule of the House of Commons that strangers in the public gallery shall not signify their approval of the sentiments of a speaker on the floor. Yesterday I went up to hear Mr. Sifton on the reciprocity question. His observations appealed to me as a patriotic Canadian and I forcibly desired to manifest my appreciation and did so, although quite unaware at the time that I was infring-

ing a House rule. For my action I was escorted from the gallery by the Sergeant-at-Arms and a Dominion policeman, an honour which I appreciated. My object in writing at this time is to invoke your good offices to secure the posting of notices prominently in the gallery warning those, who like myself up to yesterday, may not know about this rule that applause is forbidden.—PETER GLAVEY, 37½ York street.

I understand that this gentleman is a respectable citizen of Ottawa. There is nothing to show that the officials in charge in the galleries are different from any other persons, in the way of uniform or anything of that kind, and I think the government should take some steps to carry out the wishes of this gentleman so that there will not be such an occurrence again. I understand that this gentleman said that had the Sergeant at Arms, or any one else whom he knew to be an official, requested him not to do it, he would have obeyed their request. It is certainly to be regretted that a gentleman should be expelled from the House when he did not know the rules. Therefore I would ask the Prime Minister to see that in future any one in the galleries who happens to make a mistake of that kind should not be expelled, but requested to remain and hear the discussion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend knows that this is a matter which is not at all under the control of the government, but under the control of the Speaker and the officers of the House. But it is a well known rule that no expression of approbation or disapprobation in the gallery is allowed.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE BUILDING SITE.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia and of the government to a despatch in the Ottawa 'Citizen' of this morning. It has been reported that there have been some negotiations with reference to the government of Manitoba acquiring the land adjoining the legislative buildings, so that they might erect new buildings. The present buildings are somewhat out of date, and in order to get a proper site, the Manitoba government would like to acquire the land at present occupied by the old barracks. The despatch from Winnipeg is as follows:

Winnipeg, Man., March 1.—The proposal to secure the Fort Osborne barracks site, which adjoins the present parliament buildings, to permit of the building of a new legislative hall has been abandoned for the time.

Representations had been made to the Minister of Militia with a view to the government purchasing the property. Replies to this request were read in the House to-day by Hon. Robert Rogers, stating that the Dominion government asks $1,000,000 for the property and does not want to vacate until 1915. Mr. Rogers said that the price asked was four or five times the value of the site and that it was out of the question.

It seems to me that in these negotiations the Crown, as trustee in the right of the Dominion, is pinching the Crown as trustee for the province of Manitoba, and I am pleased to give the hon. minister an opportunity to remove any such impression, or to emphasize my impression of them that they will pinch everything in sight !

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The question is very easily answered. The Militia Department has its barracks and drill hall in Winnipeg situated on ground very near the parliament buildings. I understand that the government of Manitoba wish to extend their buildings as they find the present accommodation insufficient. A few weeks ago the Hon. Mr. Rogers, member of the Manitoba government, called to see me, and asked if we would be willing to sell our holdings so as to enable the government of Manitoba to make this extension. I replied that certainly we would be glad to do anything in our power to facilitate that extension, and that I would personally take the matter up. I asked him what price he would be willing to pay. He said he did not know, but the government of Manitoba would be willing to pay the value. I then sent an officer to inspect, as the case seemed to be urgent, and estimate the value. That officer returned about three weeks ago, and after consulting my colleagues in council I sent a communication to the government of Manitoba to the effect that we had had the property valued, and that the Dominion government would be prepared to accept a fair valuation, namely $1,000,000. It is only right, perhaps, that I should add, as a special answer to my hon. friend, who has intimated that there was some desire to pinch somebody, that our selling that property would necessitate a rebuilding of extensive barracks at or near Winnipeg, and also the purchase of land in Winnipeg, and the building of a new drill hall. All this would cost just about the amount of money that we ask for that property. The property is satisfactory to us to-day and we do not want to change it, but are willing to sell in order to suit the convenience of the Manitoba government.

EXCLUSION OF COLOURED ALIENS.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) a moment to a representation I received from some coloured constituents of mine, inclosing a clipping from a newspaper which I had better read:

UNITED STATES NEGROES BARRED.

Winnipeg, Man., Feb. 24.—The Dominion government has decided to prohibit the im-

migration of negroes from the United States and stopped at the boundary a party that wanted to go to western Canada. The negroes were turned back because they were regarded as undesirable citizens.

I may say that my correspondents do not object to coloured people being turned back if turned back for other than racial considerations only, and my object in bringing this to the notice of the Minister of the Interior is to ascertain why these particular individuals were turned back—whether because of racial considerations, or because they were undesirable citizens for other reasons.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot, of course, give a specific answer because I have no knowledge of the case alluded to, and have not had the time or opportunity to acquaint myself with the facts, but I can assure my hon. friend that there are no instructions issued by the Immigration Branch of my department which will exclude any man on account of his race or colour except in such specific cases as are provided for by statute or agreement laid on the table.

Mr. DANIEL. Perhaps the hon. minister will find out the exact cause and give later a specific answer.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MONK. There are some delayed returns to which I would call the attention of the government. There was an order of the House on the 5th of December last for a statement of the expenditures made out of the money voted by parliament last year for the navy. I would like to have this as soon as possible. There was also an order of the House of the 7th of December for a copy of the report of the Imperial Defence Committee of the Privy Council in England concerning the defence of the empire. That has been communicated to the dependencies, and I would like to have it on the table here as soon as possible. There was further an order of the House on the 6th of February for a copy of the declaration of London, and of the proceedings of the International Naval Conference at London. Outside of these there were two orders of the 23rd of January for documents and data connected with the concession of the Beauharnois canal. I would like to have these as soon as possible.

THE RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to call the attention of the Finance Minister to the message sent by President Taft in reply to a request from the Senate, in which statistics are given as to the different items affected by the schedule in the agreement now under discussion. These statistics include the prices of various commodities such as beef, pork, butter, &c., in Canada and the United States for a series of years, and especially for the last year. In reply to the request the President sent down a list which gave the exact information required by the Senate. During this discussion each one of us has had his own trouble in finding out what the prices were in the two countries. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he has prepared, as no doubt he has, this statistical data, especially as regards the prices in the two countries, and if he will lay the information on the table. It is absolutely important that we should have it if we are to properly understand what we are doing, and I do not see why this House should not have it as well as the United States Senate and Congress.

Mr. FIELDING. I understand the hon. gentleman refers to some statistics moved for in the United States Congress and in due course brought down. Of course we have no access to these any more than my hon. friend has himself. I presume they are now United States official documents which in due course will reach us, but we have no information in reference to them more than he has, that is what is in the public press. As to any such comparison on this side, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) gave extended comparisons and was willing to give more but objection was taken. I presume we could still have them.

Mr. FOSTER. What I want is not what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) or any other minister collates, but the absolute certainty which was used by the government in the negotiations and which we ought to have in order to form our opinions properly with reference to the measure.

Mr. FIELDING. Of course we had to use our own sources of information and hon. gentlemen who criticise the agreement will have to do likewise. We will be happy to give the hon. gentleman any documents. The particular class of information he desires was spoken of by the Minister of Agriculture, a member of the government and he desired to put it on 'Hansard', but objection was taken, otherwise it would be now in the possession of my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not seem that that answers my question. There are certain rules of debate, one is that we cannot hand in a statement and have it published without reading it, but surely the government itself ought to lay on the table of the House for the information of all members of the House these statistics to aid towards forming a good judgment. For instance what are the prices of pork, wheat and these other commodities in these other countries? On that depends the argument pro or con, and as it is we have simply

been bandying statements one with the other. In the United States the government brings down authentic data.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a generally understood rule that one cannot put on 'Hansard' anything that is not read, but that rule is violated frequently and by no one more frequently than the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who very frequently asks that some statement he has in his hand should be included in 'Hansard'; and I do not think objection has ever been taken, so that rule should hardly have been cited to prevent the Minister of Agriculture from giving information.

Mr. FOSTER. Since the minister has brought that up I challenge him—

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid I cannot allow a discussion at this point. Perhaps in going into Supply—

Mr. FOSTER. Then may I correct a statement by the minister? He says I have frequently asked to have statements which I have not read inserted in 'Hansard'. I deny that and I challenge proof.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think the matter of sufficient importance to either my hon. friend or myself that we should worry about it, but I am speaking from memory. I have read statements partly in the House and by common consent had them placed in 'Hansard' and my recollection is that the hon. gentleman has done likewise. If he says not I leave the House to consider it and I shall not trouble to hunt through 'Hansard'.

Mr. FOSTER. But will you bring down the statement?

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Agriculture, now that it has been desired, will give that valuable information which he tried to give the other night but was prevented.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the Prime Minister propose to go on with the debate on the reciprocity proposal to-morrow or to go into Supply?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take Supply to-morrow.

WAYS AND MEANS—VENTILATION OF GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. J. B. BLACK (Hants). Before going into committee, I wish to speak on a subject of great importance, the sanitary condition of this chamber, of the rooms provided for the members of this House and the rooms that are provided for the different departmental offices. This is an old subject I know, it has been brought up in this House every session since I have been here and very little has been done in the way of improvement. I notice that there is more air coming into this House—I do not mean hot air, but there is more cold air coming into this House than there was four or five years ago, but we are far from proper conditions, and from the conditions to which we are entitled. We are obliged to sit in this room from 3 o'clock till 6 and again from 8 o'clock to anywhere towards morning. Before sitting in this room most of us go into committee rooms which are worse than this room. We sit for ten or twelve hours a day in rooms in which there is not sufficient fresh air to keep a man in good health. This room has never had a ray of sunlight cast into it since it was built in 1867, I presume for the stained glass was there then and is there now. Any one who has studied the necessity of sunlight to human health must know that we are suffering from this room not being purified by sunlight. Sunlight is the great microbe killer, microbes have been gathering in this room ever since confederation and no sunlight has ever come in to purify it. I am not joking, this is far too serious a matter for any of us to joke about. Younger men may stand this, but the older members will agree with me in saying that they never go home in as good health as they come up here in the autumn. I hate to allude to a personal matter but for myself I break down before the term is over every session. I do not know that the sunlight can be properly let into this room but if it cannot let us get a room somewhere else where it can. A man may have to sacrifice his business, sacrifice his financial affairs for the service to his country, but the day of human sacrifice has gone long ago and I do not think we should sacrifice our lives or our health for the benefit of our country. For one I am not prepared to do it if it can be avoided.

The committee rooms in which we are obliged to work are in a far worse condition than this room. If any one will go say 25 minutes late into the committee rooms, No. 30, No. 32, and No. 34 and pause a moment at the door, he will find that the condition of the air can only be expressed by one word—and I do not wish to use slang—that is the word rotten. In 20 minutes those rooms are foul, too foul for men to remain in and yet we have to remain there a couple of hours. There is no system of proper ventilation. In the addition built to this building and occupied in the autumn of 1908, we had some hope that some modern sanitary engineer would have had some supervision in the matter of providing fresh air for the members there, but the provision in those rooms is worse than in the older rooms, there is no pro-

vision at all. There is more attention paid to fresh air in the wigwam of a wild indian than there is in any of these rooms. I do my work in No. 76, which is a fair sample of other rooms. When I arrived in it in autumn of 1908 it had a double window, and the fanlight over the door was closed up, closed forever, I suppose. The room was hermetically sealed, and four men were expected to breath that air over and over again for hours in the day, and in the night. Any member who has gone to the different departments, as most of us on this side of the House are forced to do that disagreable work, must have noticed that there is no improvement there either. Now these are very serious matters affecting our health, and though we talk of them year after year, nothing is done. I would respectfully suggest to the government that these buildings be put under the supervision and care of a sanitary engineer, who shall make the necessary changes, and put the buildings in a first-class condition, such as is required by the up to date knowledge of the laws of health. It may cost a little money, but there is no reason why it should not be done.

Another fault I have to find is that this House in all parts of it is overheated, fuel is wasted to the detriment of our health. There is no thermometer in any room I know of occupied by a member of the House; if other hon. gentlemen have one in their room, they have the advantage over me and those who occupy the same room with me. There should be a thermometer in every room, and proper ventilation should be established. In asking for these things I do not think we are asking for more than we are entitled to.

Now, while I am on my feet, I wish to say a few words about the typhoid epidemic in Ottawa, and about what I consider is the duty of the government in respect thereto. The government, I think, is the largest purchaser of drinking water in the city of Ottawa. I have been given to understand that there are between 3,000 and 4,000 people living in Ottawa who are employed by the government in its various services; no doubt, including the members of parliament and the civil service, there must be as many as 4,000; but I speak subject to correction. I say that these people should have a supply of wholesome water. We are now drinking boiled water in some of the departments. There is no reason why this government, interested as it is in the water supply of Ottawa, should not demand that a supply of pure drinking water be furnished to all connected with the government. There is another reason why the government should interfere in connection with this typhoid epidemic, and that is because the city council of Ottawa has established beyond doubt its incapacity to cope with this matter. For two years and more, and I lay stress on the 'more,' the water of Ottawa has been contaminated. Sample after sample has been tested and has been found to contain typhoid baccilli. If there were any doubt where the contamination originated, if there were any doubt that there is poison in the water, it would be another question. But we know two things for certain: First, that the people of Ottawa are being poisoned, secondly, we know where the poison comes from. Now what has been done to stop the source of supply of this poison? A scientific man comes along any says: If you will take water from some other place where the water is still, the poison will settle down at the bottom and you won't get much of it. Another says: If you put hypochloride of lime in the water it will kill many of these poisonous germs. That is what I call tinkering with a very serious matter. If it were a matter that merely affected our convenience or our comfort, it would be far less serious, but this is a matter that affects our health and our lives. I maintain that the city council of Ottawa have failed for two years or more to take any steps to prevent the poisoning of the people. As I have said, the government is one of the largest purchasers of drinking water, and contributes a large amount of money to pay for it, therefore I contend that the government are justified in taking a hand in this matter and seeing that we are supplied with pure water.

There is another thing I want to mention besides the water, and that is the ice that is supplied us. I have been assured in our dining-room upstairs that the water has been boiled while the waiter puts ice in the water, which of course has not been boiled. But the health officer comforts us with the assurance which I have seen in a paper, and I was astonished to read it, that this ice is perfectly pure, and that we may safely put it in our drinking water. Now I would be loath to set up my opinion against that of the medical health officer of Ottawa, or the health officer for the province of Ontario, or any other gentleman who is a specialist in that matter, though I have given some years of time and some study to the question of public health and sanitation. On this subject of the pollution of ice, I have in my hand one of the best authors on sanitation in the world, Sedgwick, from whom I ask permission to quote a few words:

THE POLLUTION OF ICE.

The processes of harvesting natural ice, and of delivering it to the consumer, still leave much to be desired. The use of horses whose droppings fall on the ice during the 'ploughing' or cutting of the ice-fields; the un-

cleanly habits of the workmen employed; the floating of the blocks through less pure, or actually polluted water, on their way to the ice-houses; their storage, often in a packing of old and dirty hay or sawdust; and their final deliverey into family, club or hotel refrigerators by common workmen after only hasty brushing with some ancient cloth or broom,—these conditions illustrate the need of improvement.

There are a great many reasons why ice taken from Nepean bay is not fit for use. In the first place, Nepean bay is the spot where it is estimated most of the poison lies. Water, in freezing, of course, precipitates a large percentage of the bacilli. The ice is purer than the water but under certain conditions the bacilli cannot all be removed by the freezing process. For instance, we will take Nepean bay——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

An hon. MEMBER. Do not mind them.

Mr. BLACK. I am not minding them; I notice that some of them know more about whisky than they do about water. In the process of freezing a large percentage of the bacilli is precipitated. It was at Cave creek at Mechanicsville that some of the water flowed over the ice from Mechanicsville, and in that way the ice was contaminated. As a result of raising the water by stop logs the water overflowed the ice, then it froze on the ice and there was no possible way that there could be any bacilli precipitated at all, but it froze in and on the ice. Over this ice horses are travelling hauling logs, and men are working. I believe the government is storing some of this ice down at government house and next winter when we go down there to dine with the Duke of Connaught, we will be asked to drink water chilled with Nepean bay impure ice.

There seems to be one short piece of cure-all advice given to the people—boil the water. I have read these three words in every town in which there has been typhoid. Many people have taken typhoid by following that rule—boil the water. Boil the water you drink! I say boil the water you drink, boil the water you clean your teeth with, be sure to have the water boiled that the dishes are washed in, and boil the milk pitcher every time. I suppose there are many people in Ottawa who have been following that short direction to boil the water that they are drinking and neglecting to boil it for anything else. The consequence is that some of them have taken typhoid out of their porridge plate which has never been washed in boiled water.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. BLACK. Yes, it will be carried in time. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are not only guilty of standing idly by and not preventing our own water from being poisoned, but we are sending the poison down to our neighbours. Ottawa is polluting the drinking water of Rockland, while Aylmer and Mechanicsville are polluting the water that we drink. It is time that some intelligent process was adopted to stop the drinking of poisoned water. Science shows where it has been done and is being done, but the process of dumping sewage into our drinking water is too barbarous for intelligent people to put up with. Ottawa is one of the most beautiful cities in Canada, and you will pardon me if I say one of the most unhealthy cities.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. BLACK. That gentleman that drinks whisky still wants it carried. The government is contributing a large amount of money every year to beautify the city, and is beautifying it. Now, I think that in the ordinary way of common sense the government should contribute to the health of the city. I have some figures here which will probably astonish some of us. In the city of Ottawa there were born last year, to the 31st October, 1910, 2,100 children. Ninety per cent of those should have lived. Of those born 626 died, or nearly 32 per cent of all the children born in Ottawa up to that date died. This is the highest rate of mortality among infants in any city in the world where statistics are kept. So much for the conditions.

Now, I would beg leave respectfully to make another suggestion; that is that the government which contributes so much to the city of Ottawa, should appoint either a properly qualified officer of public health, or a commission, to assist the city of Ottawa in providing proper water for its citizens. If the city refuses such assistance withdraw the amount which is being paid to it for the beautifying of Ottawa. That is conservation, I think, of a most important type —the conservation of the lives and health of our people.

Before I sit down I want to say one thing more. I want to say that if the government had done what I think they should have done they would have formed a bureau of public health some years ago whose duty it would have been to have enlightened the people in such a way that they would avoid all these useless and needless epidemics. It is either ignorance or carelessness—usually both—that allows such epidemics to begin. If our people were properly educated, if the council of Ottawa, or the council of Montreal had had sufficient education with regard to the laws of health and in the proper way of preventing epidemics in their cities we would not have 1,400 cases of typhoid in the city of Ottawa to-day. I am told by a citizen who

knows that there are at least that many in the town although there are only 800 or 900 cases reported. Of course we may be told, as I have been told, that public health belongs to the provinces, that we should not interfere, and that there are grave difficulties in the way. I know there are difficulties in the way of every reform, and I know there are lions in the way in every path we do not wish to follow, and the sons of Anak live in every country we do not want to go into. But if we consider it the duty of the government to conserve the health of the people as well as to conserve the resources of our forests and our water-powers these difficulties will be swept aside and there will be spread among the people knowledge of how to live and how to do away with the useless and sad amount of sickness there is in Canada. We have medical officials enough under the government; you run across them in nearly every department. There is one in the Department of Agriculture, one in the Immigration Department, one in the Marine Department, one in the Railway Department and probably others.

Mr. TALBOT. One in the Militia Department.

Mr. BLACK. There are several in the Militia Department ; they are as thick as bees there. I believe that all these scattered forces should be brought together, and a central bureau of public health established, which, if it distributed literature bearing on the subject would result in great benefit to the people at large. I repeat that there should be a sanitary engineer to take charge of the sanitary condition of these buildings, and, I believe that the government should assist in measures to put down this epidemic of typhoid and to prevent its ever recurring in Ottawa.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Black) has pointed out that the committee rooms are in a very unsanitary condition, and that has been known to us for years past. But, something might be done by the members themselves to improve the conditions. I have often experienced a good deal of discomfort as others have, I have no doubt, because of the unfortunate habit which many members have of smoking in the room. To begin with the ventilation is not good, and before you are long in the room it is much like a place where they smoke meat. This habit is not businesslike, it is not courteous to others, and it does not contribute to health. It seems to me that some one who is responsible for it should have an understanding that smoking would be stopped in the committee rooms in future. As to the water supply, it seems to me that in view of the large sum of money the government is paying for water supplied to the government buildings we should at least have some better method of determining what kind of water we are drinking. The government have their own chemists, analysts and bacteriologists, and why do they not from time to time have the water tested? The government might even go further, and, adopting the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. Black) join with the health authorities of the city in ascertaining the source of pollution and adopting means to secure pure water. I do not think the government will be doing its full duty unless it does that.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I have no doubt that the House and the citizens of Ottawa will appreciate the action of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) in bringing this matter to our attention. His remarks will no doubt be published, and I trust they will receive careful consideration from the municipal authorities. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is disposed to think that the government has omitted to do its duty but I do not think we can do more than we have done. At the request of my department the water has been analyzed by experts.

Mr. SPROULE. How often?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Often enough to know that it is of a very suspicious character, and that it contains matter which is likely to be detrimental to the public health. The evidence we have is sufficient to satisfy us that no man, woman or child is safe in drinking the crude water from the Ottawa river, and that the only safe thing is to have it boiled or sterilized. We are furnishing sterilized water for the members of this House and the employees in this building. I have given directions to have that water analyzed from week to week, and the report we have is that the bacilli have been destroyed and that it is safe to drink it. But no water from the river Ottawa can safely be drunk unless it is either boiled or sterilized. My hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Black) has said that water cannot be made safe by boiling it.

Mr. BLACK. I beg your pardon, I did not say that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I misunderstood my honourable friend, the late Dr. Bayard, one of the most eminent physicians in Canada, who resided in St. John, was of the opinion that water otherwise unsafe would be rendered safe by boiling, and he made it a practice to boil the water he used and to advise his patients to do likewise. I should think that the only thing for the city of Ottawa to do is to obtain its water supply from a different source, and the only safe source I would suppose would be found in the mountainous district in the vicinity of the Gatineau. I am told there are opportunities there for obtaining

an abundant supply of the purest water. Speaking for my department as representing the government, and having charge of this matter, I would be most happy to co-operate in any way possible in inducing the authorities of the city of Ottawa to proceed towards obtaining a supply from that source. The only thing that we can do is to agree on the amount that we would pay for an annual supply. It is our duty to obtain a safe supply for the members of parliament and the employees of the government, and the only way to obtain it is to have the water brought from a different source. I trust that the council of the city of Ottawa will move along in the direction which I am told they are contemplating, and will soon take steps to obtain a supply from that source.

With regard to the ventilation of this chamber, I want to express my disagreement entirely with the statement of my hon. friend from Hants. I think this chamber is well ventilated when the fans are being operated. There are sometimes hundreds of people sitting on this floor and in the gallery, and my experience of other rooms which have been filled with people compared with this chamber is that the atmosphere here is very good. With regard to the committee rooms, there is no doubt that if a modern system of ventilation had been installed when the building was erected it would have been better. It is difficult, after a building has been constructed, to install a proper system of ventilation. I have asked the chief architect to do everything possible to improve the ventilation, and I will make it my business to convey to him the suggestions of my hon. friend, which I believe are valuable.

Mr. BLACK. May I ask why there was no attempt made to ventilate the new building that was finished in 1908?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that the new building, with the exception of finishing the interior, was built before I became minister. I had nothing to do with the plans for it, and, therefore, at this moment I do not know why it was that the chief architect did not design a modern system of ventilation for those rooms.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I am very much in sympathy with the remarks made by the hon. member for Hants. I understood him to say that the water which the members and employees in this building have been drinking has been made as pure as it can possibly be made, but I would like to ask the minister whether it is true, as reported, that in all the departments of this government the employees are compelled to drink the ordinary tap water. If that is the case, I think it is high time, under the conditions at present existing in Ottawa, that the government took some steps towards remedying that state of things.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that the matter of taking care of the departmental buildings does not rest with my department, but with the Department of Finance, which, under a curious rule, which has been in existence, I suppose, ever since confederation, employs the charwomen who look after the departmental buildings. Some time ago I gave directions that the water to be supplied should be sterilized, and asked my deputy minister to have a conference with the Deputy Minister of Finance on the subject. I will inquire whether the necessary steps have been taken to furnish sterilized water in the different departmental buildings.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). Mr. Speaker, I am free to say that I rise with considerable diffidence to address this committee on the very important question which is before us for consideration. I feel somewhat diffident, in the first place, by reason of the fact that what I propose to do in connection with this resolution is at variance with the views of those people with whom I have always been associated politically, and, in the second place, I feel that it is impossible for me to approach, much less reach, that high standard of oratory and argument which was set by the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), who spoke on this question on Tuesday last. But, Sir, notwithstanding that I feel my inability to discuss this matter with the clearness that I would like, I feel it my duty to my constituents, to the party to which I have always belonged, and to myself, to give my reasons for the course which I propose to pursue. I apprehend that it will be generally conceded that I have always been a pretty strong party supporter. I might say that politically I was cradled in the lap of Liberalism and nursed on the essence of the 'Globe' newspaper, and it is rather difficult to get away from the influences of those infantile exercises; but, Sir, it appears to me that this is a question of sufficient importance to make every man in this country stop and consider carefully not only his position politically, but what he should do in the best interest of the country at large, and that, Sir, is my position to-day. I am in rather a peculiar position on this question. I first contested the county of Welland in the interest of the Liberal party for the Dominion parliament in 1891, and as I was elected by a majority of about 500 against

one of the strongest men at that time in the Conservative party, the late Dr. John Ferguson, and was elected on the issue of reciprocal trade with the United States as against the National Policy of the Conservative party, it may be asked why change now? I hope to prove that I am not changing from my position as a supporter of the principles of the Liberal party. In 1891 the policy of the Liberal party was strongly for reciprocity; it was unrestricted reciprocity—commercial union—and why? I am free to say that I did not altogether like the proposition, but it was the party policy; I was the candidate of the party, and I argued as well as I could in favour of that policy. But conditions were different then from what they are to-day. At that time business was depressed and everything was stagnant. When the National Policy was inaugurated the cry was sent out that it would be the cause of the erection of tall chimneys and big smoke stacks throughout the land. That was the cry in the county of Welland, which I have had the honour of representing in the local legislature and this House during the last 20 years. That was the cry of Dr. Ferguson and of his predecessor, the late Christopher Bunting, but after 13 or 14 years' experience of that policy, we had no smokestacks, no chimneys, no factories in Welland county, and no home market.

Mr. PATERSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. GERMAN. And the farmers at that time in that county, Conservatives though they were, were willing to adopt almost any panacea for the evils which then existed, and they approved and supported the then policy of the Liberal party, namely, unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Well, the Liberal party did not succeed in that election. In 1896, however, they did succeed, but not on that cry of unrestricted reciprocity. That policy was considerably modified. I was interested on Tuesday night to hear the hon. Minister of Agriculture say that personally he was pleased that the Liberal party had not succeeded in 1891. Why he did not feel any degree of satisfaction at the defeat of the Liberal party in 1891 must have been due to the fact that he disapproved entirely of the policy which that party then advocated. Otherwise there could be no reason for his satisfaction at its defeat. I presume he felt that if his party had succeeded in 1891, it would have been forced to endeavour at any rate to put on our statutes a law which would bring about unrestricted reciprocity, and he did not like to go that far. Nor do I believe that, down in their hearts, the Liberals at that time throughout Canada really wanted to go that far.

Mr. GERMAN.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GERMAN. In 1896 the Liberal party did succeed, but happily in that year the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) went throughout the length and breadth of the country gathering information and ascertaining the ideas of the business people and of the farmers as to what should be the correct policy to adopt as the fiscal policy of Canada. Having gathered that information intelligently, thoroughly and exhaustively, the Minister of Finance made his budget speech in 1897, and in that speech declared for moderate protection and a stable tariff. After having listened to all the delegations and deputations that desired to be heard, the government came to parliament and said: We will stand by—if not the National Policy as then existing—at any rate a modified form of the National Policy—and very little modified at that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GERMAN. I am here to say that I do not agree altogether with my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) in all his remarks, nor do I agree with the gentleman who preceded me in this debate, in opposition to the resolution, in all they have said. There is one suggestion to which I take particular exception, and that is the suggestion that reciprocity will bring about annexation. I do not believe that, should this agreement come into force, it will either lead to the annexation of Canada to the United States or create any very great sentiment in Canada in that direction. I am a British subject, but I am dealing constantly with United States citizens, as is nearly every other Canadian. These dealings, however, have never led me to wish to see our country annexed to the United States, and I do not think that I or anybody else has the right to impugn the motives of his fellow-citizens or to say that because they have dealings with our neighbours across the line that will change their hearts and alter their allegiance to the British Empire. I believe that loyalty is founded on something more substantial than commercialism and more enduring than dollars and cents. But having said that, I think I have said about all that can give any consolation to my hon. friends around me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GERMAN. As I have said, the Liberal party, in the first budget speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), adopted and approved of certainly the policy of protecting our industries. I do not think that the Finance

Minister will deny that. Why, I have heard my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) saying to the Conservatives, in those dulcet tones in which he is accustomed to address the public: Why, you say that we have adopted your policy, but even admitting that we did, we have been able to administer that policy for the benefit of the country, which you were unable to do. That was his plea, and I rather cheered my hon. friend when making it, and I think that the Liberals are entitled to take credit for having administered the fiscal policy of this country in such a way as to create the great prosperity we have had in the last fourteen years. What do we find? We find that in 1898 the Finance Minister followed up his statement of 1897 and in 1899 he reiterated it that the policy for Canada must be a protective policy and a stable tariff. He made that emphatic and strong, and I believe, Sir, that it was the very fact that the business people of this country found by reason of the statements of the Finance Minister that the Liberal party as well as the Conservative party in this country stood by a fair moderate protective tariff and a stability of tariff that brought about the business conditions we have had here lately. Now, Sir, we find that in 1899 the Prime Minister made a statement in this House after the reciprocal negotiations had been gone on with at Washington, the Liberal party having carried out the pledge which they had made, and I believe honestly endeavoured to secure reciprocal trade with the United States. They were given the cold shoulder, they were turned from the doors of the administration building in Washington, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier stated in 1899:

> If we know the hearts and minds of our people at present, I think I am not making too wide a statement when I say that the general feeling in Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians would have given many things to obtain the American market, there was a time not long ago, when the market of the great cities of the Union was the only market we had for any of our products. But thank Heaven, these days are past and over now. We are not dependent upon the American market as we were at one time.

I approved of those sentiments, and I will state to the right hon. the Prime Minister that in my opinion the hearts of Liberals throughout the Dominion of Canada throbbed with pride and beat high with expectant hope that from thence on and forever, our leaders were to be free from all entanglements with the United States. That was emphasized by the Prime Minister at the manufacturers banquet in Montreal in November, 1901. As reported in the Montreal 'Gazette' he stated that he would send no more reciprocity delegations to Washington. He said : It is possible they may come to us, if they do, we will teach them the lesson they have taught us, and we shall treat them with all politeness. Sir, I know the right hon. gentleman would treat them with all politeness, but has he taught them the lesson they taught us, namely that they wanted no reciprocal trade relations with them at the present time.

It is said, and some of my friends have told me, that I am deserting my party. Well, Sir, what is a political party? It is an aggregation of men in this country who unite on some principle which they wish to see embodied in law and which they believe will be to the best interests and the best welfare of Canada. That is the policy of the party as enunciated in 1899 and in 1901. In 1900 I resigned my seat in the local legislature at Toronto which I had held for six years, representing the county of Welland, to contest the county of Welland, and to contest it on what? Not Sir, on any reciprocal arrangement with the United States, but on the policy as laid down by the Prime Minister that there were to be no more negotiations with Washington. I so informed the people, and I further informed them that I was delighted to stand before them and say that the Liberal view was to look to the British Empire for our inspiration, and not to look to Washington, that we had made an honest effort to secure reciprocity, but that the United States government refused to consider our proposition, and that the Prime Minister and his government had decided finally to abandon all thought of such an arrangement, and to build up a nation on the northern half of this continent, under the aegis of the British flag, with British institutions and with British aspirations, looking to our own home market, Great Britain herself, as the place to which we should send our surplus supplies. Then in 1904, I contested the county of Welland again; not a word of reciprocity. In 1908, the last election, I contested the county again; not a word of reciprocity. It was never mentioned, nobody thought about it, and, what is more, nobody wanted it. Sir, we were progressing with such rapidity, the staple policy which had been introduced and which had been adhered to, was bringing millions of dollars of capital to our shores to build up manufacturing industries in our land. In the county which I have the honour to represent, millions of dollars of United States capital have been expended in building manufactories. The people of the United States, the manufacturers of the United States knew full well that both parties in Canada being then opposed to reciprocity and in favour of a protective policy it was impossible for them to get the advantage of the great market

which was being built up in this country, and to sell their goods to the vast number of people who were coming here to consume their goods unless they built their factories on Canadian territory, and they have begun to do that. With what result, Sir? With the result that the tall chimneys we used to hear of have been erected, seven or eight million dollars have been expended in the county of Welland in building factories employing thousands of men, a home market has been created, a home market right in my own town of Welland, which is practically as good to the farmers of that county as the market of the city of Buffalo. Poultry, eggs, butter, and nearly everything that the farmer has to sell he can sell on the markets of Welland, St. Catharines, and Niagara Falls, at a price nearly equal to what he can get in Buffalo.

Mr. LANCASTER. Sometimes better.

Mr. GERMAN. And sometimes better. I might say this further. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) took two hours on Tuesday to prove to this House and to the country that the Conservative party as well as the Liberal party at one time had endeavoured to secure reciprocity with the United States. He could have told it in one sentence just as emphatically and to just as good advantage as he told it in two hours; because, Sir, everybody knows it, the Conservatives admit it, the Liberals know it. Every one at that time thought that reciprocity between Canada and the United States, in natural products at least, would be a benefit to Canada. But in those days, 40 years ago, Canada was in swaddling clothes; in those days we thought that, like the infant, perhaps we needed a nursing bottle, and a reciprocity treaty with the United States might be the bottle. But that day has long gone by. We have reached in Canada to-day a condition of national manhood; we are to-day in a position to attract the attention of the nations of the earth; we are building up in our own land a great transportation system, we are building up in our own land a great home market, we are building up in our own land large manufacturing establishments to supply, not only our own people, but the people of foreign lands; and I for one, Sir, will not be a party to jeopardizing, much less destroying, that beneficial condition.

Now let us look at the value of farm lands. In 20 years—and I can speak of my own country with knowledge, because I have lived there all the time, and I have had to do with the farmers intimately—in 20 years farm lands in that country have increased in value from 50 to 60 and 70 per cent. Why? Simply because we have built up this great home market. The farmers can dispose of their products practically at their own doors, selling their goods to fellow Canadians, and spending their money among the merchants of Canada in purchasing the supplies they require. Now, Sir, with all this prosperity, everything going smooth, nobody asking for reciprocity, nobody thinking about it, nobody wanting it, with the sky as clear as the noonday sun, we get this thunderbolt; we get an agreement, I say it advisedly, sprung upon this party without consultation, and on the country without inquiry. When they say, as I know most of them do, that I am leaving my party, then I say that I am standing by the principles of the party, and it is the leaders who are deserting those principles. Now, I think that the Prime Minister should have said to the Washington representatives, treating them with that politeness which he said at the manufacturers' meeting he would use towards them, I think he should have used towards them the words that he used to the fruit growers of this country: You are too late. It seems to me those words would have been more applicable to the United States representatives than they were to the fruit growers of this country.

Now the Minister of Agriculture said the other night that they had a mandate from the people of this country to enter into this agreement. He rather argued that even if they did not have a mandate, it was not necessary to have one, because, foresooth, they had inaugurated the British preference without any mandate from the people. He prided himself on the fact that the suggestion for a preference towards Great Britain was kept absolutely secret within the bosom of all the ministers, no word or whisper of this preference was allowed to leak outside the doors of the council chamber. Well, Sir, I differ with the Minister of Agriculture; I think this government did have a mandate from the people of Canada to inaugurate the British preference. They had this mandate, that they were to revise the Canadian tariff as it then existed. The people of Canada, whether wisely or unwisely, did decide that the Canadian tariff as it then existed, and had existed for 13 years, should be revised. The government did revise it, and they revised it, as regards goods coming from Great Britain, by reducing the tariff on those goods to a lower rate than the goods coming from all other countries, and it seems to me that to that extent they did have a mandate from the people of Canada to revise the tariff. But, Sir, have they had any on this occasion? Surely not. In every election we have had since 1900 there has been no word of reciprocity. As I have already said, no man thought of it, no man wanted it, yet even without a mandate, the government took this step. But supposing they had decided to do it without asking the people for their opinion, surely they might have followed the precedent which they set them-

selves in 1906, and have gone about the country inquiring of the business men how this agreement would affect them. Surely that would have been the part of wisdom on the part of the Finance Minister and his colleagues. The Finance Minister is a gentleman whom I most highly respect, a gentleman I believe who has attained to a greater grasp of the finances of this country, a greater grasp on the confidence of the business men of this country, than any other Finance Minister since confederation. I have admired him exceedingly. But, Sir, I believe he blundered on this occasion. I think he should have ascertained from the business men of the country how they were likely to be affected by this proposition, whether it would be a good thing for them, he should have ascertained from the farmers to what extent they desired this reciprocity before entering into negotiations. But no, these gentlemen go down to Washington, they enter into this agreement, they come back here and they say to the supporters of the party in this House: That is the agreement we have entered into, we want you to support it, and you must support it, or you are not a good party man. Well, Sir, I regret exceedingly that I am in the category of those who are not good party men, but unfortunately I am built that way. If by doing in this matter what I believe to be absolutely right, what I believe the majority of the people of this country believe to be right, takes me out of the category of good party men, then I am not a good party man.

Mr. FOWKE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. German) if he would not kindly address himself to the question as to how the business interests of Canada will be adversely affected by this proposed arrangement.

Mr. GERMAN. Without the suggestion of my hon. friend from Ontario I was just about to tell him what I thought about that question as I have just reached that particular phase of the discussion. Before I proceed with that, however, I wish to say this further. What was the necessity for the great haste in entering into this agreement? The people of the United States had only lately decided that their tariff on goods coming into their country must be reduced. President Taft has told us that this arrangement will reduce the cost of living in the United States and that is his object in entering into it. Could we not well have waited to see what the congress of the United States would do with regard to this matter and if they would not take the duties off our farm produce? It is quite possible that they would have gone as far as this agreement goes and we could and would have got all the benefits and advantages it would give us in so far as our market in the United States is concerned without disturbing our own tariff or our own fiscal arrangements at all. It seems to me that it would have been the part of wisdom to have waited, and I think it is the part of wisdom now to wait and see what the United States Congress will do. We will cut a small figure in this country if we rush this proposition through parliament, bind ourselves to it and then find that the extra session of Congress in the United States turns it down. Why can we not wait? We do not need this thing particularly at the present time. There is no reason why we should not wait until another session. If the United States Congress turns this down and refuses to pass it, as I firmly believe it will, then the matter is ended. Of course, hon. gentlemen may say: Well, if it refuses to pass it then it does no harm; it need not go into force. But, it is on our statute-book and unless repealed it stands there as an offer to the United States at any time in the future that they see fit to pass an Act, no matter what the conditions may be in Canada or how seriously such a thing might affect us. If we pass it and they refuse to carry it out in the United States then we must repeal it or we will be at that serious disadvantage.

My hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Fowke) asked me to direct my remarks to the business interests of this country. I might direct him as to that matter to the leading business men of Canada who speak in volume considerably louder and more emphatically than I can, but when we find almost nine-tenths of the leading business men of this country opposed to this proposition where is the man who can stand up frankly and say he believes it will be a good thing for Canada? I cannot for one.

Mr TALBOT. What about the farmers?

Mr. GERMAN. It has been said—it was said in the 'Gazette' of this morning—that I was to speak to-day from the fruit-growers' standpoint and that I will 'oppose the Fielding instrument which draws a knife across the throat of a thriving native industry.' I do not wish to sail under false colours and I do not wish to be misunderstood. The county of Welland is not what you would call a fruit growing county. There are two townships in the county—Stamford and Pelham—which grow considerable quantities of fruit, but the fruit growers in these two townships are nearly all staunch Liberals and I fancy that they are in favour of this proposition. They grow nothing like the fruit that is grown in the counties of Lincoln and Wentworth, but they grow considerable quantities of fruit, and I know that many of the fruit growers in these two townships are in favour of this proposition. Speaking for myself, from what I know about their

business, I cannot see how the fruit growers can be injuriously affected. I cannot really see, but I am willing to allow the fruit growers to have their opinion about that and to concede that their opinion of the matter is better than mine, and I am convinced that it is equally as good if not better than the opinion of the gentlemen who negotiated this treaty. I think that before an agreement of this kind is entered into and before this agreement passes this parliament their views should be carefully considered as well as the views of all the other producers throughout the Dominion of Canada who are likely to be affected. I think that their views should be given all due careful weight and consideration. But no, the Prime Minister tells them that they are too late, that their views cannot be considered now, no matter how seriously this arrangement may affect them; whatever my views on the matter may be they count for nothing, whatever views they may have on the matter count for nothing; however seriously affected they may be they are too late, they cannot enter now, nothing can be done for them, they must stand the loss however serious it may be. I do not think that is the proper system or principle to adopt. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton), the other day, told us all about how it would affect the meat and packing business. I know that the leading men engaged in that business say that it will absolutely put them out of business. I do not know and the Minister of Finance does not know. He said to them the other day after he had heard them: Oh, at every change in the tariff there are certain industries which come here and say that they are going to be seriously affected, but I notice that they continue cutting off coupons. I am not sure that that is the proper spirit to show towards these leading business men. I think that their interests should have been fully and thoroughly weighed and considered and then, having done that an agreement should be entered into such as would not be injurious to them but if possible more beneficial than the existing conditions. What about the millers? The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) said the other night: Why, the millers can grind not only for 8,000,000 people in Canada but they can grind for 100,000,000 people in the United States? I notice Sir, that in forming this agreement, although they say that wheat can go into the United States free, the United States government took care to say that they would not allow flour in free of duty. Can the millers of Canada grind for 100,000,000 people in the United States while they have a duty of 50 cents per barrel to pay which is more than the profit they would make on a barrel of flour.

Mr. GERMAN.

Mr. FISHER. And the American miller has to pay the same duty if he sends his flour to Canada.

Mr. GERMAN. The American miller has to pay the same duty if he sends his flour into Canada, but when did any one ever hear of the American miller sending any flour into Canada. I never heard of it. We manufacture flour for ourselves, we wish to manufacture our flour in our own country for ourselves and for export. I am not objecting to the United States government putting a tariff on flour, or putting a tariff on anything else, but I say that in entering into an agreement of this kind which ties up our business interests we should look carefully after those business interests, and one of the things which these gentlemen should have done in framing that agreement was not only to have our wheat go into the United States free but our flour also.

It is said that the farmers will be benefited. So far as the county of Welland is concerned there are two townships in the county which grow quantities of fruit, but they also grow large quantities of ordinary farm products, and it may be said that the people of the county are almost exclusively a farming community. In 1891 the farmers of that county were anxious to get into the Buffalo market, but, in view of the home market we have established since then they are not now so anxious. I doubt very much, Sir, if the farmers of my county, or any other county in Canada will be very considerably benefited, if benefited at all, by this agreement. Why, Sir, the whole argument of the statesmen in the United States in favour of this proposition is that it will decrease the cost of living in the United States, and how in the name of all that is sensible is it going to decrease the cost of living in the United States and at the same time give a higher price to our farmers for their farm products? I certainly cannot reconcile these two things. But, I do not think it will give any considerable benefit to the farmers of this country and even if it did give some small benefit I think that benefit may be obtained at a cost too high for the general welfare of this country. Now, Sir, let me say that in my own county there is at least one-third of it (comprising the townships bordering on Niagara river) is contiguous to the Buffalo market. The Buffalo market would be a very natural market for the agriculturists there, and they might in some instances get a higher price for their commodities on the Buffalo market, and it might be more convenient for them than to go to the town of Welland where they would get nearly the same price. But, Sir, what would happen—the same vehicles that carry the

Canadian farm products to the Buffalo market for sale will bring back from Buffalo the merchandise required by the farmers to carry on their farming operations, and which will be purchased from the United States merchants. That, Sir, is one reason why I object to this problem; that is a reason why the merchants in our locality object to it, and it is a reason why large interests throughout the length and breadth of Canada object to it. And, Sir, what this agreement will do in that county it will do in other portions of the Dominion. It has already been said what the effect will be, and I believe it, that British Columbia will trade with the Pacific coast states, that the western provinces will trade with the states to the south of them, and so on from the Pacific to the Atlantic, our people will be trading with the American people north and south instead of trading east and west among themselves. I noticed some time ago an article in the Toronto 'Globe' headed: 'The National Grange Is Answered.'—referring to the National Grange of the United States—and it is answered by a letter from Mr. Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and the 'Globe' newspaper quotes that letter with approval, and this is what Mr. Wilson says:

If this reciprocity treaty becomes the law of both countries our relationship with Canada will become more intimate and our trade with her will extend and increase. The trains that bring farm products to the United States will take farm, orchard, and manufactured products back, and whether a policy of union of the two countries ever comes about or not, we will become more and more one people, developing along similar lines and supplementing each other in many respects. The raw material that comes from the Canadian farm will be manufactured in the United States and what is not needed will be sent to foreign countries. If this is desirable on the part of Canada it certainly should be desirable on the part of the people of the United States.

Well, Sir, I for one stand here as an exponent of the fact that such a thing is not desirable on the part of Canada, and I do not believe that a policy which is supposed to bring about such a result should be enacted by this parliament. That it will do so the 'Globe' newspaper evidently believes, for it quotes that letter with very great approval. Well, that is what Mr. Wilson says and that is practically what every prominent man in the United States says to-day, namely, that it will take the natural products of Canada to the United States to be manufactured there, and what is not needed of these manufactured goods for their purpose will be exported to foreign countries or sent back to Canada to be purchased and consumed by us. Sir, I believe that we must keep our natural products in Canada. I believe that we must have a policy that will keep our natural products in Canada to be manufactured in Canada by Canadian citizens and for citizens of the empire. And, if there is to be a reciprocity treaty at all it seems to me that a true reciprocity treaty would be one which would encompass the empire at large. If we are to have a reciprocity treaty we should have a reciprocity treaty which would give protection within the empire against all countries, so that there would be between British colonies and the British dominions beyond the seas and the mother land, a free trade amongst ourselves. It has been said that if the Unionists in England come into power they may give a preference to Canadian wheat, but I do not believe they will ever get into power on that platform. What I believe is this: That so long as we tax English goods for our own benefit the English people will not tax themselves for our benefit. But, Sir, I do believe that when the Prime Minister of Canada goes to the Imperial Conference this summer, if he will take his Minister of Customs with him, let this matter stand in abeyance in the meantime, and discuss that problem with the statesmen of England, he will come back home with a resolution that we will all agree to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What problem do you refer to?

Mr. GERMAN. The problem of imperial reciprocity.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Free trade within the empire?

Mr. GERMAN. Free trade within the empire. If that policy can be carried out, to my mind it is the true policy for the British Empire. I think that we in Canada, whether we are manufacturers or not, should show our faith in the heritage we have by more than word of mouth, and if we are to have reciprocity, let us have it within the empire on such terms as can be satisfactorily and beneficially arranged. But if we cannot have that, then the only true policy for Canada is the policy which was admitted by the Finance Minister and this government to be the proper policy, that is, moderate protection with a stable tariff. My observation and inquiry lead me to the belief that if we are to build up in Canada a nation commensurate with our capabilities, that is the policy which must be adhered to. And, Sir, we cannot have any jug-handled policy. The right hon. gentleman who leads the government and his associates think that they are satisfying the farmers of the Northwest and many of the farmers of the east; but I can tell

them that they are not. The farmers are not getting what they want; they are not getting what they ask for—all that they ask for, at any rate. They asked that the duty be taken off agricultural implements. That will be the cry in the Northwest in the next Dominion elections. The farmers there will say: You have given us reciprocity, which does not do us any good; we wanted the duty taken off agricultural implements, which would have done us good, and you refused. I believe that just as sure as the sun will set in the western sky on the night this agreement goes into effect, in three years you will have the farmers of the Northwest back here calling for protection to their interests, or else for doing away with the whole fabric of protection in Canada. There cannot be anything different, considering that every farming country in the world, with few exceptions, can send its agricultural products into Canada without paying any duty. We are told that these countries are far away and that, therefore, they cannot send any goods here. We do not know what time will do in that regard. The Minister of Finance says that if this arrangement does not work well, we can do away with it at any time. But see what has happened; you have upset all our business conditions and created a want of confidence throughout the country; and if that does not mean anything else, it will mean one thing which I shall honestly deplore, and that is the defeat of the Liberal party. I say that we need the protection which we have now, not only for manufactured goods, but for agricultural products as well. I might say, in the language of the hon. leader of the opposition, adequate protection. The only difference between him and me is that he does not tell us what in his opinion adequate protection is. I believe that the protection we have at the present moment, with, of course, such slight changes as may be necessary from time to time in the interest of the business industries, is all the protection that Canada will require. It has been adequate to bring to our country millions of dollars of foreign capital to be investigated here; it has been adequate to bring to this country millions of dollars of United States capital for the building up of manufacturing industries; it has been adequate to increase our population by millions; it has been adequate to establish and build up thriving industries throughout the length and breadth of the land; it has been adequate to bring to our doors the representatives of one of the strongest governments of the world seeking admission to our markets. It seems to me that a policy that has been adequate to do all these things is good enough to be left quietly alone. It seems to me that the Finance Minister should nail to the masthead of this Canadian ship of state the flag of protection with a stable tariff, under which Canada will continue on the highway of prosperity and advancement which she has travelled in the past, and will be filled with a prosperous and contented people.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). Mr. Chairman, there is cast upon me this afternoon the somewhat unpleasant duty of attempting to reply to two hon. gentlemen with whom I have been associated in the past in the most friendly relations, who have been my political friends and associates, and who have decided to oppose the government of the day on the question now agitating this country as well as the great country to the south of us. I have nothing but the kindest words to say of these two gentlemen, because I am bound to believe that they are speaking their inmost thoughts and are entirely sincere in the course they have taken and intend to pursue. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the remarks of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. German). I have been somewhat struck with the generalities of the arguments which he has offered, and the absence of anything in particular on which one can meet him in order to see whether his conclusions are well founded or not. Both he and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) have chosen to discuss this question almost entirely from the standpoint of free trade and protection. They have assumed that it means the breaking down of all the barriers which they say have made Canada prosperous in the last 25 or 30 years; they are assuming that we are throwing away our protective tariff and are bringing in a free trade tariff, and they have studiously avoided any reference to the details of the agreement under discussion. It will be my duty to try to bring the minds of the members of this House back to the true condition of affairs and to discuss the question submitted in these resolutions.

I want first, however, to point this out to my hon. friends opposite, especially those members from the west of Lake Superior who so wildly cheered my hon. friend from Welland when he said that in three years, if this agreement went through, he expected to see the farmers of the west come back here and ask for protection for themselves if they did not get free agricultural implements. I wonder if my farmer friends from the west who cheered that so wildly will not be going through the province of Manitoba and the province of Saskatchewan in the next three years telling those people that what they want is free agricultural implements, and condemning this government for not giving them free

agricultural implements. I wonder if my hon. friend from Welland and my hon. friend from Brandon would like to vote for free agricultural implements. If they do, then there is an entire absence of logic in the whole argument put up by my hon. friends against this proposed agreement. The trouble is my hon. friends cheer everything which they think may create some little friction on this side. We, however, on this side are not losing any sleep because my hon. friends from Welland (Mr. German) and Brandon (Mr. Sifton) have chosen to take the course they did, and the Liberal party is big and broad enough to treat those two gentlemen as friends, and yet allow them to disagree with us in this matter. But when my hon. friends from the west go around telling the farmers that they want free agricultural implements, how will they square this with these two hon. gentlemen or the rest of their party?

Mr. LENNOX. You do not know the west.

Mr. CARVELL. I have had the privilege of meeting here about a thousand men from the west and of listening to what they said, and I know what they asked for, and I am bound to think that they were sincere. I know that they asked for free agricultural implements, and I would ask my hon. friend who interrupts me if he would vote for free agricultural implements, as possible he may have a chance to do so before this session is through.

This question has been discussed altogether from the standpoint of free trade and protection. My hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) says that we have broken down the bulwarks of protection, and that the citadel itself will soon fall. Let us examine this proposed agreement and see whether it has broken down the bulwarks of protection or not. The government have brought down a proposition to provide for the free entry into Canada of certain articles. I shall not weary the House by going over the list, but I shall give a few in order that my hon. friends opposite may appreciate the true condition of affairs. We propose to bring in under the free list cattle, horses and mules, sheep and lambs and other live stock. Will my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German), or any hon. gentleman opposite tell me how it will injure the people of Canada to have these things brought in free? Do we import any of them? Why, these are among our staple exports. Then, how on earth can it injure us to have free imports of those goods which we are sending out of this country by the tens of millions. We next come to wheat and other grains. As we do not import those grains, it cannot do our people any harm to have them in free. Then we come to fruits, which I shall discuss later on under a different heading. We next come to dairy products. I have not the exact figures at hand, but during the last year we exported something like $20,000,000 worth of dairy products. Surely, therefore, it cannot injure us to have such products on the free list. Then we have fish, and I propose to discuss fish under a different heading. But will anybody tell me that Canada is importing fish to any great extent? Why, we exported last year to Great Britain and the United States something like $10,000,000 worth of fish, and imported practically nothing. How, then, can it injure us to have fish on the free list? We come next to iron and the manufacture of iron. There is, perhaps, taking it all around, the smallest duty on manufactures of iron that there is on any other great industry in Canada. Iron rods have been free for years and rolled sheet iron, which comes very largely from Great Britain, has only had a duty of 5 per cent imposed on it when coming from the United States. Will it hurt the consumer or the Canadian manufacturer to have those articles come in free of duty? Then we have lumber, but lumber has always come in free of duty. How, then, will it injure our purchasers of lumber to have it still come in free? So you can go down through the whole list of free articles, and in none will you find that their free admission can possibly hurt any Canadian interests. Why did our commissioners agree to allow these things in free of duty? Surely you have only to ask the question to answer it. It is in order that we may have the privilege of sending other articles from Canada to the United States free of duty, and the whole question resolves itself into this: Is it in the interests of the Canadian people that we should have the right to send these things into the United States free of duty?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does my hon. friend argue that taking particularly the case of grain—in the case of those products which we export, none will come in if we take off the duty.

Mr. CARVELL. I am not an authority on the question of grain, but I can tell my hon. friend that, as far as the maritime provinces are concerned, no grain will certainly come in from the United States. As regards the west, we are, perhaps, the largest exporters of grain of any other country of the same population, and I cannot see how, under the circumstances, it is possible that we should import grain into Canada to any extent.

Mr. MEIGHEN. How can it do us any good to have the export duties in the United States taken off in the case of products they export?

Mr. CARVELL. I am told that practically all the time during the last 20 years wheat has been higher in the United States than in Canada. If wheat is higher in Minneapolis than it is in Winnipeg surely it must be to the advantage of Canadian farmers to be able to send their wheat to Minneapolis free of duty.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am not disagreeing with the hon. gentleman, but only want to understand his argument. How can it apply in the one case and not in the other?

Mr. CARVELL. I am giving the facts, and I allow my hon. friends to draw any conclusion from those facts which to them may seem proper. In addition to the free articles which we allow into Canada, we allow a larger list of manufactured articles. I shall not go over the whole list, but I want to point out that in all that list I can only find three items on which, under this proposed agreement, the duty will be less than it is under the British preference, and only two on which the duty is made level with the British preference. If that be ture, and I am quoting from the blue-book published by the government, how on earth is it going to injure the Canadian farmer, when the Canadian consumer can bring all those articles which are manufactured in the United States from Great Britain to-day and pay a less duty than he does if he brings them from the United States under the proposed agreement? I am, of course, aware that there are some items in this list which are not imported from Great Britain to any great extent, and possibly in that case the items which come in from the United States will, to some extent, meet, or go into competition with the home product, and I presume it is on that line that my friends urge such serious objections to this arrangement.

I wish to discuss this matter from a maritime province standpoint. We have had very little discussion from the west, none from the maritime provinces, excepting the speech of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) who discussed it largely from the fish standpoint; we have had practically no discussion from Quebec, except from the moneyed interests of the city of Montreal in the person of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames). I shall not go into the history of this matter, as has been done by so many hon. gentlemen but if I have been able to read history aright, I believe that the wish of everybody from the maritime provinces, Conservatives or Liberals, has been to have free access to the American market for our natural products. I have been led to believe that that has been the wish of a very large section of the people of Ontario and Quebec, and I believe it is so to-day. I know that it is practically the unanimous wish of the maritime provinces electorate. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says that in 1891 the Conservative party buried the question of reciprocity and also that in 1898 the Liberal party buried the question of reciprocity. I do not propose to go back to 1897 or 1887, what I want is to get down to the present and see how this proposed agreement is going to interest or affect our people at the present time regardless of what the opinions of either party may have been in the past. I represent a purely agricultural district, and the same may be said of my hon. friends from York, Queens and Sunbury, Kings and Albert, Victoria and Madawaska, and two or three other constituencies. There are three or four others, like Restigouche, Gloucester, Northumberland, Kent and Charlotte, which are largely interested in lumbering and fish. What I have said of New Brunswick is true to perhaps a greater extent of Prince Edward island and to at least as great an extent of Nova Scotia. I have gone into this agreement with a view to seeing how it affects people in the maritime provinces and have made a list of the articles we export, which our people are compelled to export in order to earn the necessary money to send to Ontario and Quebec and other parts of the world in order to buy manufactured articles, because remember that while the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) told us what a great development had taken place in his constituency and in the province of Ontario in manufacturing. I am sorry to say that has not been the case in the maritime provinces, and I do not believe that outside the steel industries in Sydney there is as much manufacturing going on in the maritime provinces to-day as there was twenty years ago. That is a very broad statement, but I make it with considerable knowledge of the conditions and I repeat that I do not believe there is as much manufacturing as there was twenty years ago. I know there is not as much in my town or in Fredericton, and I believe that it is true of all the cities and towns in the maritime provinces with the exceptions to which I have referred.

I have here a list of the farm products which we produce and which we export, and the countries to which they are exported. It is not very long and I shall read it because I think it speaks more than any words I can utter so far as this matter affects the people of the maritime provinces. The figures I give are for the financial year ending 1909:

Article.	Exports to Great Britain.	Exports to United States.
Horses..	$ 66,815	$446,971
Lambs..	.....	415,912

Article.	Exports to Great	Exports to United
Sheep..	11,441	153,767
Poultry..	27,468	137,290
Berries..	.....	148,676
Oats..	508,300	534,680
Hay..	922,718	673,220
Maple sugar.	1,843	127,082
Potatoes..	259	345,903
Turnips	550	173,933
Grass and clover seeds..	239,507	489,180

Mr. DANIEL. I think the hon. member has made a mistake in his figures with regard to potatoes. The amount given for the year 1910 in the United States publication was 97,138 bushels amounting to $36,770. It is not the figure given by my hon. friend.

Mr. CARVELL. At page 39, of the pamphlet, Tariff relations between the United States and Canada, correspondence and statements, 1911, which was brought down to the House by the government I find the figures I have quoted. This is the Canadian report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1909. It must be correct, my hon. friend must be in error.

Mr. EDWARDS. I took the trouble to make a comparison between the blue-book——

Mr. CARVELL. I do not object to my hon. friend asking a question, but I want to be allowed to make——

Mr. EDWARDS. If my hon. friend compares the book he has in his hand with the statement issued by the United States in book form he will find——

Mr. CARVELL. I will answer that question. I have taken the figures which the Finance Minister has furnished this House; I believed them to be correct then, and I believe them to be correct now. I can tell my hon. friend that from my own constituency alone, last year we must have exported twice the amount of potatoes which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) has quoted. I know something about this business. I represent the greatest potato constituency in the Dominion of Canada. Last year we did not send nearly as many potatoes to the United States as we have done formerly. I can tell him that from my constituency alone last year we exported to Cuba as many as 250,000 barrels, this year we are not exporting as many. But last year we exported to Cuba and to the United States, and this year we are sending none to the United States, all going to Cuba and to western Canada.

Mr. CROCKET. Would my hon. friend give the prices of potatoes in the States?

Mr. SCHELL. I would like to confirm the statement of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell). According to the figures furnished me by the Customs Department, and which confirm the figures given by the member for Carleton, the exports of potatoes in 1910 from the maritime provinces to the United States were only 296,631 bushels at a valuation of $144,302. The total exports from the Dominion of Canada to the United States were 678,632 bushels, at a valuation of $345,930.

Mr. CARVELL. Those are the exact figures.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the hon. member allow me to give my reasons for making the statement I did?

Mr. CARVELL. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. I hold in my hand a little book called 'Canadian Reciprocity' which was published by the government of the United States, and distributed by the Finance Minister, and which I got out of our distribution office upstairs. It contains President Taft's message, and contains all the figures which relate to the articles mentioned in the reciprocity treaty. At page 68, under the heading of imports from Canada into the United States during the fiscal years from 1906 to 1910, under the year 1910, the valuation for potatoes $36,770, the very figures I gave the hon. gentleman just now.

Mr. CARVELL. Now the hon. gentleman ought to remember that I was quoting Canadian figures for the year 1909, and he is quoting United States figures for 1910. I have told my hon. friend that last year, 1910, there were very few potatoes sent to the United States. I have admitted that, and I do not see any necessity for this discussion. I know the figures I have quoted are right, I could give the figures for my own constituency almost without any blue-book. Now if hon. gentleman will allow me to proceed I will follow this out a little further. I find that of turnips we exported to Great Britain only $550, and to the United States $174,000. Of grass and clover seeds, to Great Britain, $239,000; to the United States, $489,000.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Would the Speaker allow me to interject a question?

Mr. CARVELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have put up with almost every thing, but I think this is going rather too far.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. With his permission, of course.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not object to my hon. friend asking me a question, but when it comes to asking me to adjourn my speech in order that he may have a conversation with the Finance Minister, that is asking too much.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I will only ask this question, I want information. I find for instance, in a report published by the

United States government, they say that we exported from Canada $2,317 worth of wheat whereas Canadian statistics show that we imported here $55,000.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not want to be discourteous to my hon. friend, I am not discussing wheat at the present time, I do not know anything about the document which he is quoting. Now I want to be fair with this House, and I admit that there are other articles exported by the farmers of Canada in which the trade with Great Britain is very much greater than with the United States, but those are articles which we do not export to any extent from the maritime provinces. I refer to butter, cheese, bacon, wheat, wheat flour and cattle; these are not exported to any great extent from the maritime provinces.

Now I want to take up the question of fish, but I will not go into details. I find that during the last year we exported altogether of fish to Great Britain to the extent of $5,368,000, while we exported to the United States fish to the value of $4,524,000. But of the goods exported to Great Britain $4,573,000 consisted of canned salmon and canned lobster. If you substract that from the total export to Great Britain, you have left the beggarly sum of $794,000 as the total exportation of all fish products in their natural state, or including smoked products; whereas of the same class of articles we exported to the United States nearly $4,500,000 worth.

Then take the question of lumber. Now if there is a portion of Canada which is vitally interested in the lumber question, it is the maritime provinces. I submit this table of our exports of lumber:

	Great Britain.	United States.
Sp. deals	$ 5,825,732	$ 572,003
Laths	130	1,852,211
Logs	39,324	958,918
Shingles	1,274	2,298,055
Planks and boards	1,387,439	17,877,349
Scantling	487,262	593,428
Sleepers and ties	15	328,277
All lumber products	10,635,643	22,241,166

I want to point out that no man can manufacture spruce deals without having considerable by-products in the way of laths. In nine-tenths of the cases, the profit which the manufacturer makes upon spruce lumber lies entirely in the money which he gets out of the by-products, and these he cannot sell to Great Britain, indeed you could hardly give them away to Great Britain. Our market for by-products during all my lifetime has been in the United States. We have been compelled to send them there during the past in the face of a duty at the present time of $1.25, which was previously $1.50, and $2 per thousand.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.

Mr. CROCKET. Those figures are for the year ended 31st March, last.

Mr. CARVELL. Yes. Then I have taken up the pulp and paper question, and I have found the following results :

PULP AND PAPER.

	Great Britain.	United States.
Wood pulp chemically prepared	$ 21,094	$1,597,319
Wood pulp mechanically ground	888,898	2,557,990
Printing paper	527,851	1,246,795
	$1,437,843	$5,402,104

Now, Sir, these are the principal products of the maritime provinces that will be affected by this agreement. Let us look at what our people have been working against for the last year. We have to pay the following duties, in order to get these goods into the United States :

Horses, from $50 to $75.
Lambs, 75 cents each.
Sheep, $1.50 each.
Poultry, 5 cents a lb., almost prohibitive.
Oats, 15 cents a bushel.
Hay, $4 a ton.
Maple sugar, 4 cents a lb.
Potatoes, 25 cents a bushel.
Turnips, 15 cents a bushel.

Mr. HENDERSON. Turnips 25 per cent.

Mr. CARVELL. I thank my hon. friend for correcting me. I have not the figures before me ; I am just speaking from recollection.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is about 3 cents a bushel.

Mr. CARVELL. They are only worth 10 or 12 cents a bushel, and this is pretty good protection. On all kinds of rough lumber up to two years ago we paid $2 and upwards per thousand, while now we are paying $1.50. In the face of these almost prohibitive duties the people of the maritime provinces and of eastern Quebec have been compelled by the necessity of the case to send to the United States ten times as much of their products as they have been able to send to other parts of the world. Now, I want to know if the people of the maritime provinces ought not to want this agreement to go through if the statements that I have given are correct. I am not going to discuss the fish question to any great extent because that was discussed by my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) who understands it so much better than I do, that I will not trespass upon that ground, but I have just this general remark to make that of ordinary fish products, except canned goods, while we are sending $700,000 worth to Great Britain, we are sending almost $4,500,000 worth to the United States. Does any man say that our people who labour in the fields, and in the

forests and who toil on the deep do not want a chance to sell their products in the best market that they can find?

They hold up this bogey of annexation, and some of the ladies of Toronto, as well as the men of Toronto, tell us that we must be loyal and that we must not put this thing through. They say that we will be disloyal if we do. The farmer, the fisherman and the labourer of the maritime provinces will not say that we are disloyal if we attempt to give them a better price for their products than that which they are now able to obtain.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who pays the duty on lumber that enters the United States?

Mr. CARVELL. Well, I will give the hon. gentleman my personal experience. Perhaps that is the best kind of evidence that anybody can give. I can tell him that in my own constituency we raise hay for export.

Mr. DANIEL. I am speaking of lumber.

Mr. CARVELL. Of lumber? Oh, I thought you wanted everything. The exporter in every case pays the duty.

Mr. DANIEL. Does he?

Mr. CARVELL. I know he does ; I am interested in that business, and I know what I am talking about. I challenge my hon. friend to furnish figures to show that he does not. I represent a constituency which lies for fifty miles up and down the border line, my father's farm adjoined the boundary, and I was born within half a mile of the international line. I know something about the business. The man who has stumpage for sale on the American side of the line can get from $4 to $5 a thousand for spruce lumber as it stands. The man who has that same lumber on our side of the line, almost within speaking distance of the American lumber, has to sell it for from $2.50 to $3.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. J. R. Booth, here, says that the American pays the duty.

Mr. CARVELL. Well, my hon. friend will have a chance to answer me later on. He asked me and I am giving him my evidence, and I know what I am talking about. I am interested in the export of laths and I know that we have to pay the whole duty of 50 cents. I know a man who manufactures laths in Aroostook county, just across the imaginary line from my home and he gets 50 cents more for his laths than I can get. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) was very anxious to know about the potato question. It is a fact that this year potatoes are worth more in the county of Carleton than they are in the county of Aroostook, Maine. They are worth probably to-day 30 to 35 cents a barrel more on our side than they are on the American side. That is due to the fact that there was an absolute failure of the potato crop in western Canada. There were no potatoes at all raised in southern Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, we have the potatoes for sale, and they are going to that western country by hundreds of carloads. I know that there are exporters of potatoes from my own county and in Victoria and Madawaska who have shipped into that western country hundreds of carloads during the past four months. That extraordinary condition of affairs has created a market which is redounding to the advantage of our people at the present time. We are delighted to have it continue, we are able to sell our potatoes at a splendid price, but in the last twenty-six years at least which I recollect very distinctly there has only been one other occasion when potatoes were worth as much on our side of the line as they were in Aroostook on the other side of the line, and that was in 1907 when the customs tariff was revised the last time. Because they were sending potatoes from the United States to Canada I was able to induce my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to increase the duty from 15 cents to 20 cents a bushel. That is the only time in the history of this industry when potatoes were worth as much in New Brunswick as in the state of Maine, or in Canada generally as in the United States. I knew that my hon. friends wanted to get this information, and I have given it to them. But we hope that a kind providence will cause the production of a full potato crop in western Canada, and if that takes place the potato market will revert back to its original condition and potatoes will be worth more in the United States than in Canada if this deal goes through. I want my people to share in that benefit. Let me tell my hon. friend that during the last 20 years, from my constituency alone about 1,000 of our very best farmers have sold out and gone, not to western Canada, not to the big cities of the United States, but just across that imaginary boundary line into the county of Aroostook and to-day they are prosperous and happy. These men have had the advantage of the American market under the same conditions as we shall if this agreement goes through, and as an illustration of their prosperity let me tell you that on the first day of July last I myself counted 42 former Canadians who are now resident farmers of the United States and who crossed over to a Dominion day celebration in their automobiles. I wonder how soon will the Canadian farmer be able to enjoy such a luxury. I trust that in the near future under the benefits of this agree-

ment, our Canadian farmers will be able to sell their potatoes in the United States market to the same advantage that our Aroostook friends have been able to in the past.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CARVELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to discuss to any great extent the effects of this arrangement upon the fishing industry of the maritime provinces, but I want to point out something local that comes within the purview of my own observations in the province of New Brunswick. I refer to the sardine fishery in the county of Charlotte. I am told, and I am satisfied from my own research that it is a fact, that there are about $325,000 worth of small herrings caught in the waters of the county of Charlotte alone and exported to the neighbouring county in the state of Maine to be manufactured into sardines. Under the general United States tariff there is a duty of ¾ of a cent per pound on fresh fish, but in some way, by means of their tariff regulations, this particular kind of fresh fish are allowed to go into the United States free of duty provided they go in an American vessel commanded by an American master. In that way they go in as American fish. As a matter of fact, the Canadian fisherman catches the fish, puts them in hogsheads, and then they are transferred from his vessel to an American vessel commanded by an American skipper, in which they are taken to the packing establishment, distant not more than three or four hours' sail. The result has been that hundreds of our vessels have been transferred from the Canadian register to the United States register, and hundreds of our citizens, who are the owners and managers of these vessels, have been compelled to become United States citizens, and, in fact, to reside in the United States before being allowed to man these small vessels in which the fish are carried away. If this arrangement goes into effect, the result will be practically this: Our fisherman will be able to catch his fish, as he has always done; he will register his vessel in a Canadian port, so that it will become again a Canadian vessel; he comes back and becomes naturalized as a British subject; he is able to live at home; he increases our population, and he can carry on a legitimate business, catching these fish with his own labour and that of his sons, and taking them to the United States and getting the same price that he gets to-day. When you consider that in the present conditions we are sending $325,000 worth of these fish from one county alone to the United States, you can understand to some extent what the free entry of fish into the United States means to the maritime provinces.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would these sardines have free entry into the United States?

Mr. CARVELL. They would not go in free as canned fish; they would go in free as fresh fish. They go in free now, but it is by manipulation of the United States customs regulations; but the trouble is that our fishermen are compelled to alienate themselves and their vessels from their native country in order to get them in free. The duty of ¾ of a cent per pound on these small fish is prohibitory, because the average price the Canadian fisherman gets for them does not exceed ¾ of a cent per pound, and as the United States manufacturers are dependent upon our people for their supply they have winked at the regulations, construing them differently from what they were intended to be, and have got the fish in in that way.

There are other fisheries all along the maritime coasts of Canada and up the St. Lawrence river to the province of Quebec, and what applies to the county of Charlotte, applies to the other portions of maritime Canada, even to a greater extent, because in the case I have described the people of the county of Charlotte actually get their fish into the United States free of duty, while in all other portions of maritime Canada the fishermen are not in a position to take advantage of the regulations, and, therefore, are compelled to send their fish there in the face of a duty of ¾ of a cent per pound, and when you come to consider that compared with the total price the fisherman gets for his fish, it is a terrible handicap, which in many cases is prohibitive.

Up to the present time I have discussed this question very largely from the standpoint of the maritime provinces. I would like to know what some of our Conservative friends from the maritime provinces think of this proposition. I am sorry there are none of them in their places this evening. However, I shall have to say what I intended just as if they were here, and I hope they will do me the honour of reading it in 'Hansard,' and possibly at some future stage of the debate reply to some of the statements I make. I would like to know what my hon. friend from the county of Kings, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Fraser) has to say about the right of his fishermen to send their fish and his farmers to send their potatoes, their turnips, their oats, their hay and all their other products to the United States free of duty. I would like to know what my hon. friend from the county of Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) has to say about this. I would like to know what

my hon. friend from the county of Digby (Mr. Jameson) has to say about this. Surely he knows what it means to his fishermen much better than I do; he knows what it means to his farmers, his lumbermen and to every labourer in the province of Nova Scotia. If my hon. friend votes against this proposition I would like to know how he is going to square himself with his constituents. Then I come to my own province. My hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel) will no doubt vote against this proposition, because he has no fishermen in his constituency. He seems more interested in the negro question than in reciprocity. But I come to my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket), who represents an agricultural constituency which bounds mine for 25 or 30 miles, and is vitally interested in this question. I would like to know what he thinks about it. I am sorry he is not here, because I shall be compelled to read something that affects him particularly. While he may possibly screw up his courage to the point of voting against these resolutions on the broad ground that they are disloyal and will lead to annexation, I want to show the House what was the opinion of the hon. member for York only a short year ago on one very important item in these schedules—I refer to shingles. In the last fiscal year the Dominion of Canada exported to Great Britain shingles to the magnificent value of $1,274, and in the same year she exported to the United States shingles to the value of $2,298,055, and I think I am safe in saying that nearly two-thirds of all the shingles exported by Canada to the United States went either from the maritime provinces or from eastern Quebec. Only one short year ago, when my hon. friend from York had no idea that there was going to be reciprocity with the United States in natural products, when he had no idea that his manufacturing friends in the city of Toronto, who control him, would be able to dictate how he should vote, he wrote the following letter to the Minister of Finance:

House of Commons,
Ottawa, March 11, 1910.

Honourable W. S. Fielding,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Fielding,—I have a communication from the Scott Lumber Company, Ltd., who operate two or three mills in my constituency, requesting me to lay before you, in connection with the recent negotiations between the Canadian and the United States governments upon the tariff matter, the representation that the recent increase in American duty upon shingles has seriously affected the business of Canadian mills, particularly in the maritime provinces. They claim that the rate of 50 cents per thousand is unreasonable and almost prohibitive, and that in the interest of this trade, our government should at least endeavour to have it reduced to the old basis of 30 cents a thousand.

I trust that if the question of revision of the two tariffs is taken up, you will bear this communication in mind.

Yours truly,
OSWALD S. CROCKET.

My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) this afternoon wanted to know what evidence I had that lumber was worth any more on the other side of the line, or who paid the duty. Let me refer him to the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) who is an authority with the hon. gentlemen opposite. He says that fifty cents per thousand on shingles is almost prohibitive. I say so too. I know something of the shingle business, because I have clients who are probably the largest shingle producers in the maritime provinces, and I tell my hon. friend that there will be no boon which the lumber manufacturers of the maritime provinces will prize so highly as a reduction of 20 cents a thousand on shingles. And what is true of shingles is true of laths and boards and scantlings and hay and oats and almost everything which these provinces produce.

Before leaving this branch of the case, I should like to give the House some figures on the potato question, because that seemed to bother my hon. friends opposite this afternoon more than anything else. During recess I took the trouble to look up the exports of potatoes from Canada to the United States during the last ten years, and I think it is only fair that the House should be in possession of all the facts. These exports were as follows:

1901	$ 67,151
1902	327,046
1903	56,969
1904	742,537
1905	18,301
1906	128,363
1907 (nine months only)	4,250

1907 was the year to which I referred before dinner, during which I said potatoes were much higher on our side of the line, and that is the only time in my lifetime up to this year when that condition existed.

1908	$ 15,459
1909	251,907
1910	345,903

This is a complete history from the Canadian standpoint, of the exportation of potatoes to the United States up to 1910.

Mr. DANIEL. Exports from Canada to the United States?

Mr. CARVELL. Yes. I have discussed that question from the standpoint of the maritime provinces, and propose now to discuss it briefly from the general standpoint.

Mr. DANIEL. Could the hon. gentleman give the imports into Canada from the United States of potatoes during those years?

Mr. CARVELL. I have not the figures at my hand. No doubt in some years potatoes have been imported by us to some extent, but nothing like the extent to which they were exported.

Mr. DANIEL. Last year there were more imported.

Mr. CARVELL. The debate so far has been confined to the discussion of a very few articles. We have had the wheat question discussed in nearly all its phases. We have discussed cheese to some extent, bacon to a great extent, wheat, flour and cattle and also fruit.

Mr. LENNOX. And hay.

Mr. CARVELL. I discussed that this afternoon. I want to take up first the question of cattle. My hon. friends opposite say that if this agreement should go into effect, the cattle industry would be entirely driven from the British market through Canadian channels into the United States, and I think that my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) said that the cattle industry would become centred in a few years in Chicago instead of Winnipeg. Let us follow that up. I find that last year we exported to Great Britain cattle to the etxent of $9,979,000, but I find that the United States exported cattle last year to the extent of from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000, practically all of which went to Great Britain. But, exclaim my hon. friends opposite, if you put this proposed agreement into effect, you will ruin the cattle trade. I ask why? It cannot ruin the cattle trade because if we send our cattle to the United States it will only be because the American buyers will pay more. Will that hurt the Canadian farmer? I fail to see how it will. I do not believe that my hon. friends opposite would say that they do not want our Canadian farmers to get the best prices possible. Well, should they be right in their contention, and should our cattle be driven to Chicago, that can only happen because our cattle will there command better prices. This, however, is what I believe will happen. I believe that the best quality of our cattle will still go to Great Britain, as in the past, but the poorer quality will go to the United States and sell there at better prices than we have got in the past. Let me explain why. The purchasers of cattle for the British market will only take animals up to a certain standard because the freight is paid, not by the pound, but by the animal. I am referring now to water transportation. The space taken in a steamship by an animal weighing 1,400 will not be greater than that taken by an animal weighing 1,000 pounds; and owing to this difference in freight rates, it is impossible for our farmers to sell their lower grades at anything like what they can get for their higher grades. But should this agreement come into effect, these lower grade animals will go into the American market, and will there command the same prices as we now get for our higher grade. That is what this proposed agreement means to the cattle producers all over Canada. They will send their better animals to Great Britain to the same extent as heretofore, but they will get a much better market than they now enjoy in the United States for their inferior cattle. Further, I believe it will not be long before the United States will cease exporting cattle. I find that three or four years ago the United States were exporting $24,000,000 worth of cattle per year, whereas last year they only exported some $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 worth; and it is quite within the realm of possibility that within the course of a few years the United States will cease exporting cattle altogether. The price in the American market will then go up, and our farmers all over Canada will reap the benefit. No one will seriously argue that our farmers should sell to the British market at reduced prices when they can get better prices in the American market. That is a species of loyalty I have never seen worked out yet practically. My hon. friends opposite prate about loyalty but not one of them would sell his cattle at five cents less per head in the British market than he could get in the American market. Give him the slightest advantage in the world and he does not care two cents where the article goes, he will sell it where he can get the best price and if he can get a better price in the United States than in Great Britain that is where it will go. That is how they will tell us the cattle trade is going to be ruined.

I come next to the question of pork. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) said that if this arrangement went through the packing industry in Canada would be absolutely ruined and every hon. gentleman opposite who has spoken has said the same thing. Their newspapers have said that for a month, it is the stock argument of the Conservatives that the packers of Canada will be ruined, particularly in the packing of pork. Last year we exported to Great Britain bacon to the value of $6,422,747 and of hams $413,645. I shall not take the trouble to quote many figures regarding the price of hogs because that was thoroughly given by the Minister of Agriculture. The minister stated that every week in the last year, with possibly one exception, hogs were higher in the Ameri-

can markets than in the corresponding Canadian markets. While the hon. member for Brandon was speaking, I sent to the reading room for the 'Globe' and 'World,' and compared the prices of hogs in the different places in Canada and the United States for the preceding day, February 27. I found that the prices were as follows: Belleville, $6.50 to $6.60, 100 pounds; Peterborough, $6.75; St. Thomas, $6.60 to $6.65; Buffalo, $7 to $7.30; and Chicago, $6.85 to $7.15. In other words, on February 27 hogs were worth at least 25 cents a hundred pounds more in the United States markets than in the corresponding markets in Canada, and the Minister of Agriculture gave figures showing that that condition had existed for the past year. Let us see what will happen if this goes into force. My hon. friend says that the packer will be ruined. Why ruined? Because he will be compelled to pay the Canadian farmer what his hogs are worth. Is that any disadvantage to the Canadian farmer? I fail to see it, and if the Canadian packer wants to do business let him pay what the hogs are worth. Does any man tell me that the Canadian packers, with all the combination they have in force at present, and with a duty of 1¼ cents per pound protection, cannot pay the Canadian farmer what his hogs are worth? If he cannot I am afraid the Canadian packing industry is not of very much benefit to the people of Canada. But, Sir, I do not believe that statement, I do not believe them when they say they cannot pay this price. I know they can, I know they will. Possibly their dividends will not be as great as they have been in the past, but I think the farmers of Canada can well afford to allow the packers to receive a little less in dividends and give them what their hogs are worth in the open market.

Coming to cheese and butter, we sent last year to Britain $22,000,000 and to the United States $22,000. We had an entirely prohibitive duty against these products going into the United States. My friends may say: Oh, you are selling to the same market as the United States producer is. I want to give only one concrete illustration of what this meant to the Canadian farmer, that is the illustration referred to here by the Minister of Agriculture. When the Payne-Aldrich tariff was brought into effect two years ago, by a mistake the duty on cream was placed at 5 cents a gallon instead of 5 cents a quart. The result was that whereas in 1908 we practically sent no cream to the United States, last year from Quebec alone we sent $1,500,000 worth of cream. I wonder if the Canadian farmer in Quebec finds fault? Do you suppose he sent that cream to the United States because he got less for it than in Canada? No, Mr. Chairman, the farmer down in Quebec is just as human as the farmer in New Brunswick and he does not care what the destination of his product is, it is the money he is after, and if he sold that cream to the United States to the extent of $1,500,000 he did so because there is more money in it than in selling in the Canadian market. If this happened in one year the result in four or five years in the export of cheese and butter would be simply astonishing when the market is thrown open to these products.

The hon. member for Brandon stated that the Quaker Oat Industry of Peterborough would be absolutely ruined if this arrangement went into effect. I shall discuss this first from a local standpoint. The local consumption of this product with 8,000,000 people, must be considerable, and we pay enough for this in the maritime provinces. The men who can take ordinary oats and by treating them can sell them at the price charged does not lose much. If they want to sell in the local market, they have to-day the modest protection of 50 cents a hundred pounds, or half a cent a pound on the product of oats. That duty is as prohibitive as a duty of 200 cents a hundred pounds. That will be the case if this agreement goes through. To-day they have a protection of 60 cents per hundred pounds, and they say because that is reduced from 60 to 50 this industry, which I am told has cost $2,000,000, will absolutely close down and go out of business. Does any reasonable man believe that statement? Why, Sir, you only have to state the proposition to show the utter nonsense of it from the local standpoint. Let us take the export standpoint. It was argued—not by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) because he very wisely gave no reason for his statement, and if I admired him for anything in his speech it was for his acuteness and astuteness in making statements and not backing them up by facts and arguments—it was said that the Quaker Oats establishment would go out of business. The Quaker Oats people say that the duty does not affect them so far as the foreign market is concerned. They say they send the great majority of this to the British market, which I believe is true. The oats may cost them a little more, I believe they will because owing to this arrangement the price of oats will be higher, although I must confess that in the great markets of Canada and the United States perhaps there is no product of Canada which so nearly equals the price of the same product in the United States as oats. To-day there is not more than one cent in favour of the American product. But, suppose he has to pay three or four cents a bushel more for his raw material, he starts out on practically the same footing, and it will not cost any more to produce the article for shipment to England than it does to-day. Oh, they say, there is

the offal, the bran products and all that ; we cannot export that to the United States because there is a small duty upon it of 12½ cents per hundred pounds. The argument is that we cannot send offal over there, and that is where our profit comes in, and the result will be that the manufacturers will transfer their factories to the United States, they will be able to export the finished product to the British market the same as from Canada, and sell the offal on the American market. Now, I looked up this matter in the 'Trade Returns,' and do you know that of all the millions and millions of bushels of grain that are grown in Canada, including wheat, including oats, including every sort of grain that you can imagine that is exported, during the last fiscal year we only exported the bran of all kinds of grain to the paltry sum of $1,000,000. I do not suppose the export of offal from that oat factory down in Peterborough would be probably more than $5,000 or $6,000 ; but it must be almost infinitesmal when you come to consider that of all the manufacturing going on in Canada, of all the grinding of grain going on in Canada, only $1,000,000 worth of this offal has been exported.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the by products of the Peterborough factory only amount to $5,000 or $6,000?

Mr. CARVELL. No, I said that is all that was exported. Why dont they use that offal to-day? Dont our farmers buy that offal? The offal from an oat factory is not very good; there is some nourishment in it, and there must be hon. gentlemen in this House who have used it, but I have not. I wont feed my horses with it, I want something better than that. They use it for cattle to some extent, but they have been buying it in the past, and wont our farmers buy it in the future? Do you mean to tell me that you are not going to raise any more cattle in Canada in the future, that this country is going entirely to the dogs, and there will be no more sale for offal? That is as ridiculous as the hog argument. The result will be that they will go on manufacturing in Peterborough the same as we have done, and they will make just about the same profits, notwithstanding all the cry they are making, after all the argument put forth by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). I tell you here to-night that there will not be any closing down of the factories in the oat industries, business will go on as the demand all over the world increases, and just so will our business increase in Canada.

Lastly I come to wheat. Now wheat is a big problem. I admit it is something which I do not profess to know much about, in fact what I am going to give the House about wheat will be largely information which I have gleaned from listening to speeches during this debate, and from a study of the situation from the trade and navigation returns. I told my hon. friend from Portage (Mr. Meighen) this afternoon, in reply to a question, that I knew wheat was worth from 2 to 4 or 5 cents a bushel more in Minneapolis than it was in Winnipeg and Fort William, and such has been the case continually. Why it is, I cannot tell you. I am told that it is in some cases because the American miller wants the wheat, and on account of the transportation conditions, the Dakota farmer is able to get 2 or 3 cents more for his wheat than our farmer gets.

Mr. BARKER. Has the hon. gentleman ever considered whether the increased price was not due to our wheat being a sounder and stronger wheat?

Mr. CARVELL. No, because the American wheat has the greater price, the American gets 3 cents a bushel more than our people do. I do not see my hon. friend's point.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the American wheat is better than Canadian wheat?

Mr. CARVELL. Why, no, Mr. Chairman, I did not make any such foolish statement as that. I do not think my hon. friend does me much credit when he asks me if I made such a foolish statement as that. I think my hon. friend ought to give me credit for knowing better than that. I know that our wheat is the better, there is no question about it. I know that when wheat is made free the Americans will buy our wheat because it is better, and I know that our producers will get a better price than they are getting to-day. Now let us see what we are doing. Last year we exported to Great Britain somewhere about 27,500,000 bushels of wheat, and Great Britain imported from all countries in the world 163,000,00 bushels of wheat, and of that quantity she took from the United States about 24,000,000. I will admit that if for all time the United States were able to export to Great Britain the same number of bushels as we do, and conditions remained the same in the British market, and there was no preference given to our wheat, as an ordinary rule, if we had the same transportation facilities as they have, if we had the same commercial relations as they, the prices should be the same. I want to be quite fair about that. But remember it is only a few years ago when the American people were almost monopolizing the wheat market in Great Britain, and if present tendencies continue as they have in the last ten years, I be-

lieve that in ten or fifteen years the United States will cease to be a wheat exporting country at all. When that time arrives will it not be of some value to us to have free access to that market? I know the answer will be: But they are bound to buy our wheat any way. I tell my hon. friend that they can buy Argentine wheat if they want to, and let it in free. It may surprise them to be told that last year Argentine exported twenty per cent more wheat to the British market than we did, and Argentine is one of the greatest wheat producing countries in the world. If Argentine wheat went into the United States free of duty, would it not be better for our farmers to have that market in addition to the British market? Because in Great Britain everything is always open to it. I do not think there is much danger of the British workingman ever voting to put a duty upon the wheat his family uses. Depend upon it, the British market will remain free for all time as it is to-day, and we will have that market open to us. Now in addition to that, when the United States becomes a wheat importer, we are on the ground floor, we are in a position to do the business, provided we do not throw away the opportunity and fetter ourselves with customs regulations which will prevent us from taking advantage of it.

Mr. BARKER. If our wheat is of a higher grade and of a greater value, why should we not establish our own market and sell our own wheat at its proper price rather than mix it with American wheat?

Mr. CARVELL. Who has been talking about mixing? It is only my hon. friend who is mixed. The hon. member for Brandon was mixed on Tuesday. These are the only men I have heard that are mixed on this question. They tell about this wheat being mixed, I think it was the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster)—and we are pretty safe in attributing to him any erroneous statements of that kind—I think he said in this debate: You might as well dump the elevators of Fort William and Port Arthur into the lake; when you get this trade agreement in force everything will go by American routes, our railways will go out of business and we are done forever. The hon. member for Brandon did not make quite the same statement, but he arrived at the same results, because he said there would be no more grading of our wheat, that you could not grade it, it would be mixed with United States wheat and would lose its identity, it would be mixed with an inferior wheat, causing the price to go down, and the result would be that the Liverpool market which regulates the values of wheat would place a lower price on it. But who is talking about dumping elevators into the lake? Only the prophets of blue ruin opposite. Take the experience of the United States under present conditions. My hon. friends say that all this wheat is going by United States transportation channels. Last year we exported of our wheat through United States channels 25,950,000 bushels. How do my hon. friends account for that? There was no reciprocity then, there was no trade arrangement, there was no treachery or treason on the part of the Liberals. Everything was going along squarely when things were well enough—as my hon. friends say. Yet 25,000,000, almost 26,000,000 bushels of our wheat went through United States channels. Worse than that; of that amount 19,478,000 bushels actually went through the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. How do you account for that? A child ten years of age could account for that, and the explanation is that it is purely and simply a question of transportation. I come back to my proposition of a short time ago. Give a staunch Tory one-tenth of a cent a bushel more on his wheat through American channels than through Canadian channels and he will jump at it every time; so will the Liberal. We are all alike in that way.

Mr. BARKER. That is what you are arguing for.

Mr. CARVELL. Their loyalty is only lip loyalty and it is confined to that holier-than-thou community called Toronto. What is the future of the wheat industry from the transportation standpoint? We will get the advantage of whatever the American market gives to us, if there is any advantage. If there is no advantage the wheat will continue to go to Europe as it has in the past. It will go by United States channels if these channels are cheaper than ours, but if we can do anything to get our transportation rates down to the same level, or to a point one-tenth of a cent a bushel less than the United States rates, then the wheat will be shipped through Canadian channels. Does any man mean to tell me, that, with the history of the past in view and remembering how we have been going ahead in the last five or ten years, we will not be able to handle all the wheat that we raise in the next three or four years? I have here a comparison which shows the change that is taking place in the transportation of wheat. In 1903 we sent through the port of Montreal 8,000,000 bushels, whereas there were exported through the port of New York 14,000,000 bushels. I presume that that means both Canadian and American wheat. In 1908 the export through Montreal had jumped to 30,000,000 bushels and the New York trade had gone to 16,000,000 bushels. In 1910 Montreal had dropped to 20,000,000 bushels and New York had fallen to the

insignificant amount of 6,000,000 bushels. Can any man read these figures without coming to the conclusion that Montreal is going ahead in the transportation of wheat faster than any other place? It is only a short time when, if we pursue the proper methods, the Canadian route will entirely control the transportation of wheat. We have only commenced to improve our transportation routes. It may be, as our hon. friends say, that we have spent $150,000,000 in building the National Transcontinental railway that is going to reduce the cost of transportation of the stable products of the west to Great Britain. We are, I believe—I hope so—entering into the project immediately of deepening the Welland canal. The government cannot start that work one day too soon to suit me, and I am told that next year we are going to commence the project of building the Georgian Bay canal. When we get these transportation routes perfected, even leaving out the Georgian Bay canal, and when the water in the Welland canal is deepened to 21 or 22 feet, does any man mean to tell me that we cannot transport wheat through Canada cheaper than they can through the Erie canal with a 6 feet depth of water? You only have to state the proposition in order to see the utter nonsense of the argument on the other side. I believe, and the figures prove that I am correct, that in the next five or ten years, the exportation of Canadian wheat will practically cease through American channels and we will be able to control it all through Canadian channels. I hope this government will go on with these improvements and if they do it will not be very long until we are able to carry not only all our own wheat but a great portion of the American wheat at the same time. We are reaching that point much faster perhaps than hon. gentlemen oppositie realize unless they have given some thought to the subject. We have improved our trade routes to such an extent within the last three or four years that we are able to compete with the American routes as is shown by the fact that last year Montreal exported three times the quantity of wheat than New York did. During the present winter, so I am informed by officials who know, more than half of the wheat that is being shipped through the Port of St. John is American wheat; the result of improving our transportation facilities as we have been doing. The government is not doing it all; the railways are doing wonders too. The Canadian Pacific railway will spend in the next three or four years $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 in perfecting their rail haul from the Georgian bay to Montreal. They have double tracked their line to Smith's Falls or Sharbot Lake. We had a Bill before the Railway Committee not long ago by which they are getting a charter for another road. We had a friendly little scrap over it; the Canadian Pacific railway wanted to build the road through a certain portion of the country because they thought that they could get a three-tenths of one per cent grade by going by that route and the committee, I think rightly, alowed them to go that way. We have had the Grand Trunk railway improving their trade routes and we will have the Canadian Northern men, who are entitled to occupy almost the highest place among Canadian railway men, extending their road from the Georgian bay to Montreal and Quebec in a short time. When these improvements are brought into existence I have no fear as to the carrying of Canadian wheat through Canadian channels. I am taking up more time than I had intended.

Mr. BARKER. If my hon. friend is going to continue and increase the shipment of wheat by the Canadian route through Montreal how is he going to get the western farmer a higher price for wheat down south?

Mr. CARVELL. I thought I explained that. I thought I explained that wheat is higher at the present time in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg. If it were the same price and we both continued to ship in the same quantities and to the same market we would still get the same price. I want to make myself perfectly plain. I want to be perfectly fair and to make my argument logical. I said that I was going to take up one other question which has been considered in this House and the country during the course of this debate and that is the fruit question.

Well, we got a shock this afternoon. My hon. friends pounded their desks when my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) was talking. I think that some of them must be really in a worn out condition physically this evening, the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) for instance. All of my hon. friends opposite certainly did a lot of honour to my hon. friend from Welland and when my hon. friend from Welland, who was supposed to be the star actor, next to my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton)——

Mr. CROCKET. Who is to be the next?

Mr. CARVELL. There will not be very many more. I will tell my hon. friend I can tell my hon. friends opposite that with the exception of those who have spoken there is not a 'next' on this side of the House. All the others accept the agreement loyally, believing that in helping to make it law they are doing something that will redound to their own credit and to the everlasting advantage of the Dominion. My hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) dealt with the fruit question and he lives in a fruit district and he gives it as his opinion that his constituents will benefit by this

arrangement and he ought to know. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell you that it is going to ruin the fruit industry, that 800 fruit growers petitioned the government some time ago not to carry out the agreement, but between my hon. friend from Welland on the one side and gentlemen opposite on the other, for my part I would take the evidence of the hon. gentleman from Welland because he knows.

Mr. BARKER. He said he did not know.

Mr. CARVELL. He said he did know.

Mr. LENNOX. No, he said he preferred to take the opinion of the fruit growers.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not wonder my hon. friends want to get away from that point because it is all in our favour.

Mr. CROCKET. The member for Welland said he would accept the opinion of the men in the trade because he did not know himself.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friends are welcome to whatever comfort they can get from that.

Mr. BARKER. Thank you.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) told us it was going to ruin the fruit industry of British Columbia, and Mr. McBride says so, and the whole Tory party of British Columbia says so, and the whole Tory party of Canada of course are bound to say so, but a newspaper printed right in the capital town of the constituency of my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) says the agreement is the best thing that ever happened for the fruit growers. Now, I am inclined to believe that newspaper. I do not believe that the fruit growers of British Columbia, who can raise the best fruit in the world, are not able to compete in the mining and manufacturing centres of the west with the fruit growers of California or elsewhere. As to the Niagara peninsula fruit growers, the morning after the Minister of Finance brought down these resolutions, I met a gentleman who is intimately acquainted with the fruit industry there, and he told me that the result of the arrangement would be that the Niagara fruit growers would have more of a consuming population within one night's run of the Niagara peninsula than they have now in the whole Dominion of Canada, and that he was very much mistaken if they would not have a very greatly enlarged and more profitable market. I think I will take that gentleman's statement in preference to the statement of those who know nothing about it.

Mr. BARKER. Who was it?

Mr. CARVELL. Perhaps it would not be fair for me to give his name.

Mr. BARKER. Oh, yes it would.

Mr. CARVELL. I will give it to my hon. friend in confidence.

Mr. BARKER. Oh, let us have it in public; he was not a Canadian.

Mr. CARVELL. He was a Canadian, and a good one at that.

Mr. BARKER. Name him then.

Mr. CARVELL. But Mr. Chairman, British Columbia and the Niagara peninsula are not the only portions of Canada which raise fruit. There is a portion of Canada comprising about one-eighth of the population of this country—and we think more than one-eighth of the brains and ability of this Dominion—called the maritime provinces, and in proportion to population the maritime provinces produce fruit to as great if not a greater extent than do British Columbia and the Niagara peninsula. Go to the Annapolis valley and it is in the knowledge of every gentleman in this House that, be they Grit or Tory, the farmers of that wonderful fruit growing valley—and there is nothing to equal it in the world to-day for raising apples—are enthusiastically in favour of this arrangement. To-day the apple growers of the Annapolis valley are compelled to devote their energies exclusively almost to growing a winter apple which they can export to Great Britain. True, they raise a summer apple called the Gravenstein, but at present they have no considerable market for them, and the production is limited in quantity. But, with the market of the United States, which this agreement will give us, the possibility of raising summer apples in the Annapolis valley is almost unlimited. Had these farmers had a market of the United States for the past ten or fifteen years they would export quadruple the quantity they export at the present time. In my own constituency, twenty years ago we were growing a summer apple called the New Brunswicker, which is very much like the Duchess. It was developed by a Mr. Sharpe, who devoted his life to the industry and made a success of it, and twenty years ago we were shipping apples to Boston by the carload and people were planting orchards all over the country. But the duty was put on in the United States and the market was taken from us and our orchards went to decay. Give us the United States market and these orchards will be resuscitated, and new orchards planted, and where to-day we do not sell a carload of that fruit in the United States, in a few years to come when the young trees which will be planted are in bearing, we will send hundreds of carloads.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the American duty against Canadian fruit 20 years ago?

Mr. CARVELL. It was nothing; that is just what I am telling you; it was free. When fruit was free in the United States we could send our apples there, but when the McKinley Bill came into operation against us our orchards went into decay.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the hon. gentleman quite certain that under the United States tariff of 20 years ago Canadian fruit was free?

Mr. CARVELL. I do not like to make a statement that I cannot back up with proof, and I have not the tariff of 20 years ago here, but I think I am right, and my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) will bear me out in the statement.

Mr. BLAIN. I will not. Nobody would suggest that in the United States 20 years ago there was not a very heavy duty against apples as there is to-day.

Mr. CARVELL. Within my lifetime fruit was free going into the United States, and the apples were sent there in large quantities and they cannot go there to-day because of the duty.

Mr. LOGGIE. Before the McKinley Bill.

Mr. CARVELL. Yes. I believe it is 21 years ago since the McKinley Bill came into force, and I mentioned 20 years ago, but the correction is only a quibble. That is about the size of some people.

Mr. BLAIN. Since the hon. gentleman is personal, does he say there was no duty against fruit in the United States until the McKinley Bill came into effect?

Mr. CARVELL. I am not going to get into an argument with my hon. friend. I made the statement, and if I am wrong he can correct me.

Mr. CROCKET. We merely wish to understand your statement.

Mr. CARVELL. We can raise in the Annapolis valley strawberries, raspberries, currents, and small fruits to twenty times the extent we are raising them to-day if we had the United States market, and the same is true of the St. John valley. About a fortnight ago a very prominent Conservative lawyer in the city of St. John, perhaps one of the most prominent Conservative lawyers in the province and who is interested in the steamboat business on the River St. John, told me in Ottawa that if this arrangement went into effect, from the constituency of Queens and Sunbury alone, in three years there would be a special line of steamers running on the St. John river direct to Boston in the summer time in order to carry this fruit, and this man knows what he is speaking about. He has been for years interested in steamboating on the St. John river, and during the last three or four years they have been sending these small fruits to some extent by these steamers which tranship them to the International Steamship line at St. John for Boston, and I give his statement for what it is worth, and the hon. members for York and St. John know the gentleman to whom I refer. What is true of Kings and Sunbury is true of the county of York, the county of St. John, and every other county on the western side of the province of New Brunswick, as well as of many constituencies in Nova Scotia; and where we produce to-day one dollar's worth of fruit, we shall produce in a few years ten, fifteen or twenty dollars worth. That is what it means to the people of the maritime provinces.

Now, I want very briefly to discuss this matter along the general line which the debate has taken. Our hon. friends opposite would try to make the country believe, and try to convince themselves—for I think they are hollering to keep their own courage up—that this is a great big measure of free trade. Well, Sir, it is not half so big as I personally would like to see it. We are told that the Liberal party when they came into power borrowed protection from the Conservatives; but remember that we came into power pledged to obtain reciprocity from the United States if we could get it on fair terms, just as the Conservative party were pledged to obtain reciprocity, and would have been glad to have it down to 1896. We sent a deputation to Washington to endeavour to get reciprocity, and we would have been delighted to have got the arrangement which we have to-day. We could not get it. I presume we could have obtained reciprocity if we had conceded a large enough list of manufactured articles on our side; but we would not do it. Our delegation returned home, and we introduced the British preference. Our hon. friends opposite may say that we introduced it in order to cater to the feeling prevailing at that time that we should do something to help out the British people and to prove our loyalty. I do not believe that was the object at all. I believe the British preference was meant by the government who introduced it, and I am sure it was accepted by the Liberal party and by the country generally, as intended to ameliorate to some extent the sufferings of the consumers and producers of Canada from the National Policy under which we had been suffering so long. The government first reduced by one-fourth the duties levied on articles from Great Britain, and a year or two afterwards they increased the preference to 33⅓ per cent, so that now we pay on articles coming from Great Britain only two-thirds of the duty that we pay on articles coming from the

United States or from any other part of the world. Is that not a benefit to the consumers of Canada? That was the object, as I understood it, of introducing the British preference, and that was the reason my hon. friends opposite opposed it. There are members sitting in this Chamber to-night who have opposed the British preference from the day it was born down to the present time, and who would oppose to-night as strongly as before any proposal to increase it—why? Not because it helps the farmers, the lumbermen, the fishermen and the consuming masses of the Canadian people, but because they are afraid that it will interfere with the dividends of their friends the manufacturers. But I can assure the government that there is no way in which they can more ingratiate themselves with the people of Canada or do more good to the people of Canada than to bring down before this parliament adjourns a measure increasing the British preference to at least 40 per cent. Why did not my hon. friends opposite cheer the hon. member for Welland this afternoon when he said that he wanted reciprocity within the empire? They were as dumb as oysters when he said that, because they knew that if they accepted that proposition they would be flying in the face of the manufacturers, and that is one thing none of them will dare to do, from the leader down to the hon. member for York.

Mr. CROCKET. Would you suggest that the government should do it now?

Mr. CARVELL. I do most assuredly, and I believe I am voicing the sentiment of a great number of the members on this side of the House, and I know that I am voicing the sentiment of a majority of the electors of this country. We have been told in this debate to let well enough alone. We have been told that this country has progressed for thirteen years past as it has never done before. We have been telling hon. gentlemen opposite that all along, but they would not admit it. Now they say this country has never been so prosperous as it is to-day. The hon. member for Welland, the hon. member for Brandon, and the hon. member for North Toronto, have all said that it is prosperous because we have had a protective tariff, and they say that the tariff that we have had since 1896 is practically the same as the tariff we had from 1879 down to 1896. If the tariff which we have had from 1896 down to the present time has made this country prosperous, I ask why it did not make the country prosperous before 1896 if it was the same tariff? I tell you it is not the tariff that has made Canada prosperous. It is the tariff that has kept Canada from being as prosperous as it might otherwise have been. I can tell you what has made Canada prosperous. When the Liberal party came into power in 1896, the hon. member for Brandon introduced an immigration policy which will stand to his credit even if he should pass over to the opposition side of the House, and under that policy we brought immigrants into the country, at first to the number of over 50,000 yearly, and latterly in still larger numbers. The result is that we have in the Northwest to-day a population which is using the manufactured articles of Ontario, and it is their consumption of these articles that is making Ontario prosperous. We in the maritime provinces cannot send our products to the Northwest or to Ontario because transportation is against us. We have sent practically nothing to Ontario but a little coal, and in the last few years a few potatoes.

Mr. SPROULE. You have been sending fish for the last forty years.

Mr. CARVELL. Not to any great extent. I wish we were sending ten times as much as we are. We are not sending to Ontario anything like the quantity we are sending to the United States in the face of an almost prohibitive duty.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the hon. gentleman aware that two factories in Fredericton are selling goods in British Columbia?

Mr. CARVELL. Yes, I am, and I am aware that they sold boots to British Columbia before the National Policy was ever thought of. We have not in the maritime provinces reaped the benefit of this increased population from a manufacturing point of view, though we have as good artisans as they have in Ontario, the same protective policy, as good brains, the power, and everything necessary to make a successful manufacturing country. We have failed, while Ontario has succeeded—why? Because Ontario has a great consuming population at its doors, and we have not. That is what has made Canada prosperous in the last ten or fifteen years, and not the tariff policy which this government has continued from its predecessors.

I would like to take a few moments to analyse this agreement in its results. My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) did that admirably, much better than I can hope to do it, but I want to analyse it to some extent, in a rather different way, for the benefit of my friends from the maritime provinces. Our hon. friends opposite complained that we have abandoned the British preference, that we have thrown over the mother country, that we are leading this country into annexation, that we are disloyal, that we are everything but good Canadians and British subjects. And why? Because, forsooth, we are asking for the right to sell our natural products in the

best markets we can find, and are content to pay the same duties as we have been paying in the past on everything we are manufacturing. Analyse that agreement and see what it amounts to. I have taken a leaf from the book of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and counted the number of items in the different schedules. On the free list there are 70 items, and of those there are 40 which we do not bring from Great Britain at all. Of the other 30 there are a number of which we import from Britain less than $10,000 worth, and of the whole 70 there are only two of which we import more than $100,000 per year from Britain. Those two are salt and grapes. I find, also, that the total imports from Great Britain of the articles on that free list last year only amounted to $4,190,000. If you deduct from that amount sheets of rolled steel, of which our imports amounted to $3,490,000, you have got the beggarly sum of $699,000 imported from Great Britain out of the hundreds of millions of our total imports from that country. Out of those hundreds of millions only the beggarly sum of $699,000 was the amount which we imported from the mother country of those articles on the free list, leaving out the item of steel. Yet we are told that this thing is not only injuring, but ruining the British preference. Then I counted the number of items on which the duty will be higher under the British preference than under the proposed agreement, and I find that these are only three, and that the imports of these three only amount to a few thousand dollars altogether. So that, even without increasing the British preference, the rates of duty on British imports will be still lower in every instance than the duties which the United States will pay should this arrangement go through. If there be any fault to find with this proposed agreement it is that under it the consumer is not getting his goods cheap enough. But if we should increase the British preference we would then put the consumer in the same relative position as he has enjoyed in the past.

I come now to the dutiable list, and I find that there are in it 101 items. Of those 29 are not imported from Great Britain at all and never have been. Of the items, the imports of which from Great Britain are under $10,000 per year there are 44, and there are only seven items of which we import over $100,000 from the mother country. That is the dutiable list. And I find that altogether on that dutiable list we imported last year from Great Britain only $2,196,000, a mere nothing, whereas we imported from the United States, of the articles on this same list, to the extent of $32,359,000. And all we are asked to do is to take the duty off these goods to some extent—not to any great extent. Why, the

Mr. CARVELL.

reduction is a mere bagatelle. We are only reducing the duties from 32½ per cent to 30 per cent and 27½ per cent, but still even that is some little relief to the consumers. Take item after item, and you will find a duty of 15 per cent, 25 per cent, 30 per cent and 32 per cent still left on articles brought from the United States under the proposed agreement. Take automobiles; last year we brought about $150,000 worth from the United States in spite of the duty of 35 per cent. I admit that if there be anything on which a revenue ought to be collected it is automobiles, because they are a luxury. But the duty is simply prohibitive. Under that duty it is almost impossible to bring in an automobile from the other side of the line. In my opinion it would be better both for the consumer and the manufacturer if that duty were reduced.

Mr. BARKER. Why?

Mr. CARVELL. Because we would get a better article, because then the manufacturer would not dare put on the market the thing he puts on to-day and call it an automobile.

Mr. BARKER. Our own people would make more, no doubt.

Mr. CARVELL. I know what I am talking about. I do not want to knock the manufacturers, but my hon. friend had better not ask me too many questions. If he wants information I can give it to him.

Mr. HENDERSON. Are you a manufacturer?

Mr. CARVELL. I am a consumer. And what is true of automobiles is true practically of other manufactured articles. I admit that we cannot have free trade in Canada, because we require a revenue, and, perhaps, the only way we can raise a revenue at present is by a customs tariff; but I do submit that it would be better, both for the manufacturers and the consumers if our customs tariff were reduced to such a point as would give us revenue and give the manufacturers whatever protection they can obtain incidentally from a revenue tariff. That question, however, has been threshed out during many years, and I do not propose to go into it now. But in my opinion a reduction of our tariff would be a good thing even for our manufacturers. In many instances they are twenty years behind the times. Their factories are not properly organized, they are not pursuing business methods, they are using the antiquated machinery of 25 years ago.

Mr. AMES. Name some of them.

Mr. CARVELL. I might offer some of my own experiences, because I have had a little experience myself in manufacturing,

and I can tell you that we lost money because we did not have the proper machinery. Take the woollen manufacturers; will any one tell me that you could not make wool cheaper than it is made in our factories to-day if they were properly fitted with up to date machinery? Take any of our industries that are making money, and you will find that they have modern machinery and improved methods. If you would reduce the tariff you would compel our manufacturers to adopt these methods.

Mr. BARKER. Why do you not go into the woollen business and try it yourself?

Mr. CARVELL. I do not want to refer to my own experience, but I have had a little experience in the woollen business, too, and I will tell you the results. There was a woollen mill in our town established some 15 years ago under the protective tariff. It had old machinery and poor management, and was run into debt until it owed the bank some $6,000 or $7,000. Finally the bank took it over, put in a little new machinery and better management, and ran it until the debt was wiped out. Then the bank said: We do not want to run that business any longer, and they stopped it.

Mr. BARKER. Why did you not continue it?

Mr. CARVELL. The bank stopped it because it was not the business of a bank to run a factory.

Mr. BARKER. You know how it can be done with profit?

Mr. CARVELL. Yes, by better methods and better machinery. But what does this system of protection do? In nine cases out of ten it simply takes money out of the pockets of the consumers and puts it into the pockets of the manufacturers. If a factory is up to date and properly run, it gives enormous profits. If not it only drags along. Let me refer to something with which I am perfectly familiar, and that is electrical machinery. I do not want to refer to my own business, but I was challenged by the hon. member and I will give an illustration. There are practically to-day only two great manufacturers of electrical machinery in Canada, the Westinghouse and the Canadian General Electric, and these people are charging us to-day for everything we buy, and I have bought thousands and thousands of dollars worth in the last few years, the cost in the United States plus the duty almost entirely. These people are putting out a splendid article, they have modern up-to-date machinery, well organized methods and they are making money, and if you cut their duty down to 20 per cent or even to 15 per cent they will still continue to do business in Canada because 15 per cent is enough to force them to come here, they will come and do business in Canada, and every man buying a piece of electrical machinery would get the benefit of the reduction in price. It means a lot to our people, more to the small consumer than to the larger one, but that is a concrete illustration of what protection is doing in Canada. I tell the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) who is interested in one of these companies as it is in his constituency, that it would be better for the people of Canada if they pensioned off the 5,000 employees employed in this industry than to continue them and have to pay the present increased price owing to the duty.

Mr. BARKER. What will the farmers say?

Mr. CARVELL. That there are only a few of them.

Mr. BARKER. Ask the farmers.

Mr. CARVELL. They will say: Cut the duty down, give us the machinery cheaper.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why not put it in the treaty?

Mr. CARVELL. That is the trouble. My friend the Minister of Finance was too good to the manufacturers, he saved them and look at the thanks he is getting for it. Another illustration. No industry in Canada has made the strides, has given us the results and has made as much money as the manufacturers of agricultural implements. Our agricultural implement manufactories should be a matter of pride to every Canadian. Massey-Harris and Frost & Wood, are two of the finest examples of energy, honesty and upright dealings in the history of Canada. They have developed and developed and made money. Under what? A 20 per cent duty, 22½ per cent I think until 1907, then reduced to 17½ per cent, and now proposed to be reduced to 15½. If you want any evidence of what the farm machinery manufacturers have done, I find that in the last fiscal year these people exported from Canada farm machinery, mowing machines, reapers, binders, seeders, &c., to the magnificent amount of $4,300,000, and yet you tell me that a manufacturing industry cannot get along in Canada without 30 per cent or 35 per cent protection. My hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) gave the whole thing away. He says you are attacking the outworks of protection and very soon the citadel will fall. The only men who are hit, practically, are the farm machinery men and they are saying nothing about it. I would like to know where you can get a better example of what can be done in Canada under a revenue tariff than the case of the agricultural machinery. We know that a revenue tariff produces revenue, because when the duty was reduced one-third, under the British preference, our revenue was quite doubled, not only our imports increased but our re-

venues. We know that such a tariff stimulates importation. People buy things cheaper, buy more of them, the home manufacture goes on just the same, the farmer gets more for his money and every one works more and we have a better condition of society. What happened when this arrangement was sought to be brought into effect? The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs went to Washington with the idea that if they could not get a reciprocity treaty practically in natural products they would not treat at all. They were carrying out the principle for which we have contended ever since I was a boy and for which the Conservatives contended when they were in power. I did not believe they would get it; nobody did, they did not believe it themselves, and they were so careful of the manufacturers that they did not do for us what they should have done. Let me give an illustration. The Minister of Finance, on account of the protest put up by the coal barons of Montreal was only able to reduce the duty 8 cents in order to bring it on a par with the American duty. Another illustration. I myself applied to the Minister of Finance to reduce the duty on an article which could be manufactured in St. John in enormous quantities, right on the shores of deep water, whence it could be shipped to the United States, an article of which millions and millions are sold every year. The minister could not do it because an industry in the province of Ontario might be affected and he did not do it. I do not know whether he was offered it by the American commissioners or not, as he has a faculty of holding his peace. I know he did not take off the duty and that the city of St. John cannot have that industry which would employ hundreds, I believe thousands of men in the next five years and would become one of the greatest industries in New Brunswick, simply because some protectionist gentlemen in Ontario felt that they would be affected.

Another illustration. The papers yesterday contained a statement of Senator Carter in the United States Senate to the effect that the United States commissioners wanted to make meats and flour free of duty and to put them on the reciprocal list, but that our commissioners would not consent to this because they were afraid it might interfere with manufacturers of the Dominion of Canada. I give these two illustrations of the way in which the manufacturers have been protected, in which all the interests of Canada have been protected, and yet men like the member for St. Antoine, to whom I give credit for being perfectly frank, says: You have attacked the outworks of protection and before long the citadel would fall. Fall? Because under this agreement we are going to allow in from England $699,000 worth more goods than last year, if you bar out rolled steel, and a few millions of dollars from the United States.

Mr. AMES. Please do not put words into my speech which I did not utter. If you read the part where I said the outworks were attacked you will see that is not the reason.

Mr. CARVELL. I fail to see what the reason can be. I listened attentively to the hon. gentleman's speech and read it, and that is the meaning I took from it.

Mr. AMES. Do not entirely misinterpret my speech. If you read the portion referring to the outworks you will see it is entirely different.

Mr. CARVELL. I hope my hon. friend is recanting.

Mr. AMES. Not a bit.

Mr. CARVELL. I thought not, it comes back to that, that the protectionist manufacturer will not allow my hon. friends opposite to accept this proposal. The hon. member is a manufacturer, and every man who buys a cheap shoe for his family knows the member for St. Antoine is a manufacturer, and he is as good as any of them.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the hon. gentleman say he has not himself recanted when he is so jealous of the citadel of protection?

Mr. CARVELL. I am not; I am saying that the commissioners were jealous of the citadel of protection. I have made myself plain. It was the commissioners who were jealous of the citadel of protection, and who tried every way in the world to protect these people. And what is the result? All over Canada, all the financial interests, all the bankers, some of the railroads—not all of them—the boards of trade, the manufacturers, have started a campaign against this arrangement. You would think that the whole citadel of protection was stormed and captured by reason of the paltry few millions of dollars involved in this arrangement. Now they say that the transportation interests are going to be ruined, that all the millions of dollars we have spent in opening up lines of transportation east and west are going to be wasted, because trade will now go north and south. I can only refer to the statement I read earlier in my remarks regarding farm products. In face of what would almost be considered a prohibitory tariff, three-fourths of all the farm products of the maritime provinces, yes, five-sixths, go to the United States now. But free trade in these natural products will hurt the railroads, we are told. I have shown what would

happen to wheat. It cannot hurt wheat, it cannot hurt cattle, it cannot hurt hogs; and it is only trying to draw a herring across the track when they say it is going to hurt the transportation interests.

Then the bankers say: You must not put this thing through because you are breaking down the bulwarks of trade—they do not say protection—you are unsettling all the conditions of trade. They say it is disloyal for a man to sell his horse, or his sheep, or his fish to the United States, although he can get a better price for them. The gentleman who was the leader of that famous sixteen in the city of Toronto did not think it was disloyal when he financed the cotton crop of the United States with the money of the Canadian people, and other banking institutions have taken Canadian money by the million out of this country and invested it in the United States. I tell my hon. friends that in many places our banks are nothing but savings banks, and if the farmer or any one else wants $100 or $200 he has got to get a number of his relatives to endorse a note before he can get that sum of money out of the banks. Still the bankers will take this money by the million to the United States or anywhere else they can. I remember that in 1907-8—I am saying something that I know—the banks in the maritime provinces increased the interest rate up to seven per cent and made that payable every three months, and when I remonstrated with them they frankly admitted that they could take their money to New York and put it out on call loans and make more than seven per cent out of it. And still they got that money for three per cent from the farmers of the county of Carleton. This is perhaps a little aside from the question under discussion, but I have in my hand something which was sent out by the banks, or at least by the 'Monetary Times' of Canada, closely associated with the banks, and they have an impudence which excels anything I have ever seen. I find in an article called the Parliamentary Bank Act, on page 16, they say the government will hear the arguments, and then it goes on:

> It is not to be expected that ministers will lend countenance to the extreme or revolutionary proposals that emanate from individual members of parliament.

I want to know if you ever heard such impudence as that addressed to members of parliament. I want to tell these gentlemen that if I am alive I will be in the Banking and Commerce Committee when the Bank Act comes up, and perhaps I will be guilty of some of the revolutionary proposals which this article refers to.

Mr. AMES. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is discussing the Bank Act instead of this trade arrangement.

Mr. CARVELL. It evidently hurts my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames). Now I come back to the subject. I want to tell my hon. friends, however, that while they may stand by the banks, and while they may stand by the manufacturers, and while they may stand by their interests, the farmers of this country, the lumbermen of this country, the fishermen, the labourers, all the toilers of this country, will stand by the government in the course they have mapped out for this country to-day. I have pointed out what it means to the agriculturists of the maritime provinces, I have pointed out what it means to the lumbermen of the maritime provinces, and I have tried to point out what it means to the agriculturists of the rest of Canada. I have pointed out what it means to the fishermen of the maritime provinces; and while as I have said, I do not feel capable of discussing the fishing industry in its details, I want to read to this House and to place upon the 'Hansard' a statement made at a banquet in Halifax not long ago by the Hon. Mr. Murray, than whom no abler, no more patriotic, no more loyal, no more sincere politician is in public life in Canada to-day, a man who knows the needs of the farmers, the needs of the fishermen and of the lumbermen in Nova Scotia better than any banker, any manufacturer, or any other gentleman I believe who occupies a seat on the floor of this House. Here is what Mr. Murray says:

GREAT FREE MARKET.

> For a quarter of a century this great portion of our population longed for a free market with the nation to the south. Now that great wish has been satisfied and hope is filling the heart of every man who follows the sea for a livelihood. We have seen the tremendous development that Liberal legislation has wrought in our coal industry. I do not wish to be over emphatic here to-night, but I will say this. I believe no man to-day can foresee what a free market for fish will bring to the population of our sea-board. I see no reason to-day why the fishing fleet of Nova Scotia should not increase three-fold. I see no reason why we should not become the principal fish food producers of this continent. (Cheers.) And yet there are men in this province who would expect the honest toiler of the deep to listen to some befuddled arguments about endangering the British flag, or injuring the railroads that run east and west. They would even ask him to besmirch his sacred ballot by condemning a policy that means so much to him and to the generations to follow him. Does anybody say that because the Nova Scotia fisherman sells his fish to an American at better prices, that his loyalty is being impugned? If this is the case the electors of Yarmouth and Shelburne would be open to the gravest suspicion.

Whatever our views may be upon other political issues, surely we can all agree upon this. When any one expects the fisherman who produces results by his own unaided efforts to refuse the privilege of selling in the dearest market; I say, when any man expects the fisherman to defeat by his ballot the realization of his long sought hopes, he offers an insult to that fisherman's intelligence, or else he believes that the fisherman is willing to stultify his conscience for party expediency. I believe, however, that the lesson of life has been too well learned by our fisherfolk for either result to follow.

I commend that to my hon. friends opposite, and I commend it to every thinking elector in the Dominion of Canada. I accept this trade agreement without any reservation whatever. As I have said before, it is something which the people of my province and of my constituency have been praying for ever since I was a boy. It is something the people of the maritime provinces have been praying for, that the people of Quebec have been praying for, that the people of the Northwest asked for when they came down here a few weeks ago. It is something that will build up this country, and will bring immigration into this country in a greater flood than we have ever seen it yet. Instead of our people leaving the maritime provinces by the thousands for the United States, they will come back by the tens of thousands. If in my humble capacity I can be of any assistance in helping to bring about this great boon to the people, then I will feel that my advent into public life has not been in vain; and if I retired to-morrow, I would feel that I am well repaid for all the trouble, all the energy I have expended, and all the time that I have lost in my ten or twelve years of public life.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey). I do not propose to follow seriatim the arguments used by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), though I may touch upon some of them as I proceed in the remarks I propose to make. My hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., made one or two remarks which are to me so obviously incorrect that I think perhaps he will pardon me for saying a word with respect to them. I observe that he spoke with reference to the fruit trade of New Brunswick and he said that if the agreement were passed it would enable the people of New Brunswick to cultivate certain varieties of fruit and that they would find a very profitable market in the United States. He said that there was an apple called the Gravenstein that would be very favourably received across the line and that in four or five years, to use his own words, they would quadruple the quantity produced in New Brunswick. Would the hon. gentleman tell me how they will be able to quadruple the quantity in four or five years when it takes ten years for the apple tree to mature sufficiently to profitably produce fruit?

Mr. CARVELL. I did not say that at all; I said: In ten or fifteen years.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. No.

Mr. CARVELL. I beg my hon. friend's pardon.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. My hon. friend said within six or seven years and later on he said that in a few years we will have increased the quantity ten, fifteen, or twenty times the present amount. If my hon. friend can tell me how he will increase the quantity ten, fifteen or twenty times in the number of years he has mentioned I would like to hear him. Then my hon. friend said that away back before the National Policy was inaugurated they used to export boots from New Brunswick to British Columbia. That would be six or seven years before the Canadian Pacific railway was built and then they would have to pay the duty, send them through the United States down to San Francisco and then up to British Columbia which only had a population at that time of 25,000 or 30,000. These are a few of the extravagant statements that my hon. friend made. He said something about cattle and the remark he made in reference to that was that Canada exported last year about $10,000,000 worth of cattle, that the United States also exported $13,000,000 worth of cattle; and that therefore—I suppose his argument was—that it was a good thing for Canada to have free intercourse with the United States with respect to cattle. If that argument proves anything it proves that as the United States exported $13,000,000 worth of cattle it is not our natural market but that our natural market is Great Britain, the country that takes the surplus of both Canada and the United States. But my hon. friend forgot to say that while the United States export of cattle had somewhat decreased the export of chilled and frozen meat was rapidly increasing. The country which can export frozen or chilled meat, as compared with live cattle, is the country that is doing most for its people because, by exporting the manufactured product you are keeping your cattle at home, you are giving employment to men in the abattoirs, you are giving employment to men who are converting the skins of the cattle into leather and the leather into shoes and harness, and when you compare the two nations that which is doing the former is in a much better position than that which is doing the latter. Therefore, when I say that the exportation of chilled beef from the United States is steadily increasing I am simply saying that the United States is wise and is deriving the benefit of that business. Then, my hon. friend referred to the question of

wheat. I confess that I am unable to understand his argument. If this treaty means anything to the farmers of western Canada it means that the amount of wheat from the northwest provinces that is to-day sent to the United States is going to be increased. If it means anything it means that the price on the other side is greater than the price on this side, and that therefore the quantity of wheat passing from this country to the United States is going to increase. If it does not mean that this agreement is of no use whatever to the farmers in so far as the question of wheat is concerned. My hon. friend says that last year we sent to the United States 25,000,000 bushels of wheat. I am only sorry to say we did. I think it does not say very much for the progress of Canada that we allowed 25,000,000 bushels of wheat to be transported over American roads and probably to be ground for us into flour thus depriving us of the bran, shorts and by-products which otherwise would have been available for the farmers on this side. Does he mean, by taking off the duty of 25 cents a bushel, to increase that unsatisfactory condition? If he does, then the wheat of the northwest is going to go that way. We have had hon. members on the other side of the House, I think the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy), I think the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), I think the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), I think the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), stating that when the agreement was first placed upon the table they were somewhat of the opinion that the price of wheat would be materially enhanced to the western farmer. These gentlemen all also admitted on the floor of the House that practically speaking the price would not be increased by its transfer to the United States because the price was fixed by the Liverpool market. If that is true, where is the benefit to the western farmer? The only apparent justification of it that was made by any hon. member in so far as I can remember was made by the hon. member for Humboldt who said that the western farmer would be profited because there are some lower grades of wheat that might be admitted to the United States and that they would probably get a better price for this wheat over there. The lower grades of wheat are nothing more nor less than the raw materials of the farmers of this country, and if we ship out the lower grades of wheat we are shipping out that which we should keep for the purpose of feeding our hogs and cattle. Once more I say that you are in that respect doing injury to this country.

I was very much amused the other day when the hon. member for Red Deer was making his speech. We are all pleased to hear the hon. member for Red Deer because he always makes a very interesting speech, but I always feel sorry for him because he is the one man in this House who sticks to his free trade principles and is not afraid to make them known. I always feel that he is lonely when he is making a speech, that he is ploughing his lonely furrow, but it does always seem strange to me that he will advocate these principles notwithstanding the policy that has been practised in this country. He says that this agreement is to him a long step in the direction of free trade and he thinks that because free trade has been beneficial to England in days gone by it will be beneficial to Canada. The hon. gentleman is totally disregarding the conditions of the two countries. He said nimself the other day that Great Britain exported 1,600,000,000 dollars worth of manufactured goods. As compared with that Canada exports something like 30 million dollars worth. He knows that Canada is exporting about 150 million dollars worth of agricultural products; at the same time Great Britain is importing about 1,000 million dollars worth. The conditions in the two countries are entirely different. He also forgets the fact that there was a time in the history of Great Britain when she was in somewhat the same position that we are in to-day; that is that under a protective policy she so matured her manufactures that she eventually became supreme in the world and that she attained that position under and by virtue of a protective policy. After she became supreme in the world of manufactures protection became a thing that she no longer required and about forty years ago she abolished that system. The first move in the direction of abolishing the policy of protection for manufactured goods in Great Britain came from a protectionist government. Under the protective policy the industries of Great Britain grew to such an extent that she became supreme causing, to a certain extent, the farmers to abandon the fields, come to the towns and increase the consumption of the home products thereby decreasing the number who were engaged in agriculture. Therefore, agricultural produce became scarce and for that reason we find them taking the duties off corn. Hence we had the repeal of the corn laws.

But, the position of Canada to-day is exactly the reverse because we are producing more of agricultural products than we are consuming, and, if my hon. friend's argument is good as to England then the reverse of his argument is good as to Canada, and consequently the policy of a moderate protection is the proper policy for this country. The hon. gentleman from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) spoke truly when he said that annexation would be a revolution, and that revolutions took place only when there was discontent among the masses of the people. I grant that. He

cited as instances of his proposition the beheading of Charles Ist, the French revolution, and the Rebellion of 1837 when the masses of the people were discontented, but what the hon. gentleman said with regard to political revolutions is just as true of fiscal revolutions. The fiscal revolution in Great Britain in 1840 was caused by the cry of the masses for cheaper bread; the fiscal revolution of 1878 in Canada when the Conservatives introduced the National Policy was a revolution caused by discontent, hard times, and soup kitchens. But, to-day both parties in the country admit that we were never in so prosperous a condition before, and that never were the people so contented, and yet this is the time chosen by the government for introducing a very real fiscal revolution in this country. Is there a man in this House, or out of it who will deny, that had a non-partisan plebiscite of the people been taken one year ago upon the question of whether or not they desired a reciprocal arrangement such as has been submitted by the government, less than 25 per cent of the people would have voted for it. Before taking this leap in the dark the people of Canada would have looked at the condition of the country. They would find that our trade had increased from $116,000,000 in 1866 to $533,000,000 last year; they would find that the deposits in our banks had increased from $33,000,000 in 1866 to $925,000,000 last year, and bank deposits are considered an evidence of the prosperity of a people; they would find that the railway mileage increased from 2,200 in 1866 to 24,000 miles last year, or sufficient mileage to encircle the globe; they would find that exports of manufactures had increased from $2,000,000 in 1866 to $31,000,000 last year; that the export of farm products had increased in the same period from $20,000,000 to $145,000,000, and last but not least, that owing to the increase of our manufactures and the consequent increase of the home market the people of Canada are themselves consuming from 80 per cent to 85 per cent of all the farm products produced in the country, and that of the balance, 80 per cent goes to Great Britain and not to the United States. Taking these facts together with the fact that there obtain in Canada today the best prices ever before known, would not the people of Canada declare that it was unwise to risk any change in our present prosperous condition. The hon. gentleman from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) quoted some figures to show the relatively high prices of food products in Canada as compared with manufactures, and on that important point I shall quote from the report of the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Labour as you know went to a great deal of trouble to ascertain the prices of food in the Dominion compared with the prices 10 or 15 years ago, and this is what he says in his report published this year:

For some time past, and especially since the beginning of the present century, one of the most important features of the general economic situation in Canada has been a rapid and continuous advance in prices and the cost of living. Reaching in 1907 a level unprecedented in many years previously, prices receded to some extent in 1908; the check, however, proved but temporary, and in the closing months of 1909 the high cost of living had become the subject of discussion throughout the community affecting as it did the immediate well-being of nearly every one, especially those of the wage-earning and other classes dependent on a fixed income.

In the United States as in Canada public feeling was greatly aroused. Boycotts against the use of meats and other provisions were undertaken in several localities, and numerous investigations into the nature and causes of the increase were conducted both on public and private initiative. 'When the history of 1910 come to be written,' says the editor of 'Bradstreet's Journal,' in an article published during March, 1910, 'not the least memorable of its happenings to be chronicled will probably be the great agitation, partaking of the proportions of a national revolt against the high prices of food.'

After going fully into the matter, under the heading 'What the Analyses Show,' he says:

From the above and other analyses several important central facts as to the general situation at present are set forth in the report. Of the great producing industries, agriculture seems to show the largest increase in prices. Crude farm products (grain, fodder, meat-producing animals, milk, eggs, wool, fruits, vegetables) have advanced by over 37 per cent, compared with the base decade. The products made therefrom (meats, bran, flour, hides, leather, &c.) have increased by over 34 per cent. On the other hand, imported foods are lower than they were during the decade 1890-1899. Fish products are nearly, but not quite, so high as farm products. Products of the mine are only slightly above the level of the decade, and, if coal be excluded, are below that average. Coming to Canadian manufactured products, the general level is about 14 per cent above the level of the base decade. Included in this estimate are various grades of Canadian lumber, which on an average, are 50 per cent dearer than during the base period. If lumber be excluded, the manufactured products of Canada show a gain of less than 10 per cent, compared with the decade 1890-1899.

This shows, according to the minister's own report, that farm products have advanced in price 37 per cent, and that manufactured products, excluding rough lumber have only advanced 10 per cent. Now, I want to say to the Minister of Finance this: Taking all these things into consideration, taking into consideration that 80 per cent (some say 85 per cent) of our farm products are consumed at home

and that 80 per cent of the balance goes to Great Britain, and taking into account the fact that the price of farm products has increased 37 per cent as compared with 10 per cent increase in the price of manufactured articles, and taking into account that every one in the country appears to be satisfied—the western farmer alone complaining and pretty nearly every hon. member who has spoken in the House has admitted that the price of grain, which is the chief product of the western farmer, will not be increased by selling it in the United States—taking all these things into consideration I ask the Minister of Finance what was his warrant for making this arrangement with the United States. We are met with the argument that the United States could have taken off the duties, and that as a result the consequences of the present treaty would have taken place, meaning, of course, that had the United States taken off the duties our products would have gone into the United States anyway. Let us follow that up. For the last 45 years since the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty the United States has maintained their duty against us and our products have not been admitted free into that market. But, the very moment that the United States wanted to get our agricultural products into their country free that very moment they could have placed them upon their free list, and the very fact that they asked us to enter into this arrangement was the first intimation we had that such an arrangement was necessary in the interests of the United States, and that they were demanding it because of pressure from within. The government must take either one of these two positions —either that the United States have granted us this treaty only because we have given them something in return, or that they would have done it anyway. If they take the ground that by reason of the concessions given to the United States this treaty has come into force, then they must stand or fall by the treaty as it is now, and we must in that case assume that there would have been no treaty if they had not given the concessions ; or they must take the other ground, that the United States would have taken off the duties anyway, in which case they stand in the position of having given all these concessions for nothing, of having disturbed unnecessarily our manufacturers, of having the farm products of thirteen or fourteen countries coming in free as well as those of the United States, of having killed our fruit industry, injured our packing, transportation and other industries, all for nothing. They must take either one horn of the dilemma or the other.

Now, let us inquire why the United States desired this reciprocity agreement. For fifty years they have held aloof; for fifty years their conduct was such that we were forced to carry on a trade with Great Britain. Let us see now what were the reasons why the United States changed that programme. The first reason was the high cost of living in the United States and the desire to lessen that cost, both Republicans and Democrats vying with each other in the struggle for ascendency in the coming elections; secondly, a desire to conserve their limited natural resources by the exploitation of ours; thirdly, a desire to increase their manufactures by an increased importation of raw materials and in return an increased exportation to us of the finished articles; fourthly, a desire to compel our trade routes to run north and south into the United States instead of east and west through our own provinces; fifthly, their policy of exclusion and our policy of commercial independence having resulted in our prosperity and the building up of an enormous trade with Great Britain, they feared that it would result in a greater preferential trade within the empire; and last, but not least, the successful negotiation of such a treaty would tend to the ultimate annexation of Canada to the United States, a dream always dear to the hearts of the American people, which would appeal to them irrespective of party.

Now, let us see the effect of the arrangement, speaking generally. The argument of our hon. friends opposite seems to be this, that if the price of agricultural products on the American side of the line is sometimes higher than the price on this side, that is the proper market. Looking at the matter casually, perhaps one would be apt to conclude that that is so. But Mr. Taft and all the other representative men on the other side of the line are advancing the argument there that the effect of this treaty will be to reduce the price of agricultural products on the other side. If it reduces the price on the other side, of course we lose the benefit of an increased price which might at first result on this side. In the meantime our trade will have found its way to the other side through American channels; and if an increased amount of product of the farms on the other side decreases the price there, it will decrease the amount here and consequently increase the price on our side. I do not think that can be disputed on general principles. But suppose at first the farmer here gets a little more for his agricultural products, what is the effect of that? These things go in cycles. If the farmer gets more for his products, the labourer and artisan who buys them have to have an increased wage; if they do, the manufacturer must have an increased price for his manufactured article; and when the farmer goes to buy a manu-

factured article, he finds that by reason of a little increase in the price of his product, he has to pay an increased price for the manufactured article he has to buy. Thus the thing seems to go round in a circle. But, generally speaking, the effect of this arrangement will be to decrease the price of agricultural products in the United States, so as to reduce the cost to the home consumer there, and if it does not do that Mr. Taft may annul this agreement any day he chooses to do so. It seems to me a very natural thing that since the United States exports a large quantity of agricultural products, and since we do the same, our natural market is Great Britain, which has a great deficiency, and not the United States. If you shove a bushel of grain into Minneapolis while the United States has a surplus to-day of 150,000,000 or 160,000,000 bushels of wheat, you are simply shoving another bushel out at New York; but the injury you are doing to the Canadian is that you are allowing the Yankee to take that bushel of wheat from Minneapolis to New York, and thence to Great Britain, thereby depriving the railways of Canada of the benefit of the transportation. That is the only effect it has. If it does not increase the amount of wheat that goes to the United States, it does not have the effect that hon. gentlemen opposite desire. I am not going to ask the House to accept my opinion on this. I am going to give a few quotations to show what the Americans think is going to be the result of this treaty; and I am not going to take them from the newspapers, but from the official documents. On the 13th of February last, a letter was written by James Wilson, the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, and that letter was deemed of such importance by the American Congress that it was printed in the 'Congressional Record.' In that letter Mr. Wilson said:

> The United States produces a surplus of wheat. This is sold in foreign countries. The price of our exported surplus is governed by the world's requirements, being regulated by the supply and demand, and the price of wheat in the United States is governed by the price at which the surplus is sold.

I may interject that if that surplus is sold, then the price of wheat to the western farmer will not be affected by the removal of this duty. Then he goes on to say:

> While Canada is exporting wheat and other grains and the United States doing the same, there is no particular reason why Canadian wheat should come here, unless it be that a mixture of Canadian and American wheat may be desirable on the part of our milling exporters, and our millers may find it profitable to handle the Canadian surplus. But the price to the Canadian for this surplus wheat will be substantially the same whether sold in Europe or United States. However, if the handling of Canadian wheat by the United States railroads, merchants and mills has a tendency to reduce the price, it will be reduced to Canadians. In the western states, where the farmer has turned from grain-raising for sale, to the production of crops for feeding domestic animals on the farm, the new departure has been so profitable that lands in those states have risen in value to $100 to $200 per acre, and rents for from $4 to $6 an acre.

Let me read what was said by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCall) who introduced the Bill in the United States Congress. On the 4th of February last he spoke as follows:

> Both countries have long been exporters of wheat, although the surplus of Canada is steadily increasing and ours steadily diminishing, and yet we raise a very considerable surplus. In 1909 our exports of wheat and of flour in terms of wheat amounted to more than 114,000,000 bushels. In the same year the exports of wheat from the United States to Canada were greater than from Canada to the United States. The price of wheat in the United States, Canada, Russia and other wheat exporting countries are substantially adjusted with reference to the Liverpool price.
>
> For every bushel of wheat that would come in from Manitoba, so long as we raise a surplus another bushel would go out at New York. If we did not restrict its importation a tremendous impetus would be given to our flour-making industry and the trades dependent on it. The clearing of the transactions would create a business of an important financial character, much of the purchase price would be likely to find its way into the general channels of trade, and our American railways would have a profitable business which would aid in the maintenance and result in remunerative employment of labour. It may be said that the prosperity of Canadian railways would correspondingly decline. They would undoubtedly lose in the transportation of wheat, but they would gain in other directions.

He does not indicate in what directions. I do not think they would.

> Obviously they cannot simultaneously increase their production of wheat, barley, potatoes and other agricultural articles included in the Bill except as the number of her farmers increase.

What does President Taft say? He says in his message to Congress on January 26, 1911:

> Excluding the element of transportation, the price of staple food products, especially of cereals, is much the same the world over. . . . The currents of business and transportation facilities that will be established forward and back across the border cannot but inure to the benefit of the boundary states. . . . That the broadening of the sources of our food supplies, that the opening of the timber resources of the Dominion to our needs, that the addition to the supply of raw material will be limited to no particular section does not require demonstration.

On the same subject I quote:

Geo. E. Roberts, Director of United States Mint, as reported New Orleans 'Item'. February 4, 1911, said:

If our railroads can get into the Canadian Northwest and participate in the haul of wheat in that territory to the sea-board, they will benefit by the treaty. Employ more labour and that will be to the general benefit of the farmers as well as every one else. If that promotes the growth of our cities, such as Des Moines, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Chicago, there are certain to be incidental benefits to the farmers.

I find the following in the Buffalo 'Courier' of the 5th of February:

Buffalo 'Courier,' 5th February, 1911.

Any one familiar with political conditions in Canada realizes the remarkable growth of the sentiment that Canada is capable of getting along very comfortably and successfully without asking or receiving any special tariff favours from the United States. Years ago the high tariff wall on this side forced her to seek markets in other foreign countries, and she has succeeded so well, that a great many Canadians, who in former years advocated reciprocity with the United States are to-day opposed to the recently negotiated agreement, and undoubtedly the agreement would be rejected at Ottawa but for the commanding influence of the Laurier administration. . . .

The most surprising thing in connection with the pending agreement is that in view of the course of events during the last twenty years the Canadian negotiators consented to such broad and liberal concessions. Failure on our side to treat favourably the outcome of the negotiations would come to be regarded as an exhibition of folly so amazing as to be a national humiliation.

With the exception of the last two, these are all official quotations from the American representatives. Let me say a word or two on the question of barley, which I merely take as an illustration. At the first glance, when you take the articles covered by this agreement, and compare the prices in Canada with those on the other side of the line and find that the prices of some articles on the other side are higher than those on this side, you are apt to conclude that it would be beneficial to this country to export these to the United States; but if you examine the matter closely, you will come to a different conclusion. A fair illustration is the question of barley. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) said last night that it would be a great boon to our farmers if we could get our barley into the United States free of duty and my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said the same. I admit that, looking at the matter at first, I came to the same conclusion, but I have taken the trouble to go into the figures and find out the results. In 1890, when the McKinley tariff was put into operation, a duty of 30 cents per bushel was imposed on barley. The year before namely, 1889, we exported to the United States 10,000,000 bushels, but when that duty was imposed our exports fell in the year 1891 to 190,000 bushels. But what was the result? You would have thought that the farmers of this country would have stopped raising barley. That would be the natural inference, but I followed the matter out further, and I found that whereas in 1889 we produced some 28,000,000 bushels, in 1909 our farmers raised 55,398,000 bushels. And this in spite of that fact that although in 1889 we exported 10,000,000 bushels to the United States, in the tenth year that followed we exported only 268,000 bushels. Where, then, did the difference go? We are only exporting to all countries about 2,000,000 bushels; so we are consuming over 53 million bushels. Our farmers must have found it profitable to raise the barley or they would not have raised so much as they did, namely, 55,398,000 bushels in 1909. They would not have increased the amount raised in 1889 the year before the McKinley tariff was enacted, when they raised 28,000,000 bushels, to 55,000,000 bushels in 1909 unless it paid them to do so. How can we find out what made it profitable for them to raise this increased crop? The only answer is that the difference between what we raised and what we exported was being consumed in this country. The difference was being fed to our own hogs and cattle. Then figure it out in this way. Take the reports of the agricultural college at Guelph and you will find that from 3 to 3½ pounds of barley will make a pound of pork. In the 'Farmers Sun' I find that during the past five years the average price of hogs was $7 a hundred. Convert barley into pork and it figures out in this way. Three pounds of barley give a pound of live pork. At 7 cents per pound that figures out $1.12 per bushel. Or if I allow 3½ pounds of barley to a pound of pork, that still gives 96 cents a bushel for that barley. What is the result? You have 96 cents a bushel for your barley, giving the most unfavourable computation; and instead of sending your barley to feed the porkers on the other side, you have kept it at home, you have used it in raising your own hogs, in giving employment to your own butcher and packer, and in addition, instead of impoverishing your soil by sending your barley to the United States, you have enriched your farm by feeding the barley to your stock. You have put the product back into your farm and enriched your soil. Thus it was a Godsend, that duty of 30 cents imposed under the McKinley tariff. It was like putting an export duty on barley; just as that is true of barley, it is true of every other raw material which goes into the manufactured product, and by manufactur-

ed product in this connection I mean cattle, hogs and other animals.

It is claimed that it will be a good thing to our farmers to send their wheat to the United States and get two or three cents more per bushel for it, but in sending their wheat our farmers are sending the bran and other by-products, instead of keeping them in this country to feed to their cattle.

What my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) said is quite right, namely, that our better class of cattle is shipped to Great Britain and the inferior class, the stockers, to the United States. But what are these inferior cattle fed with in the United States? They are fed with the corn and with all these by-products which we send to the United States when we send them our wheat and other grains. Yet they tell us this is going to be a benefit to this country although they admit that the price of wheat is only two cents more and some even say it is no more.

The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) referred to preferential trade. If the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) were here I would say he would be very much surprised when he found the position taken by his leader on that question. My hon. friend says he came to this country in 1896. If he had come before 1896, if he had followed the tortuous sinuosities of his honoured leader in respect to the trade question, it would make him dizzy. Since 1896 we have had only one trade policy in this country, as was testified by the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and the member for Welland (Mr. German) this afternoon, and that is the National Policy. I could tell my hon. friend that while he was taunting the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) with having advocated mutual preferential trade he little knew he was taunting his own leader, that while he taunted the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) with setting up a wax doll he was taunting his own leader for the same offence. It was in 1896, the year the hon. member arrived, that the Prime Minister said, speaking at Toronto on June 13, as reported in the 'Globe,' with reference to imperial preferential trade:

> I agree with him (Sir Charles Tupper) in regard to preferential trade. This is a new idea and one which in itself is fraught with greatness not only for the Canadian people, but for the British Empire at large. And now the principle is proclaimed that there shall be preferential trade within the empire at large. That is to say that England and her colonies should trade upon a footing of preference over other nations. Imagine what would be the consequences if the products of Canada, the wheat, the barley, the oats, the butter, the cheese, which we are sending to England were to be accepted in the British markets on terms of preference over the products of the United States, of Russia and all the other countries which are competing with us in the market. The advantages are obvious, so obvious that the moment I saw the idea I jumped at it and immediately declared myself in favour of it.

The Prime Minister jumped at the wax doll of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) as soon as the idea was suggested to him. I am sorry to say the Prime Minister did not adhere to his policy. I heartily concurred with the Prime Minister when he made that statement and I think that is something for which we should strive to-day, notwithstanding what has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite.

In November last, speaking in this House to the Prime Minister, I said:

> He is about to negotiate for reciprocity with the United States. I ask him not to forget reciprocity within the empire when he is carrying on those negotiations with the United States, I ask him to place nothing in the way of that mutual preferential trade within the empire the attainment of which I think is only a matter of years. I ask him to place no stumbling block in the way of that reciprocity but to follow the policy which he enunciated in Toronto.

Mr. PATERSON. When was this said?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. About the 26th of November.

Mr. PATERSON. It was then contemplated that there were to be reciprocal dealings?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. This was not sprung on the people?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. No, the point I make—

Mr. PATERSON. That is the point I am making.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. It was then known that the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance were in the United States negotiating for a reciprocity treaty, and I asked the Prime Minister then not to overlook the question of reciprocity within the empire. Notwithstanding that the First Minister of this country said about 13 or 14 days before he was elected by the people of this country, that if placed in power he would go to Great Britain and endeavour to get Great Britain to immediately inaugurate a policy of preferential trade whereby the farm products of Canada would receive a preference in Great Britain, notwithstanding he did that and was elected on that promise, the very first thing he did was to go to England and say: We do not want a preference in your market at all. And then they say Great Britain has not done for us what she should have done for us in the way of mutual preferential trade, when they themselves went over and gave a black eye to the policy.

It is said there was no discrimination as to the present preferential tariff in the proposed arrangement now before the House. I do not think any one can seriously contend that. But, I observe that the Minister of Finance telegraphed to Mr. Asquith as follows:

So far as British importations into Canada are concerned the British preference would be scrupulously maintained.

And the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), in speaking in this House, said:

I am absolutely convinced in my own mind that I am correct in what I state, that in no way, shape or form, in no way, general or particular, we are interfering with British interests in Canada by the proposal now before the chair.

Let me give two illustrations from the large list to prove that this is absolutely incorrect. When the Finance Minister said that the British preference would be scrupulously observed he was certainly not within the facts. We were receiving from England at the time this arrangement was made, in the last fiscal year, $3,500,000 of rolled iron plate, which came in from Great Britain free. If Great Britain had had to pay the same duty as the United States on that quantity we would have collected in duty from her $175,000. Under the proposed arrangement she has not that advantage over her rival, because it is now made free to the United States; and at the same time we were collecting actually from the United States $137,000 on what we imported from her. To-day the United States will pay nothing whatever. In the face of that, how can any one say that the British preference has been scrupulously observed? Just another instance.

In the last fiscal year we imported from Great Britain $256,000 worth of salt and from the United States $141,000. The English salt was free, but the United States came in at 5 cents a hundred pounds, or about $36,000 duty was saved to Great Britain, while the United States paid $25,000. To-day the United States pay no duty whatever and Great Britain has no preference of $36,000, with respect to the duty on salt. In the face of these facts, how can any one say the British preference has been scrupulously observed?

I find the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) in his speech saying that:

Rolled iron plates represent seven-eighths of the British free list represented in schedule 'A.'

And further on:

When you look at the schedules of the goods that come in from Great Britain you will find they are made up nearly all of goods that sell on their own brand or patent. By reason of their inherent virtue they not only come into this country but in the face of a 40 per cent to 50 per cent duty they go into the United States and are sold there.

The hon. gentleman says he is justified in taking the duty off these other articles because they now go into the United States and climb over a duty of 40 per cent or 50 per cent. That means that this is a case where the British preference is not a preference, so that when hon. gentlemen have been maintaining that they have given Great Britain a preference upon this particular article and that the same article can climb over a 40 per cent or a 50 per cent wall in the United States, it is clear that the importations into Canada are not due to the preference at all. But if you apply the same argument that these particular English goods sell because of some particular brand, or because of their known qualities, then I suppose that argument would apply to a great number of all the remaining importations from Great Britain, because most of the importations of Great Britain come in because of their particular brand, or their particular quality, or their known virtue. So the argument if carried out to its logical conclusion, would be that you do not need the British preference at all, because the goods sell on account of their particular brand. I would like to ask the English merchants if they think that is a fair argument to them? I do not think they would accept it as a reason for decreasing the British preference. But while this arrangement makes an inroad on the present British preference, that is practically nothing in comparison with the fact that it strikes a death blow to the hope of mutual preferential trade. You cannot have a mutual preferential trade between Great Britain and Canada whereby you expect to have a preference on your agricultural products in Great Britain, if you are allowing the same class of agricultural products to come in, not only from the United States, but from thirteen other nations of the world as well. The minute you do that you say good-bye to that mutual preferential trade which the Prime Minister himself led the people of this country to believe we would obtain when, in 1896, he said in Toronto: Place me in power and I will give you mutual preferential trade. You will say good-bye to that same policy, too, of which the Prime Minister, in 1909, spoke as follows:

Canada has opened her doors to Great Britain in hopes that she would ultimately receive similar preferential treatment from the mother country.

That is what he said in 1909, and yet his government brings down a measure to-day

which absolutely kills the prospect of mutual preferential trade within the empire. I say that considering the former fiscal policy of Great Britain, and the policy of free trade in Great Britain, as enforced since 1842 until the present day, and that except during the last twenty years or so no man in Great Britain would dare to suggest any other than a free trade policy; considering the fact that in the elections of January, 1910, there were 379 Liberals in the British House of Commons before the dissolution, and that in a month afterwards when the elections were over, there were only 275 Liberals, a decrease of 104; and considering the fact that in January, 1910, before the dissolution, there were only 157 Unionists who favour tariff reform, and after the election there were 273 Unionists, with a diminution of 104 in the Liberal majority and an increase of 116 in the Unionist minority, it is evident that a fiscal revolution is taking place in Great Britain, and that a preference within the empire would shortly be within the reach of the Canadian people if this measure were defeated. But unfortunately, as I say, the present agreement kills that. Let me now read what Sir George Ross said, speaking only last November, on the same subject:

So long as the British Empire endures we may expect the British market to be accessible to us. If we have any favours to bestow that is the market with the strongest claim, or if we anticipate any favours such as a preference over foreign traders it is in the British market that these favours are most likely to be obtained, we certainly would not look for them in the markets of the United States. One thing is certain we cannot have reciprocity in wheat and British preference at the same time.

Now let us see how this arrangement affects the farmer. Firstly, it gives to the farmer, in answer to his demands for free, or a greatly reduced duty on agricultural implements, a paltry reduction of two and a half per cent, which will result in no reduction in the price. I have no hesitation in making this statement; if I had, I would quote the speech of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) when he said:

It, (meaning this treaty) cannot materially affect trade with the United States or imports from the United States, because there is not enough reduction in any instance to allow American manufacturers to compete with the Canadian manufacturers.

I may point out that under this arrangement no change can be made whatever if the government thought it wise to reduce the duty on agricultural implements, because that would end the treaty. By diverting the grain through American channels, this arrangement lessens the use and the chance of adoption of government owned or operated elevators. For the same reason it lessens the prospect of usefulness and of building the Hudson Bay railway and the Georgian Bay canal. Because its tendency is to send coarse grains and by-products as raw material to feed American cattle and stock it will lessen the amount of stock raised in Canada and thus lessen the use of cold storage or chilled meat systems and lessen the use and prospect of government operation of same and place the meat trade more than ever in American hands and give a death blow to prospects of mixed farming in the west. Because it will lessen traffic on Canadian railways it will tend to maintain present high rates. Because at one fell swoop it opens all the food and agricultural products of the United States free to the Canadian market with all the uncertainties attached thereto, and gives him no reduction on the manufactured goods he has to buy. Because it opens the flood gates and allows free importation of all farm products to practically every country in the world to compete with the Canadian farmer. Let me read what the New York 'Journal' says on this very question. Commenting on Austen Chamberlain's speech it says, on the 12th of February:

He said that the result of diverting Canadian wheat to the United States would be the cultivation of other crops in that country and the constantly increasing drain on Canadian supplies heretofore sent to England. If this is so, the corollary would be that more of these supplies would go to England from the United States. He also said, that the railroad trains that brought these supplies into the United States would carry back American manufactures to the detriment of British producers. Another result would be that an enormous stimulus would be given to stock raising in the United States.

It goes on to comment:

Whatever the force or validity of this argument from the narrower British, or the Chamberlain point of view, it is distinctly in favour of the reciprocity arrangement regarded from the American point of view.

Then the Springfield 'Republican' of the 13th February says this:

But removal of tariff would greatly benefit our transportation interests and enable the currents of trade to move in their natural channels, north and south across the border, instead of compelling unnatural movements, east and west, . . . if we could sweep away all tariffs between the two countries it would have the effect upon our trade of another Louisiana purchase. And this Bill is drawn on the way to that great end.

I will not go into details as to the effect this trade would have on the different industries, but as to market gardeners in my section of the country, it will affect them very injuriously, and I suppose it will in every other section of the country. I find

that in 1910, notwithstanding the duty upon vegetables and other market-garden products coming into Canada, they sent into this country $830,000, worth with a tariff averaging about 30 per cent. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly those representing constituencies where market gardening is flourishing, what effect that is going to have in their constituencies. If that amount of goods are brought in under a 30 per cent tariff, market garden industry, will be ruined under free trade. Now, the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., in referring to the question of wheat, admitted this argument would not increase the price of wheat but he did not discuss the effect of letting it in free from all the other countries. I want to point out that we have not sufficient data and statistics from the government upon which we can make a reasonable computation as to the result. But after endeavouring to get what I could, after resorting to what information is contained in the Library, and after getting information from the Board of Trade in New York and the Board of Trade in Montreal, getting in this indirect way information which should have been given to us by the government, I have come to the conclusion that the farmers are going to suffer to a much larger extent than we expected by reason of allowing the farm products of these foreign countries to come into our markets free.

Let me take the question of wheat. The Argentine Republic had in 1895 a population of 3,954,000 ; in 1908 she had a population of 6,489,000. In 1895 the area under cultivation in the Argentine Republic was a little over 12,000,000 acres ; in 1909 the area was over 46,000,000 acres. The acreage brought under cultivation, therefore, has increased four times more rapidly than the population. That is the best kind of proof you can have that Argentine is a strictly agricultural country. The amount of wheat exported by Argentine in 1900 was 48,000,000 bushels in 1909, 106,000,000 bushels. That is just twice as much as Canada exported. Under this arrangement it is permissible for that wheat to come into Canada free. I make this statement that a bushel of wheat can be sent from Buenos Ayres to Halifax more than twice as cheaply as a bushel of wheat can be sent from Regina to Halifax. The Postmaster General said the other evening that a labourer in the Argentine Republic received 64 cents a day without board. Hon. members from the west know better than I do what labour can be got for in the west; they know that you have to pay $55 or $60 a month at least with board. With the conditions in the Argentine Republic they can grow wheat more cheaply and deliver it at Buenos Ayres much more cheaply than we can deliver it at Regina. Wheat can be shipped from Buenos Ayres to Liverpool, according to a letter I have here from the New York Produce Exchange, for 8 shillings 6 pence per ton of 2,240 pounds, which, figured out, gives us 5⅞ cents per bushel. The Minister of Agriculture the other night said that Halifax was farther away from Buenos Ayres than Liverpool. I believe that Halifax is a little nearer than Liverpool, but a question of 100 or 200 miles in marine transportation, after you have the product loaded, does not amount to anything. Wheat from Buenos Ayres can be laid down at Liverpool, and therefore, at Halifax, for 5⅞ cents per bushel. According to the rates given me by the Canadian Pacific railway you have to pay 5 cents a bushel from Fort William to Montreal, and they add to that 11 cents a bushel from Regina to Fort William. Thus, the rate is 16 cents from Regina to Montreal as compared with 5⅞ cents from Buenos Ayres to Halifax. They give the same through rate down to St. John as to Montreal. What does that mean? Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario and Prince Edward Island all consume more wheat than they raise. Ontario alone consumes 11,000,000 bushels more wheat than she raises. If these figures are correct, and I have no doubt they are, with the cheaper wheat of Buenos Ayres and with the cheaper transportation to Halifax, Argentine wheat is going to supply Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec and Ontario, because all these provinces consume more wheat than they raise, and if they can get it cheaper from Argentine they are going to buy it. The result will be that Argentine wheat will supply the whole eastern portion of Canada, and the western wheat will be driven down into the United States. I have only taken up one article. I could take the question of chilled meat. The Argentine Republic exported $21,000,000 worth of chilled meat last year. The rate for chilled meat to Liverpool is less than a cent a pound. With cheap labour in the Argentine Republic, with cheap wheat that is necessary to feed cattle and hogs and a transportation rate of less than a cent a pound, do you mean to tell me that you cannot flood this country with cheap meat from the Argentine Republic, and that it will not be possible to destroy our home industry with reference to cattle and hogs? That is only one country. I have not had time to go into the 12 other countries. My hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) pointed out the same thing with reference to New Zealand and Australian butter, lambs, and chilled mutton, and I think that if we were to go into this matter we could prove the truth of this argument with reference to a great many other countries. But we have not the time, and

they have not given us any information. My hon. friend from St. Antoine tells me that Argentine meat can be laid down for less than 7 cents a pound, duty paid. If that is the case there seems to be no doubt in the world that it will undermine entirely the home meat trade.

Let me show you how it affects my own little town with respect to transportation alone, and I have no doubt that every man could adduce some argument with reference to his own constituency. Owen Sound has a population of 13,000 or 14,000 and the Canadian Pacific railway lake terminal is situated there. This year, according to the board of trade reports, I find that we brought down from the west in mill products and grain 160,000 tons, and we sent back in package freight a like amount—160,000 tons. If you figure that out you will find out that it would give a cargo of 1,000 tons to 320 ships, and I may say that we have a great marine traffic at Owen Sound largely composed of grain, flour and by-products coming down and packing freight going back. If this arrangement has the effect that hon. gentlemen claim on behalf of the farmers of the west it will have, that is if it sends grain from the west through the United States, that grain will never reach Fort William. They say it is going to send it to Minneapolis, and St. Paul, and if it does not do that it is not going to benefit the farmer of the west as they claim and he is not going to send his wheat to the United States. But, I am assuming for the purpose of my argument that this arrangement is going to do what they say it is, that is it will send the greater portion of this wheat down to Minneapolis and St. Paul over American railways, and the consequence will be that the town of Owen Sound will be deprived of this remunerative and beneficial trade which gives employment to 320 ships with an average cargo of 1,000 tons each.

In another way it will injure Owen Sound—by reason of the increased traffic in grain coming down and in package freight going back, so large has become the shipping in the port that a dry dock must be established and I understand the plans submitted to the government for a dry dock at Owen Sound have recently been approved. And, if the carrying of that freight is going to be diverted from our lake ports as the government say it will be, and if that wheat goes to Minneapolis and St. Paul we will have less use for a dry dock at Owen Sound. I could point to many other instances where this policy will injure the people of Canada, but these occur to me now in relation to my own town of Owen Sound. A word now to the western farmer and I trust he will pardon me. I would ask him if it would not be far better to continue to foster our

trade with Great Britain which now takes eight-tenths of our exports of agricultural products; I would ask him, would it not be better to have our trade continue in channels east and west, and because of competition between the railways, and with the assistance of the Railway Commission thereby reducing the rates. If this agreement should have the effect it is said it will have, it will decrease the traffic east and west by increasing the traffic north and south to the United States, and if the traffic of the Canadian railways is decreased our railways will have to increase their rates to make the roads pay. If you decrease the railway freight traffic in western Canada by sending it over American railways, what is going to become of the Grand Trunk Pacific with respect to which we have provided that if it becomes a failure we have to take it over and operate it. I fear that this arrangement will have the effect of throwing on our hands the operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. Then, I ask the western farmer: Would it not be better for him to have for the wheat going through Canada, government operated or owned terminal elevators; I ask him would it not be better for him to have government operation of the Hudson Bay railway; I ask him would it not be better for him to have established a complete system of government cold storage and chilled meat plants; I ask the western farmer would it not be better for him to have a substantial reduction in the duty on agricultural implements, and I ask him would it not be better for him and for all of us to have complete control of our own tariff, to maintain our self respect, and to strengthen the ties that bind us to the old land by mutual preferential trade. I think, Sir, that the consummation of these policies I have enumerated would be much more beneficial to the western farmer than would the carrying into effect of the arrangement which the government proposes. Now, a word or two with reference to the annexation question and, the remarks which I shall quote on this point, I shall take from official sources. I shall first of all cite the opinions of eminent statesmen in the United States as to the bearing of this treaty on the question of annexation. Senator Sherman made a speech in 1888 in which he gave his opinion as to the effect of reciprocity, and he said:—

> The way to union with Canada is not by hostile legislation but by friendly overtures. This union is one of the things that must inevitably come in the future. The true policy of the government is to tender freedom in trade and intercourse and to make the tender in such a fraternal way that it shall be an overture to the Canadian people to become a part of the republic.

That is the language of a man who oc-

cupied a very prominent position in the United States.

President Taft in his message, says:—

They are coming to the parting of the ways. They must soon decide whether they are to regard themselves as isolated permanently from our markets by a perpetual wall or whether we are to be commercial friends.

President Taft in his speech at Columbus, Ohio, on the 11th of February last, used this language:—

The greatest reason for adopting this agreement,' he said. 'is the fact that it is going to unite two countries with kindred people, and lying together across a wide continent, in a commercial and social union, to the great advantage of both. Such a result does not need to be justified by a nice balancing of pecuniary profit to each. Its undoubted general benefit will vindicate those who are responsible for it.

'I say this in order that by answering the arguments directed to the detailed effect of the agreement upon different classes of persons I may not be thought to abandon the broad ground upon which the opportunity to confirm this agreement ought to be seized.'

I will not quote Champ Clark's speech in the House of Representatives in which he, as we all know, declared his object was annexation, and while it is sought by some to make out that he was joking I think the leader of the opposition has thoroughly disproved that. This is what Champ Clark said upon the hearing before the Ways and Means Committee on the 4th of February last:—

Mr. CLARK. What are you going to do if we annex Canada?

Mr. FINK. That is something I had not thought of.

Mr. CLARK. You had better think of it, because that is what we are all fixing to do.

Senator McColl, who introduced the Bill into Congress, according to the report of 'Congressional Record,' said in his very first sentence, and I suppose it was the thought uppermost in his mind:—

The Bill takes a long step towards establishing for the continent of North America a policy of unrestricted trade and commerce, recognizing natural conditions that have been too long ignored.

Then, Representative E. J. Hill, of Connecticut, speaking in Congress on the 13th of February last, said:—

Mr. CHAIRMAN. If instead of this very limited reciprocity now proposed between these two countries, the question was presented to this House to-day of complete political union of both peoples in one magnificent government holding full control over all the North American continent between the Rio Grande River and the Arctic sea, no man here would say it 'nay.' (Applause.)

Congressman Martin, of South Dakota, speaking on February 13, said:—

I have often said I would like to see Canada annexed to the United States.

Then Mr. Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture, an open letter to the National Grange on February the 10th, wrote:—

If this reciprocity treaty becomes the law of both countries, our relations with Canada will become more intimate and our trade with her will extend and increase. We will become more and more one people. The adoption of the pending treaty would from the national standpoint be as much an act of wisdom as was the adoption of treaties in the past that have added to our common country more than half its present area.

I quote from a speech delivered the other day in Chicago by P. C. Knox, Secretary of State of the United States, and this speech was delivered after Champ Clark's utterance and therefore was even more guarded than usual; Mr. Knox said:—

A trenchent writer on Canadian politics has observed that: a bitter cry went up (in Canada) for annexation to the United States after the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty with the United States in 1886.

Now, it will be noted that the only word printed in italics in this whole speech is the word 'after,' and what is the inference from that? Mr. Secretary Knox desires this treaty to be passed; he knows that Champ Clark's utterances have injured the prospects of its carrying in Canada, and he is very guarded, but notwithstanding he deems it necessary to use the word 'after' in the quotation given above and the word 'after' is italicized and the inference is that after the reciprocity treaty of 1854 was concluded annexation was likely, and that after the present reciprocity treaty goes into effect annexation will again be more likely to be consummated. Later on he said:—

In the higher atmosphere and broader aspect of the situation it is certain that if there should be any great world movement involving this continent Canada and the United States would, as a matter of course, act in the most perfect concert in defence of the common rights of a common blood and civilization.

He concludes his speech in these words:

So that the reasons for reciprocity are very real and striking, and ought to lift the consideration of the result of the recent negotiations to a high plane and large-minded comprehension of the greater reasons and motives of human and national relations and rise above the mere balancing of trade advantages.

They have been telling us all along that it is a mere question of dollars and cents. Here is the Secretary of State of the United States saying that it is not a question of dollars and cents, nor a mere question of trade advantages, but he says it should be regarded from the 'high plane and large-minded comprehension of the greater rea-

sons and motives of human and national relations.' Any one can read between these lines and see perfectly well what is the intention.

Let me point out to you the letter written by the United States Secretary of Agriculture which was printed on February 13, 1911, as a public document by the United States Congress. Why was it necessary for him to cut out of that letter, before it was printed on the records of Congress, the words which I am going to read? Because he knew that they expressed what was in his mind too freely, and he did not want them to appear in a public document which would probably be read in Canada. These are the words he cut out:

The several additions to our territory in the west from foreign nations were made over the protest of many people of the days in which they were made. But a majority of the statesmen of the days took the broad view and the fair view of the future of their country, and these several purchases were made. Without them, especially the Louisiana purchase, the United States would be a much less important country to-day than it is. There was vigorous opposition to the acquisition of territory from Mexico, notably with regard to Texas, but the statesmen of that day took the broad, national view and the purchases along our southwestern border are to-day exceedingly important. There was an objection made to the purchase of Alaska. It was regarded as unwise, but the broad view and the fair view were taken by Seward and other statesmen of that day, and Alaska was added. This might be said of other purchases.

Whether any more additions are to be made to the United States in this hemisphere the future will have to tell. Nothing is being said at the present time in either country with regard to political union with Canada. Far-seeing statesmen on the other side of the Atlantic say that the United States has opened the door a little to Canada, and that it may be opened wider in the future. However that may be, any one who glances at the map of North America, and whoever studies the trade relations between the United States and Canada, will have to conclude, unless they are immediately interested in the effects of reciprocity, that the closest possible trade relations between the two great peoples would seem to be desirable.

I would like to know why the Secretary of Agriculture omitted that passage from his address. There seems to be no other conclusion than that he had in his mind the thought that reciprocity would lead to annexation, and that the appearance of this passage in the official record might interfere with the adoption of the treaty by Canada.

Now, I will give you what some of the newspapers on the other side have said W. R. Hearst the proprietor of the New York 'American,' a couple of months ago said:

Let us have commercial union first, and political union afterwards.

The New York 'Mail,' of the 9th February, 1911, said:

Let not Americans fix their gaze so intently upon barley or wood pulp that they miss the comprehensive view.

What does that mean? The 'comprehensive view' means ultimate annexation.

The Newark 'Star' of the 11th of February said:

But we should not begrudge advantages under reciprocity to Canada, for they are bound to come back to us with much greater value. Every American farmer who settles in Canada takes his nationality with him and helps to loosen the tie which unites Canada to Great Britain. The thousands of American farmers who settle in the northwestern provinces look to Washington rather than to Ottawa. They are imbued with American traditions and American patriotism. They have no idea of expatriating themselves. The time is not far distant when the question of the annexation of Canada to the United States will have become a burning issue on both sides of the border. And when that time comes the American element in Canada will make itself heard and felt.

The New York 'World' of the 11th of February said:

Trade between the United States and Canada should be as free as trade between the states. There is no more sense in dividing them by a tariff wall than in dividing New York and Pennsylvania.

Which means that we should become a state of the American union. The Detroit 'News' of the 8th of February said:

Lord Lansdowne confesses much when he says:

Reciprocity means a diminution of the advantage enjoyed by British trade under the preference now given by Canada, and also the deflection of wheat to the United States. The whole history of the empire is surely altered if the great Dominions are encouraged to develop, not on national and imperial lines, but in accordance with geographical conditions.

The Buffalo 'Times' of the 9th of February said:

Every howl which comes across the water from those British Bourbons furnishes an argument for the friends of reciprocity in the United States and Canada.

I am simply giving these opinions because I want to photograph public opinion on the other side of the line, and put that against what hon. gentlemen opposite are saying, and I cannot photograph public opinion better than by quoting what the officials of the United States and the newspapers of the United States say. The New York 'American' of the 11th of February says:

Mr. James J. Hill was probably not far from the mark when he said in his speech in St. Paul the other night that if reciprocity with Canada falls through at this time negotiations for a trade agreement may never be renewed between the Dominion and the United States. What may effectually block the resumption of reciprocity conferences is in brief British Imperialism. Without Canada the Chamberlain dream of an Imperial federation can only succeed in part, if at all, and without the Dominion it can scarcely be effective

The New York 'Evening Post' of the 10th of February, commenting on Mr. Balfour's speech, says:

Mr. Balfour has condemned the Canadian reciprocity agreement as 'an Imperial disaster.' To the tariff reform Imperialists the probability that effect will be given to the agreement is indeed galling.

I have given these quotations for the purpose of showing what the sentiment is on the other side of the line. But some hon. members in this House have said that because we trade very intimately with a country that is no reason for supposing there is any danger of political annexation or absorption. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) and the hon. member from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) have pointed to the great trade existing between Germany and England, saying that there was no danger of annexation there, and therefore there was no danger of annexation between Canada and the United States. I think they were begging the question entirely. What is the difference between the two cases? Great Britain has a population of 45,000,000 and Germany has a population of about 65,000,000. Great Britain is separated from Germany by a sea on which Great Britain is supreme. Canada is separated from the United States by an imaginary line 3,000 miles long. Great Britain is separated from Germany by a foreign language; here both countries have the same language. The difference between Great Britain and Germany in population and capital is not very great as compared with the difference between Canada and the United States.

What I say is this. A better and a truer comparison would be, not to compare Canada with Germany, but to compare the little several states of which Germany is composed and see what was their fate and then you will find an example or what may happen here. Because where do you find Germany to-day? You find that she has absorbed all these little states around her. She was originally Prussia, but by reason of her strength and prowess she absorbed all the little surrounding states, whose people were practically of the same race and spoke the same tongue; and by reason of the position she occupies to-day, she is the dominant power in the whole continent of Europe. There can be no doubt about that. Austria and Hungary dare not to-day be anything else but her ally and they know it. Hungary dare not be anything but an ally and practically a portion of the kingdom of Austria, because Austria, and not Hungary is the dominant power, and Germany is the dominant power over the whole of them. The result is that Germany, by reason of her power of absorption, is to-day the dominating influence in Europe; and the result in Canada, should this arrangement go through, will be just as it has been in the states surrounding Germany. Just as Germany absorbed these little states so will the United States absorb Canada, and we will be politically annexed to that country. Is there a man in this House who will say that he would contemplate any such future with any degree of content? Why, what is the position in which we are to-day as compared with that in which the United States were a hundred years ago. The United States then had a population of 6,000,000, just the same as we had in the beginning of the present century, and that population was scattered along the eastern coast of that country from Maine to Florida. They had not a single railway going from east to west. They were simply a fringe of humanity looking out on the ocean, with their backs to the west which was practically unknown. They had not a railway or canal or the advantage of modern transportation in any respect. They had not a city on their western coast or any distance inland. At the beginning of the present century we start off with a population exactly the same as the United States had at the beginning of last century, namely 6,000,000. We consist of nine provinces bound together by two or three transcontinental railways. We have cities, not only on our eastern coast, but all away across the continent—Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver and Victoria. We have a railway mileage of some 24,000 miles, whereas the United States then had not a single mile of railway. We have all the advantages of modern agricultural methods and of modern traction methods. With these advantages there is, therefore, no comparison between what the Dominion of Canada may expect in the next hundred years as compared with what the United States had reason to expect a hundred years ago. If that be so, why not keep on the course in which we have started? Why not go on developing our resources for the advantage of our own people and not hand them over to the United States.

Taking all things into consideration, taking in view the fact there is such a great increase in the prices of agricultural products, that to-day, by

the evidence of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) himself, the prices of agricultural products in Canada are 37 per cent higher than they were in former years, I fail to see how the government can have made up its mind to push through this treaty, more especially considering that no opportunity has been given our people to formulate their views on the subject.

The other evening the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) said this—and I presume it is the best possible argument that could be given why the government should submit this agreement to the people before putting it into operation. He said:

It is well known that on two occasions, especially the government of Canada made an exhaustive and careful examination into the tariff affairs of this country. Before the tariff of 1897 was brought down the government adopted a policy which was never adopted before, of taking the people into council, of going through the length and breadth of the country, and taking evidence, &c., before giving an opinion on the question at issue.

Could there be a more complete answer to the question, why not submit this agreement to the people, than the words of the Minister of Agriculture himself, with reference to a revision of the tariff in 1897, far less radical than the one now proposed. In 1905, when another revision, far less radical, was proposed, the government took the opinions of the people in the same way. Why not then take the opinion of the people when we have a fiscal revolution proposed of the character presented in this Bill? My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) said that such a course was never taken before the present government took it. Let me call his attention to this fact. He entirely omitted to mention that when the hon member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), then Minister of Finance, proposed to bring down a revision of the tariff in 1894, a committee composed of Mr. Foster, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Mr. Clark Wallace and Mr. Angers, held meetings throughout the whole Dominion for the purpose of getting the opinion of the people, and such meetings were duly advertised. Yet the Minister of Agriculture says that 1897 was the first time such a commission was put into operation in this country.

In conclusion I will say that unless the people of Canada prefer annexation and consequently absorption by the great country to the south of us, in preference to what has always been our ambition, and what we are rapidly realizing—the dream of a mighty nation within the empire— they will repudiate the present pact.

There are many things impelling us in the direction of annexation, and it is not necessary to make a charge against hon. members opposite of purposely aiming at annexation. But I say that our position, our environment is such, that this agreement, if carried out, must inevitably lead to that end. I say that with our present position, with an imaginary boundary line of 3,000 miles, with a joint commission looking after our waterways, with another looking after our fisheries, and with another joint commission which the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) has failed to bring down so far, but which he has threatened to bring down later, and which is apparently going to control our telegraph, express and telephone rates—with all these, and with a population of 8,000,000 striving with one of 90,000,000 to 100,000,000, with all these compelling forces, with the natural attraction of small bodies towards large ones, especially when such attraction is facilitated by the fact that the two people are of the same race, language and environment, and with the keen desire of the American people for amalgamation, is there any man so wise and so prophetic as to be able to say that ere many years shall have passed we shall not have lost our identity in the realization of that long cherished dream of our southern neighbours, the annexation of this country to the United States.

Of what avail then the boast of Sir Wilfrid Laurier that if the 19th century belonged to the United States, the 20th will belong to Canada. It looks as if the 19th century not only belonged to the United States but the 20th as well would belong to that country and Canada with it. Long before the sunset and evening star of our 20th century, long before its twilight and evening bell, yes, long before its noontide arrives, we shall as a nation have crossed the bar, lulled to sleep and lured to death, through this insidious pact, into commercial, political and national absorption with the great republic to the south of us, only to add a few more stars to the original thirteen on the banner of the American republic.

For all these reasons, I say that those who have the best interests of the country at heart should come to the conclusion that this Bill ought not to pass.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 3, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

DRINKING WATER.

Mr. LEWIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 131) respecting drinking water.

He said: The Bill I wish to introduce is as follows:

AN ACT RESPECTING DRINKING WATER.

His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

1. This Act may be cited as The Drinking Water Act.

2. No corporation or municipality shall take any water for drinking purposes from any stream or river which has had sewage or refuse put in it above the intake pipe, without first having such water sterilized.

3. Any corporation or municipality violating the provisions of section 2 of this Act shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a fine of not exceeding two hundred dollars for each day during which such violation continues.

4 This Act shall come into force by proclamation of the Governor in Council.

My object is to call the attention of the government to the serious condition now existing in this city and to the necessity of taking immediate active steps to remedy that condition and at the same time guard against epidemic in other parts of the country. When I introduced a Bill with reference to sewage, I stated that there was no such thing as an epidemic of typhoid in England or France, but that the disease in these countries was confined to some isolated cases. In that respect these countries are in remarkable contrast with our own. In this city, one out of every 50 inhabitants is down with typhoid; and medical men say that while a great many of the cases are of a mild character, the disease is dangerous even in its mild form. In the pulpit and in other public places in this city, we are told that where typhoid is epidemic, those responsible should be indicted. It must not be forgotten that the sewage which this city discharges into the Ottawa river travels some 700 miles and thus is apt to contaminate the cities of Montreal and Quebec which are not so far distant. It may be objected that this is not a matter which comes under federal jurisdiction, but which belongs to the provinces, but I would point out that in a matter so grave as this, and which may become interprovincial at any moment, this parliament surely ought to have jurisdiction. We all take pride in the city of Ottawa. It is our national capital, and I do not believe there is better air anywhere than one can breathe outside these buildings, but it is a blot on our country that the seat of government should be afflicted with this epidemic. Every day the epidemic is increasing, and I ask the right hon. the leader of the government and the hon. the leader of the opposition whether it is not high time that parliament should do something to eradicate it. Will it not be wiser to vote Supply and prorogue this House and call an extra session later? As a writer of a very pertinent editorial on the subject has said, instead of combatting the evil when it comes, it would be better that we should erect such civil and national barriers against it as will prevent its entrance at all. It is with that object that I submit this measure, and I ask the right hon. the Prime Minister to take notice of the serious condition of affairs, much more serious even than it is reported in the press.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 132) to correct certain clerical errors in the French version of the Inland Revenue Act.—Mr. Templeman.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. BURRELL. I would like to call the attention of the government to a despatch in this morning's 'Citizen' from Washington to the following effect:

United States Consul General John G. Foster, at Ottawa, Canada, is already here on a summons from President Taft and a member of the Canadian cabinet is hurrying to Washington, according to a report here, to confer with President Taft concerning possible amendments to the reciprocity treaty.

The summons to Washington was rumoured at the Capitol shortly after midnight and helped to strengthen the view of some of those members of the House who have been all along holding out hope that Congress might not be called into extra session. According to the report in circulation, the Canadian cabinet minister will be here to-day.

Is there any truth in the report?

Mr. FIELDING. No Canadian minister has gone to Washington.

GOVERNMENT SHIPYARDS AT SOREL—NOTICE OF MOTION AFFECTING MEMBER FOR RICHELIEU.

Mr. W. B. NANTEL (Terrebonne). Mr. Speaker I beg, on behalf and at the request of the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin), to give notice to the government and to the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Lanctot), that, on Monday next, the 6th March instant, before the orders of the day are called, there will be presented, as a matter of privilege, a motion touching malversation and fraudulent misappropriation of public moneys paid out as wages for work done for private individuals and property, at the government shipyards, shops and works at St. Joseph de Sorel and at the city of Sorel, and touching the said hon. member for Richelieu, in connection therewith. I shall, on behalf, and at the request of the hon. member for Champlain, furnish, this afternoon or to-morrow, to the government and to the hon. member for

Richelieu, copies of the motion to be presented in pursuance of the present motion.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. PERLEY. The hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames) has asked me to mention to the Minister of Public Works two returns which he has asked for. One of these was ordered on the 14th of December last, and relates to the expenditures on public works since 1880, and the location of wharfs, &c., and one ordered on 11th January last, with reference to government post offices and repairs and some other matters. He would like very much if these returns could be expedited.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Attention is being given to these returns. As the hon. member (Mr. Perley) will understand, it will take a couple of years, in the ordinary course, to get them ready?

Mr. PERLEY. When does the hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley), think he will have them ready?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Unless I employ quite a number of additional officials, it will take a very long time. I cannot hope to have them this session. I hope to have them next session.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), to an order of the House, of December 5 for a return relating to contracts between the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company and M. P. Davis. There is another return, for which, I suppose, I must look to either the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), or the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), concerning the number of public buildings used wholly or in part as post offices, the cost of such buildings, the revenue, &c. Then, on January 11 last, there was an order passed on motion of the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames) in which I am indirectly interested. There was another order on January 18 last in reference to aliens in the service of the government residing out of Canada. Also I have been requested to call the attention of the government to the fact that on December 14 on motion of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) two orders were made relating to travelling expenses. I desire also to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to an answer to a question, given in this House, on 27th February last, and reported on page 4390 of unrevised 'Hansard.' The question and its answer related to the Indian reserve at Christian Island. I think we have reason to complain of the kind of answers we sometimes get in the House, but not usually those from the Minister of the Interior. In this case, I asked distinctly:

> In order to obtain its object, did the government erect a residence for the agent upon the reserve, and at what cost; has the Indian agent ever resided in this house, and by whom is it occupied?

This latter part has not been answered, I think. Another part of this question was:

> 4. Where does the Indian agent reside, and when did he last visit the reserve?

I may say to the minister that I have reason for desiring more specific information than is given. The answer given is:

> He has moved to the reserve, and from information received he was there a few days ago.

I am told that the Indian agent has not been residing on the island, has never resided in the house referred to in the answer, and that this house has been occupied by somebody else. It is possible that since I got the information—a week or ten days ago—this agent has gone to reside upon the island. I understand that he has not resided on the island and that some one else has been occupying this house which was built by the government, with the express understanding, I believe, that the agent should reside on the island to instruct the Indians in agriculture, &c.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg to assure my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) that if the answer is not sufficiently detailed to meet his purpose, it is not on account of any intent to deny him information.

Mr. LENNOX. I quite appreciate that.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall be glad to supplement the answer with the fullest details possible. But we were not able to give all the details asked for and yet answer his question as quickly as he wished.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister will look into the matter.

Mr. MURPHY. As to the return ordered on 14th December last at the instance of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), if that is the one relating to the travelling expenses of officials of all the departments, my attention has been drawn to the fact that one department will require about a year to get the information.

Mr. LENNOX. It will involve a great deal of expense?

Mr. MURPHY. The point is that there are a large number of officials, and they are scattered throughout the country.

Mr. FIELDING. Another of the returns referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) is in preparation by my department, and I will see that its completion is expedited.

Mr. MACDONELL. May I ask about a belated return to an order dated December 12, respecting certain information regarding the International Waterways Commission. The information there asked would be of use in discussing the order which the minister has on the paper.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall have inquiry made at once.

Mr. FOSTER. I would call the attention of the Minister of Finance to a return to an order of the House dated February 6, 1911, of curator's reports in the case of banks in which curators have been appointed. The first return relates to the Bank of Yarmouth. There is a note from the department saying that the curator did not make a report to the Department of Finance as to the condition of the bank, but did report to the Canadian Bankers' Association, with regard to the false and deceptive returns made to the department which advice was communicated to the department. In a letter from the Deputy Minister of Finance, dated March 17, 1905, to the president of the Canadian Bankers' Association, a request was made for a report of the bank's affairs. It says: The attached is a copy of the report made. When I come to that it is from the secretary-treasurer's office, Bank of Montreal, March 21, 1905, to Mr. Courtney. It reads:

Dear Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 17th inst., I have now received a report from the curator of the bank of Yarmouth, of which the following statement is a synopsis:

I did not ask for a synopsis of the report and the Act does not contemplate that the Department of Finance, or the House shall be put off with synopses. There is attached a page of typewriting giving the synoptical report. If we are to have anything we should have what the law allows, which is a full report.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sure if there is such a report in the department we have presented it. I cannot answer offhand, but in view of what my hon. friend has said I will have the matter investigated and see where the omission is if there be one.

Mr. FOSTER. If there is no report the minister has a right to one.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The statute says that the curator shall make all returns and reports and give all information touching the affairs of the bank which the minister requires of him.

Mr. FIELDING. I shall be very happy to look into the matter.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I wish to ask about the following returns: Order of December 14, 1910, showing what ministers abroad in 1908, 1909 and 1910 with their business and expenses. Order of December 14, 1910, showing total payments made by the government to the Eclipse Furniture Company, the Office Specialty Company and Ahearn & Soper. Order of January 11, of payments made to Dussault & Lemieux. There is also a very belated return dated March 22, 1909, showing the names of villages, towns and cities in the various provinces where public buildings have been erected in certain years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Those in my department are being expedited, but a reference to the orders will show how voluminous a number of the returns will be, and, of course, the motions have to take their turn. I cannot promise my hon. friend just how soon the returns will be presented, but there will be no unnecessary delay so far as my department is concerned.

RECIPROCITY—ATTITUDE OF DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATIONS.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (E. Lambton). I ask the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to withdraw a statement made on February 16 last in the course of some remarks that I was presenting to the House. I was discussing the position of the cheese and butter market when the hon. gentleman made use of this statement:

Does the hon. gentleman remember that the dairy associations of eastern and western Ontario unanimously desire that this treaty should go into effect?

I have before me a letter from a director of the Western Dairymen's Association, and he distinctly and emphatically states that the Minister of Customs is mistaken in making that statement. He refers to the statement of the minister as published at page 3826 and says:

This statement is absolutely incorrect so far as the Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario is concerned. I am a director of that association, and have been for twenty years. I was present in Stratford when this question was introduced. We consulted every director and officer of the association, and unanimously agreed not to permit the question to go on the programme of the afternoon for discussion.

He closes with an emphatic denial of anything of that nature being discussed there that afternoon by the Dairymens' Association. I will ask the minister, in the face of that statement, to withdraw the statement he made in this House on the 16th of February.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I think I said that I had read in the newspapers, when in Washington, an account of the meeting. I do not see that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) himself says that no such discussion took place there. I have no desire to misrepre-

sent the facts or state anything that I do not believe. If I have said anything that is not in accordance with the facts, I can only say that I regret having done so. I did it in good faith. I read in a newspaper a report of proceedings I think at Stratford, in which the subject was discussed and in which reciprocity in dairy products was approved. Whether it was after the association had adjourned or not I do not know. I gave what I understood to be the case and still believe to be the case. If I have stated anything not in accordance with the facts, of course I regret it, as I do not wish to do anything of that kind.

SUPPLY—ATTACHMENT OF CIVIL SERVANTS' SALARIES.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. A. M. BEAUPARLANT (St. Hyacinthe). I would beg to make a few remarks on a matter which hitherto, owing to the rules of the House and other causes, I have not had a chance to place before parliament. The question I wish to discuss is whether the salaries of prominent public officers are to be continued under special privilege conditions or whether they should be placed on the same conditions as the salaries of other people with regard to the payment of debts. From the first occasion on which I introduced this Bill into the House, I never pretended that I was advancing a new idea by attempting to place all debtors on the same footing, by compelling those who earn high salaries to pay their debts just as those earning lower salaries are compelled to pay theirs. This is so evident that no one can to-day claim to have been the first to think of it. Many members in the past have advocated a like measure before this House, among them the Solicitor General, the ex-member for Lisgar, Mr. Richardson, and the ex-member for Laval, I think, now the Hon. Mr. Justice Fortin. Whatever may be the result of the discussion of my proposition, I cannot claim the merit of having introduced by it any new idea before this House. What is now the position of Dominion public officials with regard to debts? Their salary is not liable to attachment, seizure or garnishment, while the salary of any other debtor is. There is no law allowing an attachment of the salary of a Dominion civil servant. Article 599, paragraph 9, of the Code of Civil Procedure of the province of Quebec, and the unwritten but well-known principle of English common law, which prevails in all other provinces and which was affirmed in many cases, notably in the case of Fraser & McArthur, reported at page 165, of the Nova Scotia 'Digest,' a legal work due to our distinguished friend and colleague the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Congdon), who was at that time a lawyer practising in Nova Scotia, join together to make such an exception in the case of a Dominion official. My proposal now is that we should pass a law striking out such an exception. If I may be allowed to make a suggestion to the government it would be that they might take this measure up and enact it into law. For the purposes which I have here outlined, I would propose to add to the Civil Service Act, 1908, the two following subsections, immediately after section 47:

47a. All moneys or salaries due or accruing due to any person employed by the government of Canada shall be liable to attachment in each province of Canada, according to the laws and rules of procedure in force in such province.

47b. The attachment or garnishee summons or order may be served on the minister, deputy minister, chief officer, secretary or assistant secretary of the department in which the debtor is employed, or on the chief officer or clerk of such department or branch thereof if the debtor is employed outside of the city of Ottawa.

It should not be necessary for me to make any argument in support of this proposition. I trust that it will be accepted if it is as good a proposition in principle as I contend it is. I might remind the House that five years ago we had no law to prevent strikes and lock-outs. Since then we have passed a law to deal with that subject, and the people generally are satisfied with it. The people have derived some benefit from it and our example is to be followed by other countries, namely, South Africa and the United States. This goes to prove that a law, although new, may be a good one. Australia passed an indirect, but very effective, law during the session of 1901-2, which will be found at page 339 of the statutes of the Commonwealth of Australia for that year. I quote from that law the following:

1. If an officer is on an indictment or presentment convicted of any offence he shall be deemed to have forfeited his office and shall thereupon cease to perform his duties or receive his salary.

That is a preliminary remark.

2. If the estate of an officer is sequestrated either voluntarily or compulsorily for the benefit of his creditors, such officer shall apply as soon as he may legally do so to a court of insolvency for a certificate of discharge. If it appears to such court that the applicant has been guilty of fraud, dishonourable conduct or extravagance, such court shall direct the clerk of the court thereupon to report the same to the minister or permanent head or chief officer of the department in which such officer is employed. If such officer does not

apply as aforesaid for such certificate of discharge or if he applies and it appears from the report that such officer has been guilty of fraud, dishonourable conduct or extravagance, such officer may be dismissed from the public service or reduced to a lower division class or grade therein or fined, reprimanded or otherwise punished by order of the Governor General.

PENALTIES.

67. On receiving notice of any pecuniary penalty imposed upon any officer under the authority of this Act the officer who pays the salary of the officer so punished shall deduct the amount thereof from such salary.

With the permission of the House, I will quote a resolution which was passed on the 25th May, 1910, at the meeting of Federation of the Chambers of Commerce of Quebec, held in Montreal, and which reads as follows:

EXEMPTION FROM DISTRAINMENT OF THE SALARIES OF FEDERAL OFFICERS.

Mr. BOUCHARD. I shall be short, for I am convinced that every one here believes, as I do, that civil servants who generally earn a good salary should be, like all others, obliged to pay their debts.

The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe, Mr. Beauparlant, has devoted his attention to this question in the House of Commons where he introduced a Bill to that effect. That Bill will be again submitted at the next session and our representative expects that it will carry. Therefore, it is expedient, I think that the Federation of Boards of Trade should pass a resolution in favour of the Bill and advising the local boards of trade to meet their respective representatives and to endeavour to have them vote in favour of the Bill.

I beg to move that it be resolved that the Federation of Boards of Trade of the province of Quebec emphatically endorse the principle of the Bill presented by the member for St. Hyacinthe to render the salaries of federal officers liable to seizure and that they prompt parliament to pass the necessary legislation to that end the very next session.

Mr. AQUILA JASMIN, from Lachine. I second the motion.

Everybody: Carried.

I will also read the following communication from the secretary of the Montreal Board of Trade:

Mr. A. Beauparlant, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Dear Sir, Reply to yours of 8th ult., has been delayed by reason of the adjournment of the council meetings over the Christmas holidays, but I now beg to inform you, as follows:

First, that the council objects to the system of garnishment for debt.

Second, that as the system of garnishment for debt exists it heartily approves of your Bill, which places Dominion civil servants in this respect, on the same level as other citizens.

I am dear Sir,
Yours truly,
GEO. HADRILL,
Secretary.

I have received this statement from the secretary of La Chambre du Commerce of Quebec:

Quebec, February 1st., 1911.

A. M. Beauparlant, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—I have been directed to inform you that the Quebec Board of Trade are entirely favourable to the idea of that excellent Bill which you have introduced in the House of Commons, providing for the garnishment of part of the salaries of civil servants under the control of the federal authorities. The immunity enjoyed by these officers in respect to the seizure of the salaries coming to them gives rise to grievous abuses, to shameful impositions on the good nature of business men and other creditors, on the part of debtors in bad faith, and it is certainly high time that the unfairness of such a procedure should be recognized and that means should be taken to safeguard to a certain extent the interests of bona fide and deceived creditors. You may rest assured that you have the sympathy and moral support of all business men and particularly of the members of the Board of Trade.

Your obedient servant,
T. LEVASSEUR,
Secretary.

The 'Mail and Empire' of the 3rd December last published the following editorial note:

Civil servants have in the past been debtor-proof. Owe what they might their salaries could not be garnisheed. Mr. Beauparlant, one of the Quebec members, has introduced a Bill to change all this. Under his measure salaries of civil servants can be attached precisely as those of private individuals may be. Officials who pay their way will not object to a Bill of this kind. The only possible objectors would be non-payers, and their opposition is an argument in favour of the change. Why the public officers have been exempt from the law for so long is a mystery.

The Kingston 'Standard' of the same date contained the following:

SALARIES OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

A Bill has been introduced into the Ottawa House to amend the Civil Service Act so that the salaries of the gentlemanly, but often impecunious employees of the government shall be subject to garnishment. It may or may not become law; but there is no doubt of this fact—that the prayers of every retail merchant in the country will go up nightly in favour of it; for of all the dead beats that ever swindled a tradesman the civil servant dead beat, as he is seen in certain outside cities——

It is never in the city where the newspaper is published.

—is the worst. The salaries of these men have not hitherto been subject to garnishment because it has been considered 'contrary to public policy' to allow this to be done. In some mysterious way that no one can find out, the business of the country will suffer, according to this theory, if these dead beats

are made to pay their debts by having their salaries garnisheed. This is simply a theory borrowed from some older lands where the civil servants were the sons, cousins or some other connection of the parties in power and were by this means protected from having to pay their honest debts, when confiding tradesmen trusted them and relied upon their promises. 'Contrary to public policy' forsooth! What a hoary fiction that is! As if the public good would not be better served by making these men pay their debts like every honest citizen and live up to their contracts.

To emphasize the need for this legislation it would be well if every retail merchants' association in the country were to send down a deputation to Ottawa to urge the passing of the Bill.

We in Kingston here will, it is true, not be affected by the Bill, because here our civil servants pay their legitimate debts, but for the principle of the thing we should all contend, namely, that in the eye of the law and in respect to their debts, civil servants are and should be like other individuals. Other cities are not so happy in this respect as in Kingston.

The Peterborough 'Examiner' of December 12, says:

Mr. Beauparlant, M.P., for St. Hyacinthe, has introduced into parliament a Bill which should pass into law. Heretofore civil servants at Ottawa have enjoyed a remarkable exemption. Their salaries were not attachable for debt. They might run bills for groceries, dry goods, and what not, and they were uncollectable by process of law. Under the proposed law the civil servants are to be legislated into the ranks of ordinary honesty, and respectability. The old law of exemption for responsibility for debts incurred was a premium on dishonesty. There are civil servants by the thousands in Ottawa and it stands to reason that practical freedom from paying honest debt must have exercised a bad effect upon merchants and business. In the ordinary course of things collection of debts is difficult enough; and this difficulty adds to the difficulty, of business men making ends meet. Few realize how much the payment of even a small obligation exercices a cumulative effect; a sum like, say, ten dollars, goes the rounds, so to speak, and can possibly, in a hundred cases, help to make up an amount necessary to meet an obligation, and effect a balance with the bank. Pay-as-you-go is a splendid lubricant for the wheels of business, and pay promptly when you don't pay down, is the next best thing.

I beg to quote from a letter which I have received, the following:

A. M. Beauparlant, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Let me congratulate you in connection with the Bill which you are introducing and which provides for the garnishment of the salaries of Dominion civil servants and does away with a remnant of the oppressive privileges of feudal times.

The salary of the poor workingman may be seized, while hands must be kept off the salaries of these wealthy gentlemen who earn as much as $1,000 or $2,000 per annum, and avoid paying their just debts.

That was a dark spot and an anomaly, an anachronism in this democratic era of ours.

I have found in my protracted career, that this exemption was practically a safeguard for prodigality and dishonesty.

You are doing a meritorious act and the country should be grateful to you for so doing.

I enclose a letter of approval from Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to whom I had submitted the matter.

Please accept, together with the compliments of the season, the assurance of the high esteem in which I hold you.

(Signed): G. Z. MAYRAND,
Notary.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the expressions of opinion I have read to the House are opportune to this discussion, and that something ought to be done to remedy the evil now existing. It is needless to remind the House that it is only just and honest that every one should pay his debts; it is also needless to say that most of the Dominion officials are faithful to their obligations and do not need any law or legal rule to compel them to pay their debts, the moral rule being sufficient. However, a certain number of these officials refuse to pay their just debts, although in a position to do so, and some of them even go so far as to insult their creditors when they are asked for what they honestly owe. Why the salary of a workingman who earns $30 or $40 a month should be liable to garnishee and the salary of the Dominion public official who earns from $100 to $500 a month is not so liable, is a discrimination which ought not be suffered to longer exist. Either an end should be put to the system of attaching small salaries or the same attachment should be allowed on high salaries. We are all aware that the operation of the law allowing or prohibiting the seizure of the salaries of those not in the Dominion service is within the sphere of the provincial legislature, but, the allowing or disallowing of the attachment of the salaries of employees of this government is within the purview of this parliament, and I trust that in the near future this parliament will put an end to the present system of exemption. Why should any class of men be granted such a privilege; why above all should the high salaries—and generally speaking the salaries of the Dominion public servants, may be considered comparatively high salaries—why should the high salaries be exempt from seizure while the low salaries of other wage earners are not. I expect to be told in reply that the system I advocate would create disturbance and inconvenience in the different departments by compelling some chief officials to go to the courts from time to time to make the required statement as to the amount due to the official in default, but the same inconvenience is

now experienced by banking institutions, by municipal and provincial institutions, by railways, and by all kinds of industries, and the people prefer to suffer this inconvenience so that by complying with the requirements of the law, they may ensure that the principles of honesty shall prevail. Should not the Dominion government which is the chief institution in this country give to all others an example of fairness and honesty by compelling their officials to keep faith with their creditors. There is a department of justice specially created for the purpose of causing the principles of honesty to prevail in the whole community—and allow me to state en passant, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Justice could not have at its head a more able, or a more devoted man than the present minister—and in conjunction with the departments of the attorneys general of the different provinces their mission is to make honesty and justice prevail by safeguarding the rights and properties, as well as the lives and liberties of the citizens. Why should not the several departments of this government be ready to sacrifice their convenience to some extent if need be, in order that principles of honesty and justice should prevail among their employees.

The new system would have some inconveniences, we shall, perhaps, be told, but there is a reply, I trust, to every objection. The new system would be fair to the creditors, and would be desirable for the public officials themselves. It would be an advantage for the good ones, whom the present system does not help as they deserve, and also for the others, who, precisely because they rely upon this privilege, are led to incur obligations beyond their means. I expect to be told, also, that government employees, on account of the deference due to authority, ought to be free from the rules applied to other citizens. Sir, I am a Liberal, and I believe in equality and in the responsibilities resulting from equality, rather than in privilege. When public officers are expected to be true to their promises and faithful to their obligations in business matters, this is the best guarantee that they will be true also to the government which employs and pays them. I believe that the community are not made for the government, or for the chief officers of state, but that the government and the chief officers of state are made for the community, with all due consequences of that fact. I may be looked upon as not being up to date in saying that I still believe in the possibility of one condition and one rule of conduct for all men living in the same country, but I feel some pride in the hope that I may be of some use in that respect to the community in which I live. If the government cannot do something this year in the direction that I have proposed, and if I am still here next year, I will bring the same measure down again, because I think it is fair to all, and above all because it is honest.

Mr. GUSTAVE BOYER (Vaudreuil). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to add a few words to what the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Beauparlant) has said.

I have no hesitation in saying that whoever incurs debts is bound in honour to free himelf of such indebtedness. Before the government decide what should be done in connection with the measure introduced by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe, I wish to make a few remarks in respect to occurrences of a different character though connected with the question.

The remarks of the member for St. Hyacinthe have reference mainly to those who are permanently in the employ of the government; but there is still another class who are paid from the public chest, I mean the contractors, the temporary employees, that is to say those who work during the summer months, in connection with the crews on the dredges and the hydrographic surveys. Means should be taken whereby business men in the localities to which such contractors resort for their supplies and provisions, might be protected. Now, to my own knowledge it happened in the very district from which I hail, that contractors carrying on some dredging work for the government neglected on several occasions their most important duty, which is to pay for their supplies. More than once I have been under the necessity of applying to the minister direct in order to get these people paid.

I say the government should not lose an opportunity of taking all necessary means to oblige these contractors to meet their obligations by exacting that they should settle with their purveyors. Within the last two years, the Department of Marine—and I take this occasion of congratulating the Minister in regard to it—has applied a new policy in connection with their men in the hydrographic survey. Formerly it was the department who directly undertook to board the men. For two years past, a special purveyor has been appointed for that purpose. In that manner the department has effected a considerable saving, as shown by the public accounts to which I have had access.

The Department of Public Works has applied the same policy in regard to its dredges. That was an excellent move; I approved of it at the time, and I still approve of it to-day. However, it has its drawbacks, purveyors are not always responsible men and they go into debt. To my knowledge, suppliers of these dredges, after buying from butchers and merchants

the necessary goods for the board of the men, have subsequently failed to pay the bills. Application had to be made to the Department of Public Works, to the deputy minister and the claims of these men set forth. Such occurrences are very aggravating, and the department should leave nothing undone towards providing some security to merchants as regards the payment of goods bought from them by the purveyors.

In conclusion, I agree with the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe as to the desirability of such a Bill as this. I say that a man, whether he be an employee of the government or not, should lay down as a rule for himself to follow in the footsteps of all honest men living in this beautiful country of ours: pay his debts and not endeavour to shield himself behind some kind of privilege.

In recent years we have been called upon to increase the salaries of civil servants. We have granted the application, in spite of the opposition of a good many outsiders who did not view the proposal kindly. After all, public servants are well paid, and there are very few in business or industry, either in Ottawa or in the metropolis of the Dominion, or other cities, who earn as high salaries. I may add that civil servants, while drawing higher salaries, are generally better treated, that is, they have shorter hours. People engaged in business and elsewhere are bound to pay their debts; the law reaches them at all times. Why should a different rule be laid down in the case of civil servants? We pay large salaries to government employees, and why should they, under cover of the law, pile up accounts and then avoid paying them. I say that we would not be justified to allow such a state of things to persist. I congratulate the member from St. Hyacinthe on having brought the matter up ; it is a question which concerns everybody and I am satisfied that the government, with their usual foresight, will find a remedy which will be fair to all parties interested.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE (Quebec county). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I have only a word to say in respect to this question. In the province of Quebec we have a principle of common law under which the whole belongings of the debtor are the common security of his creditors. That law, strictly enforced, means the utter depriving the debtor of everything in his possession for the benefit of his creditors. It was considered that such a law, under certain circumstances, was rather too harsh, and numerous exceptions were made, exempting in the first place those things which cannot be dispensed with in every day life; then, as regards salaries, we have a provision which allows only a part of them to be garnisheed, in order to leave the debtor with enough to meet his own needs and those of his family from day to day. That principle has been applied to the civil service of the province of Quebec. Formerly no part of the salary of a civil servant could be garnisheed. This, it was contended, was a matter of public interest, and the prevailing idea was that as soon as one became a public servant, his salary was beyond seizure.

As I have just stated, an act has been passed providing for the garnishment of part of the salary, said part varying in proportion to the amount of the salary. As regards small salaries, one-fifth may be garnisheed, and the higher the salary, the greater also the proportion which is liable to garnishment, until it reaches one-third.

That law works very well. It is derived from the general principle that the belongings of a debtor are the common security of his creditors, with this humanitarian compromise that a certain part cannot be seized so as to avoid leaving the debtor without any resources whatever.

Considering that such an enactment gives beneficial results in one great province of the Dominion, and the oldest of them all, considering that the results so far have been of benefit, not only to the creditor, but also to the debtor, who thus frees himself by degrees, I cannot see why such a principle should not be applied in respect to employees of the Dominion government.

Of course the government might shield themselves behind the constitution, a provision of which states that all matters relating to indebtness under the civil law fall under the purview of the local legislatures and not under that of the Dominion parliament. However, Mr. Speaker, at this very session, this House has voted a Bill providing that on certain government works public servants shall not be required to work more than eight hours per day.

That shows a disposition on the part of the House to take a fair and broad view of the public interests and to bring certain classes of people, not directly under federal control, within the scope of that enactment, Since the bill introduced by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe has reference to employees of the Dominion government, paid out of moneys voted by this parliament, I fail to see why we could not apply such a restriction to these men, in the same way that we interfered in favour of those employed on the Dominion government public works. The principle is the same in both cases. If we had authority to legislate in favour of our employees, why should we not have the same right to legislate to their disadvantage? I say to their disadvantage, inasmuch as a part of their salary

would be liable to be garnisheed, as provided by those enactments of the local legislation. Such a measure might not be to the taste of certain government employees, but it would certainly be in their interest, since it would put them in a position to free themselves of their debts.

I believe that the Dominion parliament should stand out as a model as regards the observance not only of laws of public order, but also of that general law of honesty and justice which is indestructible. I believe that once that restriction has been enacted, through the experience acquired by the superior officers of justice in the every day routine of their calling, we shall succeed in framing such an enactment as will enable the creditor to recover his due and the debtor to free himself, without in any way impairing the efficiency of the public service.

For the above reasons I wholly approve of the remarks uttered by my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation). I did not intend speaking on this question, but after listening to certain remarks made by the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Boyer), concerning the manner in which some contracts are carried out, I deem it my duty to say a word.

A few years since, as hon. gentlemen will remember, the House discussed again and again the desirability of changing the practice then followed in regard to boarding the men working for the Department of Marine. That question came up several times, and finally the unanimous opinion of the House seemed to favour the idea of the department granting a contract to some employee who would undertake to board the men and all the passengers sojourning on the vessels. The outcome was altogether satisfactory. We concluded with the stewards on the various vessels an arrangement whereby we paid them an amount of 50 cents per head per day for the men composing the crew, and 60 cents for the officers. The result has been most satisfactory. I received the other day a report showing that last year a saving of several thousand dollars had been affected in this way.

The hon. member for Vaudreuil has given to understand that in one particular instance the steward had not paid for the supplies received from various points. I am very sorry to hear so. I only wish the hon. member were in his seat just now, and I regret he has been obliged to leave the House, temporarily. However, he will read what I said in 'Hansard.' Had he been here, I would have asked him to give me the name of that man, and if he is still in our employ, I will surely see to it that these suppliers are paid, otherwise he will not be kept on.

As regards the Bill introduced by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Beauparlant), I agree with him. I know, and it has been stated to me on several occasions, that civil servants as a rule are in favour of such a measure. When I say that civil servants are in favour of such a measure I mean those who have no reason to fear the putting in force of such an enactment. I know that in the province of Ontario, in Ottawa, for instance, the same difficulties are not met with as in the province of Quebec, as here, the law provides a means whereby a creditor may to a certain extent, and in an indirect manner, lay hands on the salary of the government employee.

As regards the province of Quebec, it is a different matter. We have a law providing that salaries of local government employees may be garnisheed not wholly, but in part, as stated a moment ago by the hon. member for Quebec county (Mr. Turcotte). It is much to be desired that such a measure should be voted by this parliament in respect to Dominion government employees so as to oblige them to pay their just debts.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). We are indebted to my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Beauparlant) for the great attention he has given this matter and I personally feel certainly under obligation to him for having seen fit to address the Chair in the English tongue, although, judging by the facility he has displayed in that language, that is no trouble to him. At the outset I wish to say that, in my ideas on this subject, I am not actuated by any feeling of sympathy for the civil servant who does not pay his debts. To pay his debts is a man's first duty, if indeed he be not acting contrary to his duty in incurring debts. But none the less, I must say that I look upon a proposition to change the law regarding the garnishment of the salaries of civil servants as one of very doubtful expediency indeed. The question is simply one of expediency, and the condition of the law which now prevents the seizure of the salary of civil servants is one which exists, not out of any consideration for these employees, but simply and wholly out of consideration for the public interests. It is entirely from that point of view that I question the desirability of making the change advocated by my hon. friend. I have seen it stated in legal works, as the reason for this rule of law, that the King cannot be brought into court against his own will, and, of course, we all recognize that it is the prerogative of the King to be sued only with his own assent upon the advice of his attorney general. That prero-

gative I regard as something of substantial advantage to the public, and I have no doubt that it may be quite accurate to describe the foundation of this immunity from the process of garnishment which civil servants enjoy as resting upon that principle of law that the King is not to be brought before his own courts and his own judges except upon his own assent, in the constitutional manner I have indicated. That difficulty, which may be considered as of more or less technical character—though I think it has a good foundation in the public interest—that difficulty has been felt by my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Beauparlant), and in framing the measure to which he refers he sought to overcome it by providing that the process of garnishment should be served upon some minister, deputy minister, chief or other officer of any department of state in which the debtor is employed. That might remove the technical objection, but it does not touch the root of the matter. The root of the objection is, in my judgment, that it would not be in the public interests that this should be permitted. Let me say why I am of that opinion. It is practically the same principle of law which precludes a civil servant from assigning his salary. The transfer of his salary which he might make, before receiving it, to any friend, if he wanted to protect himself, or to any creditor, or any person who might buy an instalment of his salary, would not be valid because it is against public policy. That has been the law from the earliest times, when law grew up in England by judicial decisions or judicial interpretations of what is the common law of that country. The principle of the thing is put by Baron Parke, recognized among English lawyers as one of the great masters of English common law in these words. Speaking of the Civil Service, he said:

> The compensation allotted to him under this Act is by way of salary, the object of which is to enable him to maintain such a position in life as will save him from the necessity of risking his character, by incurring those temptations which persons reduced to poverty are necessarily exposed to, and which would render him an unfit person to be again employed as a servant of the Crown. For this purpose, public policy requires that he should not be permitted to assign it away.

Exactly the same principle applies to this proposition to permit a creditor to garnish instalments of salary or sufficient of it to pay what is due him. That is but another form of effecting a transfer, or assignment. A civil servant, knowing that he cannot make a transfer, or assignment, of his salary by direct means, may co-operate with his creditor and enable him to get into the same position by taking proceedings before a judge to attach the salary and have an order served on the Crown to pay that salary to the creditor instead of to the civil servant. What, then, is the effect? The effect necessarily is, if you assume, as you must, the case of a civil servant who is not paying his way—the effect necessarily is that the man whose salary has been attached and ordered to be paid to some creditor is harassed by the daily needs of his daily outgoings, and consequently is not in a position to give his undivided attention to the discharge of the duties of the public office which he fills. It is in the interests of the general public that they should get the best possible return for the money they pay, and that cannot be accomplished if the civil servant is liable to the duns of the continually besetting creditor, and not only to that annoyance, but to seeing possibly his salary taken from him against his own will, leaving him unable to provide for the actual necessities of his family.

I have not the slightest sympathy for the civil servant who gets himself into that position. It may be, of course, that through some unexpected adversity, some misfortune or illness, he may temporarily find himself in a position where he cannot pay as he goes, but his salary is assumed to be sufficient for his station in life. In fixing his salary it was the intention of parliament that it shall be adequate and that its payment should be assured—that there was to be a certain fixed and definite amount paid upon a certain fixed and definite day. It is the duty, the business, of the civil servant to cut his coat according to his cloth, and except in the case I have mentioned of some unexpected calamity, he has no business to be in debt at all, and no more has the creditor any business to let him go into debt. Every man is presumed to know the law, and the creditor is presumed to know that he has not the right to seize the salary of his debtor who is in the public service, which he would have if his debtor were not working for the public. The creditor knows, or ought to know, that he has no right to take from that man a transfer of his salary. He knows presumably, and in most cases he does actually, what that man's salary is, when it is payable, just how much he can rely upon, and, therefore, the creditor acts with his eyes open if he allows a civil servant to get heavily into his debt. Under these circumstances, I do not feel much more sympathy with the creditor who is not able to enforce payment by process of law than I would feel for the civil servant who allows himself to get into the position I have described.

I think the law as it stands is in the interest of the people of the country who have the right to get, for the money they pay to the civil servant, the best possible return in the shape of his whole time without his attention being distracted by the annoyance

and harassing of creditors such as I have spoken of. It is to be remembered, in this connection, that the civil servant who takes his position of immunity, and it may be said in that sense of advantage over the working man or employee of a private employer, has disadvantages to correspond. The civil servant is not in a position to strike for higher wages. Some civil servants in France, not long ago, went on strike; and they found at once that they had committed an infraction of the law. It certainly would be an illegal act for any number of civil servants to enter into a combination among themselves to go on strike if they did not get higher wages. It may be a perfectly lawful thing for a man in public employment to agitate and urge an increase in his salary; it may be not an unlawful thing that two or three, or half a dozen, should combine together to endeavour to exert united influence. But the moment that these same men combined to strike and leave the public service deserted and not performed, they would be doing an illegal thing in respect of which they would be liable to prosecution. There are, therefore, countervailing disadvantages so far as the civil service is concerned. But I am not looking at it from this point of view; I am considering it from the standpoint alone of the public interest when I say that it would be better to leave untouched the wisdom of generations in this regard and not seek to make any change in the law which forbids the civil servant either to assign his salary directly or to effect the transfer of it by any other means.

Mr. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie). Not having had any notice that the subject introduced by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Beauparlant) was to be discussed this afternoon, I come before the House without any preparation for the present debate. Nor would I have risen had not the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) in his treatment of the case, in my judgment, departed from those principles of common sense which usually distinguish him in the application of legal formulas to the practical affairs of life. I listened very carefully to the defence of the present system which the Minister of Justice brought forward, and I must say that I fail to recognize any objection offered by him to the change which would not apply with equal force to many if not all the classes of cases in which salaries are garnishable at the present time. The Minister of Justice states that the present rule is based on the doctrine laid down by Baron Parke, that the salary of the civil servant is in the nature of a gratuity and that it is made for the purpose of enabling that servant to render to the public the greatest possible service in the capacity in which he acts, and to prevent him from being harassed by creditors or others to the detriment of the public service. To that statement of the doctrine, I have no exception to take. That doubtless is correct. But wherein does it apply? Does not the same doctrine, in so far as it affects this argument, apply to the servant of the railway companies, the servant of the provincial government—both of whose salaries are garnishable at the present time. The salary paid to any one may very well be put on the same basis as that laid down by Baron Parke as a matter of legal doctrine. But the whole question before the House is: What is the interest of common honesty and of equal rights among not only civil servants but all servants throughout the country. It may be that the civil servant is in a better position to offer free and unhampered service to the public if he is hedged about by the wall—the artificial wall—which now protects him from the ordinary process of garnishment. But I cannot see why the public as a corporate body has any higher rights than the ordinary citizen in this regard. It seems to me that the public as a body politic is in the same position as the Canadian Pacific railway, or any other company, or any private employer. Why should it be otherwise? Is not the Canadian Pacific Railway Company entitled to the very best possible service from the employees whom it pays? They are entitled to that just in the same sense as is the government of Canada. Is not a farmer on the plains entitled to the best possible service which the body and brain of his hired servant is able to give him? Certainly he is. The same rule applies throughout our commercial life. Why should we single out the government and say that, because it is stronger or represents more people that it is, in any higher or loftier sense, entitled to the unhampered efforts of its servants than any other employers in the community? I see no distinction so far as the interests of the country are concerned.

And why is the civil servant entitled to protection? The minister says he has no sympathy with the civil servant who runs into debt. That, doubtless, is just as true of the civil servant as of any other servant. But the minister says also: I have no sympathy with the creditor who allows the civil servant to run into his debt. The minister also said—let me do him ample justice—the creditor who permits the civil servant to run an account knows the position of that civil servant, knows his income, and consequently is warned beforehand, and incurs the credit at his own peril. That is equally true throughout the whole range of our commercial life. It is true of the employees of the great companies; it is true of the labouring man.

But what is the difference? These men do not incur the debt all with one creditor; if they did there would be some force in the argument of the Minister of Justice. But they go from one man to another; they concurrently run bills here and there, the same as other classes of servants all over the country. There are the same exceptions in the matter of frugality in the civil service as anywhere else.

How is one creditor to know that he is the only one, and even if he permits the civil servant to incur only a modest expenditure, he knows not, but what that man at some other store, or with some other creditor is doing the same thing as with him. Consequently there is absolutely no distinction, the creditor is no more on his guard in this case than in any other and he is liable to be innocently mulcted. The law has never denied to the creditor in any other case where he permits a man to live beyond his means, the right of recourse, that man has all the weapons for the collection of his debts he would have had, if he had acted paternally with reference to that debtor and told him he was not to be permitted to buy what he could not pay for. He has all the redress possible in that case, and why should he be denied it in this? It seems to me that when the minister comes thoroughly to consider all the aspects of the case, he will not permit his mind to be warped by legal doctrines which are after all, only a relic of days gone by, and which are being one by one overruled at this time in behalf of the broader principles of common sense and equal rights. The minister referred to the civil servant in another aspect. He said it was quite true that in so far as garnishment is concerned, we protect him, we say that his salary is not to be garnisheed. We also say he is not to be allowed to assign it. In both of these regards, I say he should have the same rights and should be restricted by the same methods as any other servant. In our provinces certain rights to assign not only of civil servants, but of all servants, have been very seriously restricted. That has been done in what was believed to be the public interest, but no distinction was drawn between the civil servant and any other servant, the restriction applying to all, and was intended to guard the improvident and particularly those who who have wives and families, from anticipation of their means. The minister said we should protect the civil servant in the matter of garnishment, excuse in other regards he is restricted, he is not permitted to strike. A moment's reflection will surely convince the very clear mind of the Minister of Justice, that that is not a strong argument. Surely the right of striking is not a right which the civil servant can complain of being deprived of. It seems to me nothing but the use of words to say that the civil servant suffers anything by the provision of our law, which forbids him to strike. The civil servant now has in his possession all the weapons that would be of any use to him in securing an advance of his salary, and the weapon of striking would be absolutely worthless to him. I think the civil servant is better equipped in this way than the ordinary employee. I say, let the civil servant of Canada suffer garnishment if he goes behind in the same way as any other man, and then we shall have advanced at least one step further in the progress of democracy in Canada.

Mr. CARVELL. I wish to heartily endorse the sentiment just expressed by my hon. friend from Portage, who has, to my mind, covered the whole range of this question, and I congratulate my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Beauparlant) for bringing this matter up. The Minister of Justice has argued in his usually careful and lucid manner, but I fear the Minister of Justice is arguing from the standpoint of a lawyer, who wants to maintain his case on account of the precedents. There is no doubt of the force of the arguments in the decision of Baron Parke quoted, but that does not make it irrevocable. I cannot understand why a civil servant should not be placed in exactly the same position as any other labourer, or servant or employee. He is as well paid, if not better paid than other men doing similar work for outside employers. He may be under one disadvantage, in that he is a member of a class and has not the chance for advances in salary that he would have in a big corporation or employment in the ordinary business of the country. I do not believe to any great extent in the doctrine of the right of the creditor to garnishee the wages of any man. I believe it is against the best interests of the civil servant himself to know that he is subject to this exemption. It may be that he and his family are anxious to shine in social circles, and his security from having his salary attached, I believe, may cause him to run into excesses that he would not otherwise indulge in, and this may have placed many of these people in the unfortunate position in which they find themselves. I believe this should be changed, and that if you put the civil servant exactly on a parity with every other labouring man or man working for a salary in the different provinces, and made him entirely subject to the jurisdiction of the provincial authorities with reference to garnishment, it would be to his advantage.

HAGUE ARBITRATION, ATLANTIC FISHERIES.

Mr. C. JAMESON (Digby). A few days ago, a resolution standing in my name, call-

ing for the bringing down of certain correspondence which led up to the settlement of the North Atlantic Fisheries case for reference to the Hague Tribunal, was passed. I do not think it should have been necessary for a member to ask for the bringing down of this correspondence, because, it seems to me, the subject matter of that case was of sufficient importance for the government to have laid before the House all the information in their possession. So far the only information which they have brought down, printed and distributed is contained in a book issued a few days ago containing the award and some fishery regulations recently based on the award.

The Hague Award, when published on September 7, 1910, was hailed with a great deal of satisfaction by the government of Great Britain and the government of Canada, and was considered of sufficient importance to be made the subject of a reference in the speeches from the Throne at the opening of parliament in Canada, the opening of parliament in England and the opening of the legislature in the province of Nova Scotia. It was also considered of so much importance that the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) has made sundry journeys up and down the country for the purpose of enlarging upon its virtues and expatiating upon its merits. One important feature in connection with this award, however, is that it does not apply to the Bay of Fundy, probably the largest bay in the western hemisphere and certainly, from the standpoint of the fisheries, the most important. Although the award makes a very important declaration respecting international law with regard to bays, the Canadian fishermen find themselves debarred from the benefit of that declaration with respect to the Bay of Fundy.

I may be permitted, Sir, to trace very briefly the history leading up to the submission of this question by Great Britain and the United States to the international court of arbitration at The Hague. In 1908 an arbitration convention or treaty was entered into between Great Britain and the United States of America. That was signed at Washington on April 4, 1908, and ratified on the 4th of June in the same year. The first article of the convention provided that differences which might arise relating to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two contracting parties, and which it had not been possible to settle by diplomacy, should be referred to the permanent court of arbitration at The Hague. The second article provided that in the case of a reference to The Hague a special agreement defining clearly the matter in dispute and the scope of the powers of the arbitrators should be entered into and the same article goes on to state:

> That His Majesty's government reserving the right before concluding a special agreement in any matter affecting the interests of a self-governing dominion of the British Empire to obtain the concurrence therein of the government of that dominion.

And it also provides that no such special agreement shall be binding until confirmed by an exchange of notes between the two contracting parties. The third article merely relates to the ratification of the treaty, and the fourth and last article provides that this convention is concluded for a period of five years, in other words, until June 4, 1913.

On January 27, 1909, the special agreement under which the reference regarding the North Atlantic fisheries was made, was entered into between Great Britain and the United States, and signed at Washington on the date which I have mentioned, by Mr. Bryce, the British Ambassador, on behalf of Great Britain, and Mr. Root, Secretary of State for the United States, on behalf of the United States. Question 5, of the questions which were to be submitted to The Hague Tribunal under this special agreement, reads as follows:

> From where must be measured the 'three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks, or harbours' referred to in the said article.

The article referred to was article 1 of the old convention, or treaty of 1818, between Great Britain and the United States with reference to the fisheries. The feature particularly referred to in article 1 was contained in the following words:

> And the United States hereby renounce forever, any liberty heretofore enjoyed or claimed by the inhabitants thereof, to take, dry, or cure fish on, or within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks, or harbours of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America not included within the above-mentioned limits.

'The above mentioned limits,' were in treaty waters, and did not affect the Bay of Fundy.

Under this question 5, referred to the court of arbitration at The Hague, one would have supposed that the exclusive rights of British subjects in the Bay of Fundy were to be settled. The question as will be seen, embraced all bays: no bays were excluded from its scope, and it would be reasonable to suppose that the question as to all bays on the Atlantic coast in His Majesty's North American possessions would be settled, with regard to fisheries.

Section 4, on page 20, of the award of the tribunal, relates to the extraordinary contention of the United States with respect to these bays. It reads:

> 4. It has been further contended by the United States that the renunciation applies

only to bays six miles or less in width 'inter fauces terrae,' those bays only being territorial bays, because the three mile rule is, as shown by this treaty, as principle of international law applicable to coasts and should be strictly and systematically applied to bays.

But the tribunal did not concur in that view. It went on to state in its answer to that question what I shall now read:

But the tribunal is unable to agree with this contention.

(a) Because admittedly the geographical character of a bay contains conditions which concern the interests of the territorial sovereign to a more intimate and important extent than do those connected with the open coast. Thus conditions of national and territorial integrity, of defence, of commerce and of industry are all vitally concerned and with the control of the bays penetrating the national coast line. This interest varies, speaking generally in proportion to the penetration inland of the bay; but as no principle of international law recognizes any specified relation between the concavity of the bay and the requirements for control by the territorial sovereignty, this tribunal is unable to qualify by the application of any new principle its interpretation of the treaty of 1818 as excluding bays in general from the strict and systematic application of the three mile rule; nor can this tribunal take cognizance in this connection of other principles concerning the territorial sovereignty over bays such as ten mile or twelve mile limits of exclusion based on international acts subsequent to the treaty of 1818 and relating to coasts of a different configuration and conditions of a different character;

(b) Because the opinion of jurists and publicists quoted in the proceedings conduce to the opinion that speaking generally the three mile rule should not be strictly and systematically applied to bays;

(c) Because the treaties referring to these coasts, antedating the treaty of 1818, made special provisions as to bays, such as the treaties of 1686 and 1713 between Great Britain and France, and especially the treaty of 1778 between the United States and France. Likewise Jay's treaty of 1794, Art. 25, distinguished bays from the space 'within cannon-shot of the coast' in regard to the right of seizure in times of war. If the proposed treaty of 1806 and the treaty of 1818 contained no disposition to that effect, the explanation may be found in the fact that they first extended the marginal belt to five miles, and also in the circumstance that the American proposition of 1818 in that respect was not limited to 'bays,' but extended to 'chambers formed by headlands' and to 'five marine miles from a right line from one headland to another,' a proposition which in the times of the Napoleonic wars would have affected to a very large extent the operations of the British navy;

(d) Because it has not been shown by the documents and correspondence in evidence here that the application of the three mile rule to bays was present to the minds of the negotiators in 1818 and they could not reasonably have been expected either to presume it or to provide against its presumption;

(e) Because it is difficult to explain the words in Art. III of the treaty under interpretation 'country . . . together with its bays, harbours and creeks' otherwise than that all bays without distinction as to their width were, in the opinion of the negotiators, part of the territory;

(f) Because from the information before this tribunal it is evident that the three mile rule is not applied to bays strictly or systematically either by the United States or by any other power;

(g) It has been recognized by the United States that bays stand apart, and that in respect of them territorial jurisdiction may be exercised farther than the marginal belt in the case of Delaware bay by the report of the United States Attorney General of May 19, 1793, and the letter of Mr. Jefferson to Mr. Genet, of November 8, 1793, declares the bays of the United States generally to be, 'as being landlocked, within the body of the United States.'

Now, Sir, if this doctrine had been applied to the Bay of Fundy it would have been declared territorial waters with exclusive rights to Canadian fishermen, and this doctrine would have applied to it, but for the so called understanding by which the Bay of Fundy was shut out. I read from the report of the award of the tribunal, the last clause in answer to question 5:

It is understood that nothing in these rules refers either to the Bay of Fundy considered as a whole apart from its bays and creeks or as to the innocent passage through the Gut of Canso, which were excluded by the agreement made by exchange of notes between Mr. Bacon and Mr. Bryce, dated February 21, 1909, and March 4, 1909; or to Conception Bay, which was provided for by the decision of the privy council in the case of the Direct United States Cable Company *vs.* the Anglo-American Telegraph Company, in which decision the United States have acquiesced.

Here suddenly we find that the whole situation had been changed and instead of the Bay of Fundy being dealt with under question 5, it was expressly excluded by some understanding or some mysterious subsidiary agreement which was entered into. I would like to ask the minister how it was that this was done, and why it was done? At whose instance and upon whose advice was it done, and who is it that is going to take the responsibility for the exclusion of the Bay of Fundy from the operation of this award? At this particular moment, and before I proceed further, I would ask the minister to give an answer to that question.

Mr. BRODEUR. Certain correspondence of many years ago between the United States government and the imperial government dealt with the question of the Bay of Fundy, and later there was an exchange of notes on the matter between Mr. Bryce and the United States Secretary of State.

Mr. JAMESON. What correspondence does the minister allude to?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is correspondence which took place in the year 1843. Had I been aware that my hon. friend would bring up this matter I would have had this correspondence here.

Mr. JAMESON. I gave notice last night.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman did not mention the Bay of Fundy especially.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). What we want to know is whether there has been any arrangement made with reference to the Bay of Fundy excluding it from the treaty?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I tried to explain when addressing the House on this subject on the 2nd December last, the position with regard to the Bay of Fundy, as fully as I was able to. When the difficulties first arose between the United States and Nova Scotia in regard to this treaty as early as 1840, or before that year, the principal subject of the difficulty seemed to be the fishing by United States fishermen in the Bay of Fundy. The legislature of Nova Scotia insisting that the Bay of Fundy was, notwithstanding its size, within the renunciation made by the United States in the treaty of 1818, addressed the imperial authorities upon that subject. The matter was referred to the law officers of the Crown in England and they supported the contention of the Attorney General of Nova Scotia and delivered their opinion that the Bay of Fundy had been renounced by the treaty of 1818. The matter continued to be one of much agitation diplomatically between the United States and Great Britain and finally it was closed in the year 1845, I think in the month of March, by a despatch from Lord Aberdeen the foreign secretary, to the United States minister at the Court of St. James, in which Lord Aberdeen stated that while maintaining the legal right of Great Britain to exclude United States fishermen from the Bay of Fundy they would relax their right so far as that bay was concerned. Ever since then the bay has been treated as open to the fishermen of the United States, and it has been so treated by both parties. When the arrangement for submitting these difficulties to arbitration at the Hague was under verbal discussion at Washington in January, 1909, Mr. Root as representing the United States said as though it were a matter of course—and I think using these very words: Of course nothing in this submission is to affect one way or the other the position of the Bay of Fundy, or of what was termed 'Innocent Passage through the Gut of Canso.' That was made a sine qua non of the reference to the arbitration of the Hague at all. The contention was: The question of the Bay of Fundy has been settled between ourselves and Great Britain now more than 60 years ago, and there is no question of reopening it. It was at one time proposed that a clause to that effect should be inserted in the agreement of submission to arbitration, but it was thought better—indeed I think it was my own suggestion—that instead of putting it upon the face of the agreement to arbitrate, informal notes stating the understanding in that respect should be exchanged between Mr. Bryce and Mr. Root. Such letters were exchanged in either February or March of 1909. They were before the tribunal, and it is the circumstance of their having been so exchanged that leads to the tribunal making the observation in the award which the hon. gentleman has read, that it is understood that nothing in the rules which they were then suggesting should be taken to refer either to the Bay of Fundy or to the Gut of Canso, which were excluded by these notes of the 21st February and the 4th of March, 1909.

Mr. JAMESON. The minister has given a pretty lengthy answer to my question, and I may say with all deference, that it is very unfortunate that he should express this view, as also the view he expressed on the 2nd December last, upon this same subject. I do not think, in the first place, that the correspondence that took place between Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Everett in 1845 can possibly bear out the extreme construction placed upon it, and the extreme claim founded upon it by the United States. I also think that the treaty of 1908 between Great Britain and the United States made special provision for a settlement of matters in dispute, or on which there was any doubt, in regard to subjects of this kind. The minister himself, on the 27th of January, 1909, when this case was being settled, says he suggested that there should be an interchange of correspondence, and in that correspondence the reservation of the rights of both parties and the contentions of both parties were made. It seems to me, under these circumstances, that it was clearly a subject which should have been arbitrated. If there were no rights there on the part of Great Britain and Canada, what rights were being reserved? If there were rights, why should they not have been arbitrated? But, Sir, the statement which the minister has made, which has gone on record, is unfortunate, because he has taken almost the extreme view that the United States has taken, and in future negotiations it will very seriously militate against this country. I am going to refer to the correspondence between Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Everett. The letter, to

which reference was made by the Minister of Justice, was dated March 10, 1845, and the clause which has particular relation to the subject matter now under discussion, and which is to be found at page 141 of the appendix to the British case, reads as follows:

The undersigned has accordingly much pleasure in announcing to Mr. Everett, the determination to which Her Majesty's government have come to relax——

Observe the word, Mr. Speaker.

—relax in favour of the United States fishermen, that right which Great Britain has hitherto exercised, of excluding those fishermen from the British portion of the Bay of Fundy, and they are prepared to direct their colonial authorities to allow, henceforward, to allow the United States fishermen to pursue their avocations in any part of the Bay of Fundy, provided they do not approach, except in the cases specified in the treaty of 1818, within three miles of the entrance of any bay on the coast of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick.

That was the offer of Lord Aberdeen to Mr. Everett, and it was an offer which clearly contained a condition. Here is the reply of Mr. Everett, or the important part of it, which will be found on page 142 of the same volume, under date of March 25, 1845. After acknowledging the receipt of Lord Aberdeen's letter, Mr. Everett goes on to say:

While he desires, however, without reserve, to express his sense of the amicable disposition evinced by Her Majesty's government on this occasion in relaxing in favour of the United States——

Again observe the word, Mr. Speaker.

—the exercise of what, after deliberate reconsideration, fortified by high legal authority, is deemed an unquestioned right of Her Majesty's government, the undersigned would be unfaithful to his duty did he omit to remark to Lord Aberdeen that no arguments have at any time been adduced to shake the confidence of the government of the United States in their own construction of the treaty.

At this point, just let me say that the contention which the United States were putting forward then, which they always thereafter put forward, and which they put forward at the hearing of this case before the Hague Tribunal—the same extreme contention with respect to bays, that was made with respect to the Bay of Fundy in this correspondence—was made on behalf of every other bay, when the matter came to be arbitrated in 1910 at the Hague. Mr. Everett's letter continues:

While they have ever been prepared to admit, that in the letter of one expression of that instrument there is some reason for claiming a right to exclude United States fishermen from the Bay of Fundy (it being difficult to deny to that arm of the sea the name of 'bay' which long geographical usage has assigned to it), they have ever strenuously maintained that it is only on heir own construction of the entire article that its known design in reference to the regulation of the fisheries admits of being carried into effect.

The undersigned does not make this observation for the sake of detracting from the liberality evinced by Her Majesty's government in relaxing——

The word 'relaxing' is again used——

—from what they have regarded as their right; but would be placing his own government in a false position to accept as mere favour that for which they have so long and strenuously contended as due to them under the convention.

Here we have the conditional offer of Lord Aberdeen to Mr. Everett, spurned by the representative of the United States, who said in effect: You are giving us nothing; you are merely offering to us what we already have, and therefore, we will not, on our part, meet the conditions which you have imposed. They did not permanently change anything by that correspondence, and no concession was ever made after that. It was a relaxation for a time only and conditional at that. There was a finality attached to it, and that finality was brought about by certain actions on the part of the government of Canada with the assent of the British authorities.

Now, I may say that there were several reasons in addition to the reason I have just given, why this should not be considered as more than a temporary relaxation. For instance, during the hearing of the Halifax Fishery Award Argument, it was declared by Mr. Thompson, in arguing the case on behalf of Great Britain, that it was only a relaxation, and a temporary relaxation. The United States did not contend at that time that this relaxation of Lord Aberdeen's gave them rights in the Bay of Fundy. They were then founding their alleged rights, not upon that chiefly but rather upon the award of Mr. Bates, in connection with the arbitration with reference to the Schooner 'Washington,' an American vessel, which had been seized for fishing within what was then known as the three-mile limit in the Bay of Fundy, that is outside of the Grand Manan islands. The matter was referred to a tribunal of three, Mr. Bates being the umpire, and giving a decision adverse to Great Britain, and the sum of $3,000 damages was paid. The United States claimed under that chiefly, rather than under Lord Aberdeen's letter.

In 1870 the Hon. Peter Mitchell, then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, placed certain restrictions upon American fishermen with regard to the fishery regulations of this country, and Lord Grenville sent a despatch

to Mr. Mitchell in which he said that 'Her Majesty's government hopes that the United States fishermen will not, for the present, be prevented from fishing except within three miles of land or in bays which are less than six miles broad at the mouth.' So that on that occasion, there was a clear illustration of the view that the Canadian authorities held that this did not operate in any way as giving a permanent right to the Americans in that bay and the British authorities when they used the expression 'for the present' regarded the relaxation of the enforcement of their exclusive rights in all bays more than six miles broad at the mouth, as being a temporary relaxation only.

Again in 1886 the parliament of Canada passed an Act respecting Foreign Fishing Vessels. That Act did not meet with the approval of our friends in the United States, and consequently an interchange of correspondence took place between Mr. Phelps, then representative of the United States at the Court of St. James, and the Marquis of Salisbury. Here is an extract from a letter, dated January 25, 1887, from Mr. Phelps to Lord Salisbury referring to this Act of 1886, which was passed by the parliament of Canada. Mr. Phelps says:

> Since the receipt of Lord Iddesleigh's note, the United States government has learned with grave regret that Her Majesty's assent has been given to an Act of the parliament of Canada, passed at its late session, intituled: 'An Act further to amend the Act respecting Fishing by Foreign Vessels,' which has been the subject of observation in the previous correspondence on the subject between the government of the United States and of Great Britain.

Mr. Phelps goes on to state:

> It has been pointed out in my note to Lord Iddesleigh above mentioned that the three-mile limit referred to in this Act is claimed by the Canadian government to include considerable portions of the high seas, such as the Bay of Fundy, the Bay of Chaleurs and similar waters, by drawing the line from headlands to headlands. And that American fishermen have been excluded from those waters accordingly.

So that there is no foundation for the assertion that since 1845, the date of the interchange of correspondence between Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Everett, the United States had the privilege of the fisheries in the Bay of Fundy without any objection on the part of Great Britain or Canada. I say that that citation which I have made—a citation from the letter of the representative of the United States at the Court of St. James—is the strongest evidence of the fact that the British and Canadian authorities considered that the United States had no rights in these waters, and that when Her Majesty's assent was given the Act—and the assent of the Governor General of Canada was withheld pending the sanction by the imperial authorities of that Act—it is evident that the British authorities claimed that the Bay of Fundy was British territorial waters.

Now, Sir, to return again to the arbitra- by the Hague Tribunal.

In April, 1909, a document was brought down in the imperial parliament which contained the special agreement entered into at Washington on the 27th January, 1909, and embodied the correspondence between Mr. Bryce and Mr. Bacon of 6th February, 1909. There is nothing, however, in this document to indicate that any arrangement had been made to exclude the Bay of Fundy from the scope of the arbitration which was to be undertaken under this agreement.

Again in September, 1909, we find that another document was printed and presented to both houses of parliament in Great Britain. This contains the special agreement entered into on the 27th January, 1909, at Washington, and also two notes interchanged between Mr. Bryce and Mr. Bacon, who had succeeded Mr. Root as Secretary of State for the United States. The first is from Mr. Bryce to Mr. Bacon:

> British Embassy,
> Washington, March 4, 1909.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note informing me that the Senate of the United States has approved the special agreement for the reference to arbitration of the questions relating to the fisheries on the North Atlantic coast and of the terms of the resolution in which that approval was given.

It is now my duty to inform you that the government of His Britannic Majesty confirms the special agreement aforesaid, and in doing so confirms also the understanding arrived at by us that question 5 of the series of questions submitted for arbitration—namely, from where must be measured the '3 marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks, or harbours' referred to in the said article—is submitted in its present form with the agreed understanding that no question as to the Bay of Fundy, considered as a whole, apart from its bays or creeks, or as to innocent passage through the Gut of Canso, is included in this question as one to be raised in the present arbitration, it being the intention of the parties that their respective views or contentions on either subject shall be in no wise prejudiced by anything in the present arbitration.

This understanding is that which was embodied in notes exchanged between your predecessor and myself on the 27th January, and is that expressed in the above-mentioned resolution of the Senate of the United States.

I have, &c.,

JAMES BRYCE.

Here now we have the most extraordinary statement that, at the same time that the agreement was entered into, there was an 'understanding' outside of that agreement which varied it and lessened the benefits of it, so far as Great Britain and Canada in particular are concerned.

Let me read the reply:

Department of State,
Washington, March 4, 1909.

Excellency:

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 4th instant, in which you confirm the understanding in the matter of the special agreement submitting to arbitration the differences between the governments of the United States and Great Britain concerning the North Atlantic fisheries, as expressed in the resolution of the Senate of the 16th of February, 1909, and as previously agreed upon by the interchange of notes with my predecessor of the 27th of January, 1909.

I therefore have the honour to inform you that this government considers the special agreement as in full force and effect from and after the 4th day of March, 1909.

I have, &c.,
ROBERT BACON.

In this document brought down to the British House of parliament on September, 1909, a reference is made to an understanding entered into on the 27th January of that year, the same date that this special agreement for the submission of these matters to the Hague Tribunal was signed and sealed. And the strange part is that in the document brought down in February no reference is made to any such understanding, and the agreement, as brought down to the Imperial House might well be misleading so far as the scope of question 5 is concerned. For would not the members of the Imperial House have the right to believe that every question with regard to bays in His Majesty's North American possessions on the Atlantic, was to be settled by that tribunal under question 5? Yet here we have this mysterious understanding which suddenly crops up in this blue-book submitted to the imperial parliament in September, 1909.

Mr. FOSTER. The other was February.

Mr. JAMESON. Yes, and this was in September, or eight months after the clandestine understanding was arrived at. I ask the hon. minister why it was that this understanding was entered into, at whose instance, upon whose advice, with whose consent, and who is to accept the responsibility. The minister in effect stated that this understanding was arrived at under his instructions or with his knowledge and consent.

One thing is sure, and that is that this government cannot escape responsibility for it; because that responsibility is absolutely nailed down by Article 2 of this treaty of 1909, which I have already read, but which I will repeat at this juncture:

His Majesty's government reserving the right, before concluding a special agreement affecting any of the self-governing dominions of the British Empire, to obtain the concurrence therein of the government of that dominion.

So that it is to be presumed, apart altogether from the statement of the Minister of Justice, that the government had full cognizance of this matter—they were party and privy to it, and the responsibility is entirely upon them for the failure to include the Bay of Fundy in the subjects submitted to the Tribunal under question 5.

I must say that it is a surprising thing to me, notwithstanding the statement of the Minister of Justice, that the understanding was arrived at with his concurrence, that he preferred to have the understanding separate and apart—as I gather from his remarks—from the special agreement itself. I cannot understand the advisability of that. Here was a special agreement entered into on the 27th of February, 1909,—the documents signed and sealed at Washington on that day. The documents were exchanged between Messrs. Bryce and Root, on the 6th of February, 1909. Up to that time, there was not a word upon the record, or in the document itself that any change had been made or was to be made in respect to its scope. Again, on the 16th of February, 1909, we find that the Senate of the United States approves of that special agreement, subject to the exclusion from the operation thereof of the question regarding the Bay of Fundy, the 'innocent passage of the Gulf of Canso,' and some question with respect to Conception Bay. We cannot find out what was said in the Senate of the United States, with regard to this matter, because what went on there, was carried on in camera. There were secret proceedings all round. And it was not until the 18th of February, 1909, that 'the injunction of secrecy was raised in the United States Senate from the special agreement between the United States and Great Britain for the submission to the permanent court of arbitration at the Hague, of questions relating to the fisheries of the North Atlantic coast.' That is the record that appears in the congressional record of February 20, 1909, in regard to the Senate of the United States. Now, this understanding, as I have said, was evidently arrived at with the concurrence and by the consent of the government of this country or of its representatives in that behalf.

Mr. FOSTER. Were the papers not brought down?

Mr. JAMESON. No papers with regard to this subject have ever been brought down, printed and distributed to this House, with the exception—I think I am stating the facts—of this blue-book distributed on the 27th of February last, entitled: 'Papers in regard to differences between Canada and the United States, referred to the Hague Tribunal, also amended fishery regulations' (in other words, the award of the Hague Tribunal and some fishery regulations enacted thereunder) and a return brought down in response to a motion of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), on the 27th of February, 1909, which embraced, I believe, the copy of the special agreement entered into on the 27th of January, 1909. It, however, was not printed. But no correspondence relating to this matter—none of the notes which passed on the 27th of January, 1909, and which varied this special agreement—have been laid before this parliament or so far as the documents in our hands evidence were ever presented to the imperial parliament.

The mysterious part of the matter is, here is a special understanding arrived at on the 27th of January, 1909, between Mr. Bryce and Mr. Root, excepting the Bay of Fundy from the scope of this inquiry and from the operation of the award. The United States Senate, according to all the records we have, did not pass upon that matter until the 16th of February, 1909, so we have an agreement on the part of the representatives of the Canadian government that the Bay of Fundy should be excluded from the award, actually entered into twenty days before the Senate of the United States demanded it. I say that is a most extraordinary condition of affairs, and is something which certainly needs explaining by the Minister of Justice, or whoever it was had this matter in charge.

It will be observed, also, that, while Mr. Bryce agreed to exclude these questions, of the Bay of Fundy from submission to The Hague Tribunal, he clung to our rights by the paragraph in his letter to which I have alluded. Although the minister has stated, in effect, that he does not regard us as having any territorial rights in the Bay of Fundy outside the three-mile limit, I wish to enter now a protest against that statement in the strongest terms possible, because I do not think the statement is one which should go unchallenged. Though a layman, I take that stand, and I trust I shall be supported in it by gentlemen of legal attainments whose opinion on that matter would be worthy of consideration. I feel it would be detrimental to the interests of the country and detrimental to our interests in any future negotiations we may have in regard to this important bay that the statement should go unchallenged.

In what condition are we placed by reason of this 'understanding' arrived at on the same day the special agreement was entered into? Where does that leave us with regard to future arbitration in respect to the Bay of Fundy? Are we precluded by it from arbitrating in regard to the Bay of Fundy? Are we precluded for any specific time, by this mysterious understanding of which we get no particulars? Or are we shut out for all time? I say, these are important questions. The life of the treaty of 1908 between Great Britain and the United States, as I have pointed out, is five years from the 4th of June, 1908. It expires on the 4th of June, 1913, that is, there is practically only two years left of the life of that treaty. I do not know, from any information I have, or can obtain, whether or not we are shut out from arbitrating our rights with respect to the Bay of Fundy by reason of any 'understanding,' which may have been arrived at between Mr. Bryce and Mr. Root by the consent, and with the concurrence of the government of Canada or their representative.

What the toiling fishermen of the Bay of Fundy shores want to know is, what are the Canadian rights in the Bay of Fundy. Are they certain or are they indefinite? Are they exclusive, or are they otherwise? If indefinite, when will the government ever have another opportunity such as they had in 1909, to clear up the question and settle it for all time? If our rights are exclusive does the United States recognize them as such, and does the government of Canada intend to enforce our rights in that regard? Two considerations hang upon this, if the Bay of Fundy is British territorial waters, the government of Canada can first exercise supervision and control of these fisheries from shore to shore. And, secondly, that the fishermen of the world can be excluded from the benefit of those fisheries.

I have heard it stated in this House by supporters of the government that the fishermen of the maritime provinces are going to serve as recruits for the Canadian Naval Service. Sir, I believe that the fishermen of the Atlantic coasts of Canada will always be found ready and willing to do their duty to their country whenever they are called on. Of that I am absolutely confident, and I do not think it needs assertion or reassertion. But, Sir, what I say is, that if the fishermen of the maritime provinces are to be expected to recruit our navy, if they are to be expected to come to the rescue, the defence, and protection of Canada and Canadian interests, surely it is the duty of the government to guard and protect their interests when they are entrusted to them, as they were on the occasion to which I have alluded. In that connection the government has absolutely failed of its duty. It was the most complete backdown in matters diplomatic which has ever taken

place in connection with any Canadian affair. The people of this country wish to live on friendly terms with the people of the United States, of that there can be no question whatever. The two peoples are sprung largely from the same stock, speak pretty generally the same language, have largely the same laws, literature and customs, but with all that I believe that the people of Canada would hesitate to purchase that friendship at the cost of their rights as British subjects in our own fisheries. I believe that the people of Canada will shut their eyes to irregularities in different departments of government, that they will even shut their eyes to worse than extravagance in that connection, but if I know their temper and their mettle they are not likely to tolerate a sacrifice of their national interests either through weak-kneed diplomacy, or through the inefficiency of this or any other government; and so far as the documents I have inspected give me light on this subject, the government of this country has absolutely failed of its duty in connection with the Bay of Fundy, and with the preservation of the rights of our fishermen in that most important bay.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). When my hon. friend in the course of his remarks asked an answer to a question not long ago, I made an answer, which was possibly longer than it ought to have been. I understand it was long enough to lead to complaint of its length on the part of the hon. gentleman. That was my fault, my misapprehension, I suppose, because I had in all sincerity taken it that the question was asked because he wanted information. I think he has made it evident enough that it was not information that he was seeking, but rather some foundation, if by any possibility, even a foothold or a toehold for it could be obtained, for making an attack on this government, and I am agreeably disappointed in the gravamen of the complaint which is made by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman gave notice last night that to-day he would discuss some points in connection with this award. The points in connection with the Hague award are literally too numerous to mention. A matter that took the better part of the summer for discussion and in respect to which the award itself, which is probably as compendious a summary of the points involved as could possibly be put upon paper, and which extends over the number of foolscap pages this award occupies, is of such a character that to speak of some of the points in regard to the case, is like saying that all the words he intends to use would be found in an unabridged dictionary. Thus, I was not able to refresh my memory on particular points or to bring with me the papers bearing on the matters to be brought up. The burden of the hon. gentleman's complaint is that the government is very seriously to blame because something or other has been lost or has been given away or somebody's case has been weakened or prejudice has in some manner or another arisen out of these recent proceedings in regard to the rights of Canadian fishermen in the Bay of Fundy. The answer to that is very simple, very brief; the answer is simply that whatever such Canadian rights were before this arbitration was entered upon such and no less are Canadian rights to-day since this arbitration is ended and an award has been made. The reference to arbitration did not touch the Bay of Fundy one way or the other, and the notes which were exchanged between Mr. Bryce and the American authorities on that subject pursuant to the verbal arrangement in that behalf which had been entered into, say in so many words that nothing in connection with these proceedings is to prejudice the rights of either party or the contentions which either party is at liberty to make in regard to the effect of the treaty of 1818 upon the Bay of Fundy. Surely nothing can be plainer than the position in which matters with regard to the Bay of Fundy are left by that arrangement. There was no arbitration about the Bay of Fundy, that is all that has happened in regard to it. There was arbitration in regard to the remainder of our bays, and whatever position the Bay of Fundy was in before this agreement to have an arbitration was entered into, in that identical position the Bay of Fundy is to-day unless it may be, as I think it may well be, that the position of Canada in regard to that bay is made stronger by the success which Canada's contentions have had before the tribunal last summer.

It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to deplore the fact that the Bay of Fundy was excluded from the arbitration of last summer. The position which was taken by the United States with regard to that sheet of water was simply: We will not arbitrate about it. It takes two people to make a bargain, it takes two people to make an agreement to arbitrate just as much as it takes two people to make any other agreement and with the United States saying: We will not submit any question to The Hague Tribunal with regard to the Bay of Fundy, the position of Great Britain was just simply this: Will we arbitrate with regard to the other bays, will we arbitrate with regard to the other questions which are in issue, leaving any question with regard to the Bay of Fundy untouched by this arrangement for arbitration? The hon. gentleman may have the opinion that it would have been wiser for Great Britain to have refused to arbitrate at all than to have entered into any submission to arbitrate when the Bay of Fundy was excluded

from that submission. He is entitled to that opinion if he entertains it. Speaking for myself, I entertain exactly the opposite opinion, and I think it was a vast advantage to this country to obtain the submission of the leading, in fact, all the questions which had ever, in the course of ninety years, arisen with regard to this treaty, even although we did not at the same time get the decision made applicable to the Bay of Fundy. We have not in any degree lessened our rights in the Bay of Fundy. The agreement which is made with regard to that piece of water and the notes which have been referred to expressly declare that the rights or claims of Canada are not to be prejudiced as far as the Bay of Fundy is concerned by anything which takes place in this arbitration. Equally the rights and claims of the United States with regard to that bay are preserved and kept from being prejudiced by this arbitration. It was, as I said when I was on my feet a little while ago, simply made, on the part of the United States, a sine qua non of entering into this arbitration that nothing with respect to the arbitration should affect the position of either party with regard to the Bay of Fundy. I am not concerned, I think, in discussing the effect of the correspondence of 1845 and of the earlier years with regard to that bay. I am perfectly aware that the effect of that correspondence is a matter about which a good deal can be said on either side, and from more than one point of view. If the hon. member will take the trouble to peruse the oral argument which took place last summer at The Hague he will find pages and pages of discussion by the learned gentlemen on both sides of this matter devoted entirely to a minute and critical dissection and analysis of all the correspondence which culminated in the letter of 1845 written by Lord Aberdeen. The attitude of both parties in the previous years in the course of the prolonged diplomatic discussion, while it related immediately to the Bay of Fundy, had the most important possible bearing upon the general question of the interpretation of this clause of the treaty, and just for that reason every word, I may say every letter, of that long diplomatic correspondence was scrutinized with the utmost care, was presented before the tribunal and was discussed over and over again on both sides of the question by the various counsel who were concerned in the case. In those circumstances I should be a very bold man if I were to express my own opinion in so far as I have formed one as to the effect of that correspondence, and it would not, in any circumstances, be fitting that I should do so. The hon. gentleman indicates the opinion of it which he has and he believes that there is nothing in it which in any way precludes Great Britain or Canada asserting to-day the right to exclude the fishermen of the United States from the whole Bay of Fundy. That may be so, but if that is a matter which is ever to be again in debate between the United States and Canada I think it would not be desirable that I, at any rate, whatever other hon. gentleman may see fit to do, should discuss it in this House, or express an opinion with regard to it.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 101) respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Sealey.

Bill (No. 106) to incorporate the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Harris.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 126) respecting the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Fortier.

SUPPLY—HAGUE ARBITRATION; ATLANTIC FISHERIES.

The Order for Public Bills having expired, the House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion to go into Committee of Supply.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. When you left the Chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I had shown, I think conclusively, that whether or not Great Britain gave away the Bay of Fundy in 1845, we certainly did nothing in the nature of giving away either the bay or any contention with regard to the bay when we entered into the arrangement for arbitration on the subject of the fisheries, two years ago. But the hon. gentleman who addressed you this afternoon makes the complaint as well that the reservation of the rights of the respective parties with regard to the Bay of Fundy which took place in 1909, was something secret, clandestine, mysterious, which nobody can understand. Well, I do not know what the grievance is if that were so. It is not so as a matter of fact; there is not a particle of foundation for it that I am able to discover anywhere. But if it were so, who is injured by it? What is the grievance? What difference would there have been if it had been published in all the official gazettes between here and Kamschatka? The arrangement was entered into in the shape of an interchange of notes between the British embassy and the United States Secretary of

State simply as a means of recording the agreement which had been come to. An agreement of any kind does not take shape at once, as any one knows who has had anything to do with the practical work of framing an agreement between parties. Ordinarily it is built up piece by piece and by slow degrees; always it must be preceded by either verbal negotiations or written communications between the parties, and in this instance, just as in the case of the most ordinary business agreement which might be entered into between any two men, there were a great many verbal communications on the subject of what should be submitted to arbitration, between the British Ambassador, on the one part, and representatives of the United States Department of State on the other part. Ultimately, out of these negotiations and communications there came to be something put into writing as a proposed draft of, it may be the terms which were embodied in the formal document of agreement to arbitrate, or it may be at first of the questions which it was proposed to have submitted—I cannot say which, as a matter of memory. It was the subject of communication backward and forward between the different people who were interested in the matter for months before the final meeting in January, 1909, at which the terms of the agreement were definitely put into their last shape. It had been an understanding more or less distinct, for more than a year before that, that these differences would be referred to arbitration before a tribunal at the Hague. At the Imperial Conference of 1907, Sir Robert Bond, then First Minister of Newfoundland, asked the help of his colleagues from the sister colonies in the effort to get these differences settled. It is to be remembered that Canada had at that time, no question of acute difference with the United States with regard to the fisheries. Canada had been getting along for 20 years or more under the modus vivendi of 1888, and there had been, so far as I at present recollect, not a single dispute, unless it might have been some letter or protest about some more or less trifling matter which may have occurred in that interval. But in 1907 things had come to be in a very acute condition between the United States and Newfoundland, and Sir Robert Bond asked his fellow-members of the Imperial Conference to exert their influence and assist him with the British government in an effort to get these difficulties referred to arbitration at the Hague. Finally, perhaps some time during the year 1908, it came to be understood or more or less definitely agreed, that the matters would be referred to a tribunal to be arranged out of the members of the permanent court at the Hague. Then the question arose of what points should be submitted to this tribunal. Any agreement for arbitration would of course be between the United States on the one part, and on the other part, not Canada, not Newfoundland, but the whole British Empire; and the British government was not merely theoretically but literally taking charge of the work of the negotiations for this reference to the Hague. Communications were had from time to time with this government in Canada, and we were kept informed of what was going on, and the proposed drafts of submission to arbitration were from time to time forwarded here, whether those drafts were proposed on the part of the British Ambassador, or on the part of the United States. I cannot now, speaking from memory, state at what stage of the matter the first reference to the Bay of Fundy appeared; but I am quite sure that it was at a very early stage of the efforts to frame the questions which should be submitted. It was Canada which was mainly interested in having settled the question as to the bays. Quite true, Newfoundland was interested in that question also. They have many large bays upon their eastern coast and upon the eastern half of their southern coast, in regard to which it was their contention, just as it was ours in Canada, that in the treaty of 1818 the United States renounced their right to fish. But the question of the bays, so far as Newfoundland was concerned, was not presented as being of the first consequence. To us it seemed probably the most important question of any which had been suggested, so that from the first time that Canada had anything to do with suggesting questions which ought to be included among those to be submitted to arbitration, the question which now appears in the list of questions as number 5—how the 3-mile limit is to be measured, or, in other words, what are the bays from which the United States fishermen are to be excluded—always had a place. That was in the first draft that went from Ottawa in connection with this matter; and it always remained there in some shape or other until its final inclusion, when the agreement to arbitrate was settled two years ago. As soon as that question appeared upon any draft going from here, I venture to say, speaking from recollection, the United States at once said: Very well, we have no objection to arbitrate that question with you, but it must not affect our position with reference to the Bay of Fundy, that question must not include the Bay of Fundy; we are not prepared to arbitrate with reference to the Bay of Fundy. And let me remind the hon. gentleman who has spoken that there is a great deal of reason in that position.

Without saying anything as to the true

meaning of the arrangement with regard to the Bay of Fundy which was made in 1845, this at all events is certain as a matter of history, namely, that from the time when that letter of Lord Aberdeen was written in 1845 up to the present, no one on the British side has asserted a right to exclude the fishermen of the United States from that Bay. Whether or not that be what the letter means, that is what has happened. The United States fishermen, ever since that letter was received by them from the British government, have exercised what they call their right to fish in the Bay of Fundy, and no attempt has been made to prevent the exercise by them of that right. Sixty and odd years had gone by when, in 1909, we were framing a submission to arbitration. Was it unreasonable on the part of the United States to say to us: We will arbitrate, if you like, with regard to the bays which you say we are excluded from, but we will not arbitrate with regard to the Bay of Fundy. There are no differences to arbitrate with regard to that bay. There have been no quarrels regarding it ever since 1845. What, then, was there to arbitrate? If we had resisted their demand that the Bay of Fundy should not be included, and if they had taken the position I have just mentioned, what answer could we have given? It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to cry out now in the light of our victory and inquire why we did not include the Bay of Fundy and succeed as to that as well as to the others, but the fact is we had been making no claim to exclude the fishermen of the United States from that bay for sixty-four years when this treaty of arbitration was entered into. There was, in fact, no question then outstanding with regard to it.

As the United States took the position that they did not intend to submit any question with regard to the Bay of Fundy to arbitration, there was no other course left if we were to have an arbitration at all than to arbitrate the remaining questions which had arisen, some before 1845 and some later and some of which were of pressing, practical importance.

Then, the manner in which the understanding was expressed that the Bay of Fundy was not to be included in the arbitration seems to me a matter of very trifling consequence. It had been originally proposed as an independent article of the agreement to arbitrate. It appeared in this draft agreement to arbitrate which reached us from Washington. I do not know which side framed it, and I do not suppose there was any dispute about it. It was simply a couple of lines saying that this agreement to arbitrate was not to affect the claims of either party in respect of the Bay of Fundy. That was the position of the draft, or proposed terms, of the arrangement in January, 1909, when I went to Washington in order to get the matter brought to a final termination. In the verbal discussions we had over the subject it was, as I have said, myself, I think, who suggested that instead of having that clause on the face of a formal instrument it would answer every purpose and be better if put into the shape of an exchange of letters between the British ambassador on the one part and the United States Secretary of State on the other. That form of expressing a collateral understanding, or agreement, is a very common one among lawyers when for any reason it is thought preferable by either party not to express on the face of a formal instrument some understanding or provision. Instead of doing this, letters expressing such understanding are interchanged between the parties, and are of equal weight. This is done just as a matter of convenience, or probably because some one connected with the affair expresses a preference to have it that way. Everybody else agreed, and it was done accordingly. My hon. friend (Mr. Jameson) thinks, however, that there was something terribly mysterious about this, that it was secret, clandestine and improper. Well, one hears a good deal on some occasions of such expressions. I suppose they are intended to impress somebody or other somewhere in the country with the idea that things are done in a sort of underhand fashion. I do not know for what other purpose such charges are made or such expressions used in this House. Similar charges might be made regarding the most ordinary transactions. If two men enter into a bargain in every-day life, do they unnecessarily publish it abroad? Why should they? If any lawyer, making an agreement between his client and the client of a fellow-practitioner, were asked that this agreement or the pourparlers which preceded it should be published in the newspapers, he dare not consent under penalty of losing his practice. If he did consent, nobody would go to him. Why on earth should we act differently in public affairs? Again, let me remind the hon. gentleman that it was not Canada making this agreement with the United States. This agreement was, not only in terms and name, but literally, the agreement of His Majesty under the advice of his own advisers in Great Britain. It may be said that it was the home authorities who led Canada and Newfoundland into this difficulty. It was certainly they who got them out of this difficulty. They made it, as they might very properly do, their own matter, and this treaty, or agreement, of arbitration was entered into by them through their ambassador. It is perfectly true that they consulted Canada and Newfoundland and acted with the concurrence

of these colonies, but it is none the less true that they acted upon their own view as to what was right and proper.

The hon. gentleman says that nobody knew of this agreement until it appeared in a British blue-book in September, 1909. He might quite as well have said that it appeared contemporaneously in the printed appendix to these proceedings, and, as a matter of course, was open to any one to read who was interested enough to look through the volume. It is something which took place contemporaneously with the signed agreement to arbitrate, and the documents show on their face the nature of the circumstances which led to that agreement being entered into. The agreement to submit these differences to arbitration was signed on the 27th January, 1909, between Mr. Root and Mr. Bryce. I may now say that another understanding, which is not expressed in this agreement, an understanding verbally expressed, was that it was not to be acted upon unless the government of Newfoundland afterwards assented to it. It was of great importance that it should be signed at the time it was, the 27th January, 1909. Mr. Root was leaving office immediately after affixing his signature to this document, and it was he who had negotiated on the part of the United States the whole matter from the beginning.

He was the man who had conducted the diplomatic correspondence with Sir Edward Grey in connection with these disputes for years before 1909; and, this being something which he was, on the part of the United States, more familiar with than any other single person, it was certainly of some consequence to get it closed, if possible, before his final retirement from the official position of Secretary of State. He resigned immediately after the signature of this document. It had been, up to that date, impossible to submit the document in its final shape to the government of Newfoundland. The Attorney General of Newfoundland was in Washington, but he was insisting that it should be submitted to his first minister, Sir Robert Bond, and, although the document was actually signed by Mr. Bryce and Mr. Root on the 27th January, it was with the understanding that it would not be acted upon unless and until it had the approval of Sir Robert Bond and of his government. Receiving that approval, in due course it came to be submitted to the Senate of the United States; and, being so submitted, at some date before the 21st February, 1909, within the next three or four weeks after it was signed, the Senate agreed to it only upon the condition that all question with regard to the Bay of Fundy should be excluded. The Senate made that an integral part of their acceptance of this arrangement. The resolution is worded:

It is agreed by the United States and Great Britain that question 5 of the series submitted namely, 'from where must be measured the three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks, or harbours referred to in said article,' does not include any question as to the Bay of Fundy, considered as a whole apart from its bays or creeks.

Then, there is the reference to innocent passage through the gulf of Canso and to the respective views or contentions of the United States and Great Britain not being in any wise prejudiced by anything in the present arbitration, 'and this agreement on the part of the United States will be mentioned in the ratification of the special agreement, and will, in effect, form part of the special agreement.' So, the Senate of the United States, having given its assent to this matter being sent to the Hague only on the terms of that resolution; it became absolutely necessary that the resolution should be notified officially to the government of Great Britain as one of the terms of the ratification. It was in that way that these notes were exchanged between Mr. Bacon, who, by that time, had succeeded Mr. Root as Secretary of State, and Mr. Bryce. Mr. Bacon wrote his letter immediately on the resolution being passed on the 21st February to Mr. Bryce, stating:

In giving this advice and consent to the ratification of this special agreement, and as a part of the act of ratification, the Senate states in the resolution its understanding——

the effect of which I have already given. Mr. Bryce, having received that letter on the 21st February, when he came, under the proper authority from London, to exchange the formal ratification of the agreement with the government of the United States, wrote his letter of 4th March, 1909, to Mr. Bacon in which he acknowledged the receipt of the letter of 21st February and proceeded to say that the British understanding of the situation with regard to the Bay of Fundy was exactly that which was expressed in the resolution of the Senate. These notes having been exchanged between the representatives of both nations and the agreement to refer this matter to the Hague having been ratified and entered into only on the condition that anything resulting from the arbitration should prejudice in no way the claims of the United States to the Bay of Fundy—and equally should prejudice in no way the claims of Great Britain in regard to the Bay of Fundy—who is hurt by it? What foundation is there in fact for the charge of the hon. gentleman that there has been some dereliction of duty on the part of this government in not having the Bay of Fundy included, and the Bay of Fundy settled? It was simply in the position that the United States was willing to arbitrate other ques-

tions, but refused to arbitrate that one, saying that there was nothing to arbitrate in regard to it, and the whole question for determination was whether we would arbitrate all the rest—which were the only things we were quarrelling about—leaving the Bay of Fundy in regard to which there had been no question of difference for nearly seventy years, on one side. I think we should have been very remiss in our duty, if we had insisted on making the inclusion of the Bay of Fundy a point in this matter, if we had endeavoured to waken up questions which had remained absolutely quiescent for nearly seventy years in regard to the Bay of Fundy and had made the inclusion of them a condition precedent to entering into arbitration with regard to the others. As I have pointed out, nobody has been in any way damnified by the fact that the Bay of Fundy has not been included in this arbitration. The condition in regard to it remains exactly what it was five years ago—not any worse certainly for us; I think it is a good deal better, because the result of the award having been to confirm our contention in regard to bays generally, it has gone a very long distance toward confirming the like contention about the Bay of Fundy if we are in a position to set up that contention about the Bay of Fundy. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jameson) thinks we are, upon his view of the correspondence of 1845. It may be so; I am not disputing it for a moment. I know that other people take a very different view. I know the United States takes a very different view. I know that ever since 1845 the United States has treated that letter of 1845 as an absolute concession to them on the part of Great Britain of all their contentions in regard to the Bay of Fundy. I am not saying they are right in doing so; I am only stating as a matter of fact that they have done so all these years. Now, if at any time it is thought desirable on the part of Canada to revive the contention which Nova Scotia made before 1845, to reassert in 1911, or at any subsequent date, the position which Nova Scotia took in 1841 and the subsequent years, there is nothing in the arrangement for this arbitration of last summer to interfere in the least degree with their doing so. Whether or not it would be desirable that it should be done is for hon. gentlemen to consider. Let me say in that connection that I think there are a great many other things to be considered than those which have been mentioned this afternoon. And, whatever there may be to be considered now, there were a very great many more to be considered two years ago.

It is always very easy to be wise after the event, but I ask hon. gentlemen to reflect upon the position matters were in in January, 1909. I am able to say I think, having followed the course of these proceedings day by day and hour by hour last summer with the keenest interest, that with things as they were, our success upon this important question of bays was a close enough affair. There were five members of that tribunal, one of whom in the end was adverse; of the other four members of that tribunal one was the representative of the United States. Looking at the situation as it existed before the argument and before any indication of opinion had been given by the arbitrators on the subject of bays, it was reasonably manifest that the fate of our bays depended upon one of the five arbitrators who was not a representative of either of the nations interested, and it was certainly, on the part of all the counsel or lawyers who were engaged in the case, a matter of not only the greatest doubt and anxiety, but literally of the greatest uncertainty until the very moment when the award was handed out what the decision on the subject of bays would be. We were undertaking a pretty heavy task, when, in the face of the declared policy of the British government in regard to the non-territoriality of European bays which are more than six miles across we were undertaking to argue that great bays like the Baie des Chaleurs, 16 miles across at the entrance, were territorial, inland, closed waters to which other nations had no right of access, and I say again, as I said before when I was speaking three months ago, that in my opinion we are vastly indebted to the ability, the learning and the skill of the Attorney General of England and his argument before the tribunal that we succeeded upon our bays at all. Looking at the situation as it existed when this agreement of arbitration was being negotiated in 1909, I am certainly by no means prepared to say that it would have been a wise thing for us to have asked that the Bay of Fundy should have been included, that it would have been a reasonably prudent thing for us to have included the Bay of Fundy in the subjects for submission to the tribunal at the Hague, and looking at it to-day, after the event, and in the light of what took place during the argument, and of the words in which the award itself is made, I am glad that we got through that arbitration without the Bay of Fundy being included and without having had to have the burden of proving that a sheet of water 60 miles in width at its entrance was a territorial bay of Great Britain.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How does its width compare with that of Placentia bay?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Speaking from memory I am not able to say, but of course it would depend entirely on where you marked the entrance to Placentia bay.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I mean the entrance as marked by the tribunal?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Again I am not able to say from memory what the length of the lines would be across Placentia bay, which the tribunal has recommended the parties to adopt. The hon. gentleman, of course, will not overlook the fact that the tribunal has decided nothing in regard to Placentia bay, but has recommended simply that the parties interested should adopt certain lines which it has defined.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what respect has it not decided with regard to Placentia bay what it has decided with regard to the Baie des Chaleurs?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. The position in regard to Placentia bay is the same as in regard to Baie des Chaleurs, the tribunal has not undertaken to pronounce any piece of water to be a bay but it has declared in answer to the question how the three marine miles mentioned in the treaty are to be measured that when you are dealing with bays, you ought to treat as the entrance of the bay the place where the bay first loses the characteristics and configuration of a bay, and contenting itself with making that general answer that you are to mark as the entrance to the bay the point at which if you were proceeding seaward, you would first cross the line which would mark the situation where the bay ended or where the characteristics and configuration of the bay came to an end, the tribunal has proceeded to recommend that certain lines be adopted across Placentia bay, Baie des Chaleurs, Bay Miramichi and the other large bays in question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Having regard to the general character of the award what would have been the danger of including the Bay of Fundy in the terms of the submission?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. The idea was as I have stated that it would have increased the burden of difficulty upon us which was already heavy enough; it would have been certainly the largest of the bays we would have had to contend for, and would have given our adversaries opportunity to point to it as being the thing we were contending for and to say to the tribunal: Is it possible to hold that that sheet of water is territorial and not open sea? In making that argument, the United States would also have had the advantage of the concession, whatever it was, which was made in 1845, and if the Bay of Fundy had been included as a thing to be arbitrated upon, the United States would have been able to point with the utmost confidence to the course, which Great Britain had herself taken in regard to that bay in 1845 as being not only an indication of willingness to give up all further contention about the Bay of Fundy, but equally an indication of willingness to do the same thing in regard to other bays, if the Bay of Fundy had been before the tribunal in the same category with the remaining bays upon the coast. I venture to think our position was better before the tribunal without any reference to the Bay of Fundy being included in the matters for decision, the arrangement being that nothing in the proceedings should prejudice our claims with reference to the Bay of Fundy or the claims of the United States in reference to the Bay of Fundy. That bay was simply put upon one side.

It could be referred to for the purpose of illustration and for matters of argument, but it was not anything that we were fighting over upon that particular occasion. We are not in the least degree precluded from fighting over it as a separate matter, if at any future time it is thought desirable to do so. But, before that course could be taken, either two years ago, or at any future time, you have first to get the consent of the British government, and, secondly, the consent of the government of the United States. It is not for me to offer any opinion as to what course the British government would take, if they were asked by Canada to raise now the old question with regard to the Bay if any such proposition were now made by 1845. I have not any doubt, however, that if any such proposition were now made by Canada to Great Britain, the exact language of the letter of Lord Aberdeen in 1845 would be carefully considered and no British statesman of to-day would, for a moment, be willing to recede at all from what, in his opinion, the fair meaning of that letter may have been. But, if the British government agreed with us, that it was desirable to arbitrate now any question with reference to the Bay of Fundy, it is plain surely that the assent of the United States to such an arbitration is equally necessary, and unless the United States were put in such a position by reason of seizures in the Bay of Fundy or by reason of our seeking by active means to exclude their fishermen from that bay, that they felt it a matter if importance to them to go to arbitration with regard to it, I am not able to see what other inducement would exist for them ever to agree to any arbitration in the world about it. They are perfectly content with the present situation. My hon. friend thinks that the letter of 1845 does not mean any more than a temporary relaxation of the right of Great Britain with regard to the bay. The United States is, at any rate, quite content with its present situation upon the language of the letter and the manner in which, since the letter was written, the fisheries of the Bay of Fundy have been

administered by Great Britain and by Canada. The hon. gentleman urged that the effect of these contemporaneous letters upon the agreement to arbitrate was, in his judgment, greatly to weaken the case of Great Britain. I have tried to show why I think that is not so, but I am quite willing to let it go in the shape in which the hon. gentleman put it. He thinks that our arranging to leave the Bay of Fundy out greatly weakened our case. Be it so, weakened as it was, our case was strong enough to succeed.

Mr. JAMESON. The hon. minister misunderstood me. I said that the omission of the question of the Bay of Fundy would weaken any future case which we might desire to press, with regard to the Bay of Fundy.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. If the hon. gentleman, when speaking of the case being weakened, was not referring to the case which has been already arbitrated, I have nothing additional to say. As to the future, I think I have plainly enough shown and that the language of the document abundantly establishes that nobody's case is weakened any, but that on the contrary, the reasons for the decisions which have been given by the arbitrators in their considered judgment, certainly do not weaken, but rather strengthen any claim which we may now put forward with regard to the Bay of Fundy. They have, as the hon. gentleman himself has pointed out, in the extracts which he has read, used words which might fairly be applied to the Bay of Fundy, and which in any future arbitration, if any future arbitration ever exists, could certainly be used as a strong argument in favour of the contention that the Bay of Fundy is territorially altogether British.

With regard to the animadversion which has been made with respect to the papers not having been brought down, I am utterly astonished. There has never been the slightest idea on the part of anybody of keeping back papers. There is certainly nothing to keep back. While the matter was yet under consideration before the tribunal, however, probably a different situation would have arisen had anybody asked for papers. As I have said, it was the British government conducting this arbitration, literally and entirely so. They were in charge of it and anything we had to do, was under their direction. I was attending there not only in the capacity of a member of the government of Canada, but as the agent for Great Britain, under the appointment of Sir Edward Grey, responsible to him, reporting to him periodically during the arbitration, and the arbitration was in every sense of the word conducted on the British side by the British government assisted, as far as it was possible, by the governments of Canada and of Newfoundland. I may say to the hon. gentleman that long after this arrangement or agreement to arbitrate was entered into, even down to the 1st of June, 1910, when the actual oral argument began, the British government placed its prohibition upon this government and, I have no doubt, upon the government of Newfoundland as well, against the making public of any papers in connection with the case. Even the documents and the case which were printed and interchanged between counsel and between the governments on the 1st of October, 1909, were held as confidential. Only a few copies were in Canada, and these copies were under the strictest injunctions of confidence or secrecy down to the very day of the beginning of the oral proceedings at the Hague. I was not myself, able to understand the necessity for these injunctions of secrecy, but they were given me personally and given to others in the strictest possible manner, and for reasons which were considered sufficient, the British government preferred to insist upon the papers in connection with this matter remaining of a confidential nature, until the actual hearing of the case had begun. In these circumstances, if any application for the production of these papers had been made twelve months ago, it is quite possible that it could not have been acceded to. But, in the absence of any suggestion from any person of a desire to have these papers brought down to examine them or to look into them, or even a verbal request to see them, I do not understand upon what principle it is that the hon. gentleman now complains that the government has been remiss or has been attempting to hide something or to keep back from the information of the public, any of the papers in connection with this matter. No cause whatever, exists for seeking to attach to this government or to anybody, any blame in connection with the preparation or custody of these papers or the exclusion of the Bay of Fundy from the arbitration. Nobody has been in the least degree injured by it, and the whole gist of the complaint is, that whereas we submitted seven questions to the tribunal, we did not submit an eighth question in regard to the Bay of Fundy which would have been one in reference to which the United States told us distinctly they had nothing to arbitrate, and would not consent to any submission.

Mr. J. W. MADDIN (South Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, it is much to be deplored that the Minister of Justice did not reply to the able argument of the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) in the urbane and dignified manner which usually characterizes him. I cannot understand why the

Minister of Justice should charge the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jameson) with attempting to get a toehold of him in this debate; I cannot appreciate by what process of mental gymnastics or intellectual athletics the minister should introduce a toehold into a debate on arbitration before the Hague Tribunal. I submit, Sir, that the hon. member for Digby, realizing that the wealthy and important fisheries of the Bay of Fundy had been withdrawn from submission to the Hague, owed it to his constituents, to the people of his province, and to the whole Dominion to endeavour to ascertain the true reason why the Bay of Fundy was excepted and to fix the responsibility. The Minister of Justice complained that short notice had been given him, but I would remind the minister that when he saw that a paragraph appeared in the speech from the Throne attaching what I consider a great deal of undue importance to this decision, and when on the 2nd of December he rose as Minister of Justice in this House to describe the proceedings before the tribunal, he did not give notice beforehand that he would do so, nor has he up to the present hour placed before this House the documents in connection with this alleged important arbitration.

Mr. BRODEUR. When the Minister of Justice made his statement on the 2nd of December he laid on the table a report of the proceedings before the Hague Tribunal.

Mr. MADDIN. All of which had been published in the press a long time before. My complaint is that on the 2nd of December when the minister discussed the treaty under which the tribunal was constituted, and the special agreement, he pointed out that the Bay of Fundy had been excluded, and he offered reasons why, but he did not submit to the House previous to that date a copy of the agreement, nor the correspondence under which the signed agreement was interchanged between the plenipotentiaries, or the correspondence concerning the final confirmation and ratification of the agreement as executed by Mr. Bryce and Mr. Bacon. I point out that article one of the treaty of the 4th of June, 1908, provides:

> Differences which arise of a legal nature or relating to the interpretations of treaties between the two contracting parties and which it may not have been possible to settle by diplomacy shall be referred to the permanent court of arbitration established at the Hague

Now, Mr. Ewart, K.C., in his letter to the press points out that the important functions discharged by the Minister of Justice, were the constituting of the Arbitration Committee of the Hague Tribunal, and framing the questions which were to be submitted to it, and there certainly being differences with regard to the Bay of Fundy why were they not submitted under article one of that treaty. When the Minister of Justice spoke on the 2nd of December he was not obliged to explain why the Bay of Fundy had been excluded, but he did undertake to offer reasons, although he did not furnish to the House the documents which should have been furnished long before, and which he says were preserved with the greatest secrecy. Let me tell him that one of these very secret papers was laid before the imperial parliament, printed in September, 1909, and offered for sale by the King's Printer in Great Britain at a penny a copy. This was one of the documents, which according to the Minister of Justice, no one was to look at until June of 1910. But, the Minister of Justice not having laid these documents before the House on the 2nd of December, he got before the Canadian Club at Ottawa, and he offered them explanations in regard to the efficiency of this award.

He went before the Barristers' Society in Osgoode Hall in Toronto, and there again extolled the virtues of this splendid piece of arbitration at the Hague. Now, I submit that it was not incumbent upon him to offer any reason why the Bay of Fundy had been excepted; but when he did take it upon himself to explain how it was that it had been excepted, I submit that it was his duty to take this House into his confidence and tell them the true and correct reason. He did not do it when he spoke here on the 2nd of December; he did not do it when he addressed the Canadian Club; he did not do it when he spoke before the Bar Society of this province at Osgoode Hall; but he did it tonight in his effort to reply to the hon. member for Digby. When this matter was under discussion by the hon. minister on the 2nd of December, speaking of the Bay of Fundy, he said:

> The colonists of Nova Scotia, I have no doubt, felt their case immensely strengthened and thought they would have behind them all the prestige and power of the British government itself in defending the claim they were making to the Bay of Fundy as part of their territorial waters. But in 1845, the Lord Aberdeen of that day, then Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, wrote a letter which had been prepared as a piece of diplomatic correspondence, after the most careful and matured consideration, in which while affirming the right of the colonies, while standing upon the opinion which had been expressed by their legal advisers and by the legal advisers of the British government, none the less, on the part of His Majesty's government, as a pure matter of grace and concession, expressed his willingness to forego, so far as the Bay of Fundy was concerned, the extreme right of the British subject in that regard, and assented to the use, by the fishermen of the United States, of the fisheries of the Bay of Fundy, in common with the inhabitants of the British colonies, upon which stipulation that as to the remainder

of the maritime coasts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec, the claims of United States fishermen should cease. The representative of the United States government at the court of St. James, to whom that letter was addressed, acknowledged courteously the concession which had been made, but continued to argue that it was really no concession, but only the recognition of a right which the United States fishermen had. And I am sorry to say, that the stipulation which had been attached by the British government to the concession was, I think, at no time recognized by the United States, and their claims continued as strongly pressed as before to equal enjoyment in all the other bays of the maritime coast of British North America. But the result of the argument made during the present summer and the award pronounced two months ago has been to uphold to the fullest extent the British contention and to demonstrate, I think, that if the concession regarding the Bay of Fundy had not been made in 1845, that bay, as well as the other large bays of our maritime provinces, would to-day be declared British territorial waters.

To-night the hon. Minister of Justice tells this House that he is glad and proud that this question with regard to the Bay of Fundy was not submitted to the tribunal. On the 2nd of December he was frank enough to say that if it had been submitted, the Bay of Fundy would have been declared to be British territorial waters.

There is one other aspect of this treaty which I propose to deal with, and that is the part of article 2 which says:

> It is understood that such special agreement on the part of the United States will be made by the President of the United States by and with the consent and advice of the Senate thereof.

After these documents changed hands and were signed on the 27th of January, 1909, they went before the Senate of the United States on the 16th of February for confirmation, as required by this part of article 2. The same article goes on to say:

> His Majesty's government reserves the right, before concluding a special agreement in any matter respecting a self-governing dominion of the British Empire, to obtain the concurrence therein of the government of that dominion.

Why, Sir, it is not so very long ago that the distinguished Prime Minister of this administration said: 'Where is the man or woman in Canada who will not be thankful for the day when this country will be rid of British diplomacy?' Here is a provision expressly set out in the treaty of 1908 which gives this government, in regard to disputes which affect the Dominion of Canada, the right to affirm and approve of an agreement regarding this country before it becomes effective. But the hon. Minister of Justice said: I was there as the appointee of Sir Edward Grey, responsible to him alone; I was not there as representing the government. Who, Mr. Speaker, was representing this government at Washington? Who was acting on behalf of this administration? Who was going to discharge the duties that are placed upon this government by section 2 of the treaty? For the first time in our lives we were to be free from the difficulties involved in the clumsiness of British diplomacy, and were going to have a matter settled to our own liking. But how does it turn out? The hon. minister says that the British diplomats took charge of the case absolutely, every detail of it, that he was not responsible, that he had nothing to do with it. If that be so, he was remiss in his duty, or the government of this country was remiss in its duty, in not seeing that the agreement was approved of by this government as well as ratified by the Senate of the United States. The hon. minister says that the question of the Bay of Fundy was raised very early in the discussion. He says that an agreement of any kind will never be carried out in the market place, that it is not published in the press, that a lawyer would not think of drawing an agreement and publishing it, or if he did he would have to close his office. That is absolutely true; but, Sir, this was a matter affecting the people of Canada and the government of Canada; it had been negotiated up to the point at which the result of the agreement was submitted to the tribunal; the tribunal had passed judgment upon it; His Majesty had referred to it in the speech from the Throne; the hon. minister was to explain the operation of it, and I say that was the time to have come out in the market place and to have taken this House into his confidence and to have exhibited every document connected with the matter, in order that a fair and intelligent discussion might be had in regard to the award and the manner in which it has been arrived at. The hon. minister says that it was very early in the discussion that the question of the exclusion of the Bay of Fundy and the right to navigate the Gut of Canso for peaceful purposes were introduced into the negotiations. He says that it was himself who suggested that the question of the Bay of Fundy be abandoned.

He offered also the suggestion that it is not unusual to incorporate in the interchange of notes an exception from the original agreement. Well, as a lawyer, I can understand how, when a document is drawn up, signed and sealed, and the parties subsequently agree to some exception or alteration, instead of disfiguring the original agreement by interlineations

they make a supplementary agreement, which could only be done in writing by an interchange of notes or otherwise. But that is not the position in this case. The hon. minister says that in the oral negotiations, an understanding was entered into that the Bay of Fundy should be excluded from the operation of question 5. Then I ask, if that were the case, why was it not expressed in the document signed and sealed on the 27th of January, 1909?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Hear, hear.

Mr. MADDIN. The agreement was signed on the 27th of January, 1909, and on the 6th of February we find Mr. Bryce writing to Mr. Bacon as follows:

I have the honour to inform you, under instructions from His Majesty's principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that I am now in a position to complete the formalities incident to the conclusion of the special agreement for submission to arbitration of the question of the fisheries on the North Atlantic coast. I transmit herewith signed copy of the agreement in my possession which, when signed on the 27th ultimo, was for the terms to be held in suspense, and I have to request you to be so good as to acknowledge its receipt in a note forwarding to me the copy now in your possession and to take note of the fact that formal delivery of the document has now been duly effected by our action on behalf of our respective governments.

I shall not read the whole of this note because time will not permit, but suffice it to say that on February 6, 1909, ten days after the original agreement had been signed and sealed, signed copies of the subversion were exchanged between Mr. Root and Mr. Bryce as it went before the Hague Tribunal; and neither in the signed agreement nor in the notes exchanged under date of February 6, was there one syllable excepting the Bay of Fundy. I submit that if, in the oral negotiations leading up to the execution of these documents, the understanding had been arrived at to except the Bay of Fundy, that should have appeared on the face of the agreement dated January 27; but if it was subsequently to be referred to in an interchange of notes, the time to have made that interchange was on February 6, when this exchange of signed documents took place between Mr. Bryce and Mr. Root, as shown by the White document brought down to the imperial parliament. This however, was not done. At a later date, on April 4, there was a letter written by Mr. Bryce to Mr. Bacon, who had succeeded Mr. Root. In that letter, Mr. Bryce says:

I have the honour to inform you that I have been instructed by His Majesty's principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to place on record, on behalf of His Majesty's government, with reference to the general arbitration treaty just signed by you and myself, that the final sentence of article 2 has been inserted in order to reserve to both governments the freedom of action secured to United States government under their constitution until any agreement which may have been arrived at shall have been notified to be finally binding and operated by an exchange of notes.

To this Mr. Root replied on April 4, and in this correspondence there is no reference made to the exception of the Bay of Fundy. On March 4, 1909, Mr. Bryce wrote to Mr. Bacon as follows:

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note informing me that the Senate of the United States has approved the special agreement for the referenec to arbitration of the questions relating to the fisheries on the North Atlantic coast and of the terms of the resolution in which that approval is given.

It is now my duty to inform you that the government of His Britannic Majesty confirms the special agreement aforesaid, and in doing so confirms also the understanding arrived at by us that question 5 of the series of questions submitted for arbitration—namely, from where must be measured 'the 3 marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbours' referred to in the said articles—is submitted in its present form with the agreed understanding that no questions as to the Bay of Fundy, considered as a whole, apart from its bays or creeks, or as to innocent passage through the Gut of Canso, is included in this question as one to be raised in the present arbitration.

Here on March 4, 1909, is the first intimation that the Bay of Fundy is to be excluded from the operation of this agreement to arbitrate.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the last paragraph of the award of the tribunal with regard to question 5 In that paragraph the arbitrators say:

It is understood that nothing in these rules refers either to the Bay of Fundy, considered as a whole, apart from its bays and creeks, or as to the innocent passage through the Gut of Canso, which were excluded by the agreement made by exchange of notes between Mr. Bacon and Mr. Bryce, dated February 21, 1909, and March 4, 1909.

Now the hon. minister (Sir Allen Aylesworth) tells us that it was by an oral agreement, which led up to the consummation of the special agreement dated 27th of January, that the Bay of Fundy was excepted. We are told in a letter signed by Mr. Bryce, that the bay was excepted by an understanding had some time before, but the arbitrators discover an entirely different letter and one to which, up to the present, hon. members on this side have not had access. There was a letter written on the 21st of February, 1909, and it was in that letter as well as in the letter of the

4th March, that the Bay of Fundy was excepted. In reply to that letter of the 4th March, Mr. Bacon wrote to Mr. Bryce:

I have the honour to acknowledeg the receipt of your note of the 4th inst., in which you confirm the understanding in the matter of the special agreement submitting to arbitration the differences between the governments of the United States and Great Britain concerning the North Atlantic fisheries, as expressed in the resolution of the Senate of the 16th February, 1909, and as previously agreed upon by the interchange of notes with my predecessor of the 27th January, 1909.

It is to be observed that Mr. Bacon refers to this understanding as expressed in an interchange of notes on the 27th January, 1909. The special agreement also speaks for itself, which was executed on the 27th January, 1909. Both these authorities are in direct contradiction with the Minister of Justice, who says the exception of the Bay of Fundy was an oral understanding, but I submit that the significant part of the matter is this, and the hon. minister gave it to us to-night. For the first time he gave the real reason why the bay was excepted from the operation of this agreement. He said that the United States refused to arbitrate on any other condition and that the Senate of the United States on February 16 made the same exception of the Bay of Fundy. Well, the hon. minister suggested to the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) that if our foresight was as keen as our aftersight, we should be very superior men. And I must confess to him that, in preference to having the perfect subsequent knowledge of events, I would like to have that prescience by which the hon. minister and his friends arrived at the conclusion on the 27th of January that the Senate of the United States on the 16th of February, would strike out the Bay of Fundy from this arbitration.

So much with regard to the manner in which this agreement was brought before The Hague Tribunal. I would like to point out to the minister that when he made the statement that he thought he should not discuss this question of the Bay of Fundy in view of the fact that there might be future negotiations, he is closing the door a little too late, and, perhaps, he has been talking too much already with regard to this award. At pages 73-74 of the oral argument, which took place in connection with this case, we find Sir Robert B. Finlay pressing upon the tribunal with regard to no less a sheet of water than the Bay of Fundy—and pressing with considerable force and effect—the speech made by Hon. Amos Tuck in the House of Representatives of the United States in 1851, as reported in the 'Congressional Globe.' Sir Robert quoted from this speech as follows:

From the first of September to the close of this season, the mackerel run near the shore, and it is next to impossible for our vesesls to obtain fares without taking fish within the prohibited limit. We differ with England in regard to the measurement of these 'limits,' they claiming to run from 'headland to headland' and we to follow the indentations of the coast. But the real difficulty is not here. The British have never taken a vessel as a trespasser when not within the limits which we acknowledge that we have renounced. They have given particular directions to the officers of their vessels not to do so, and the reason is plain. They know that if they exact a strict observance of our renunciation, on our own construction they break up our mackerel fishery. Hence, it would be a folly in them to raise an issue on the 'headland' doctrine, on which most people, I think, would hold our construction to be the true one.

Sir Robert Finlay says:

I am not going to stop to controvert the statements there made by Mr. Tuck, for I am citing him for the purpose of showing the facts with regard to the mackerel fishery, which led to the raising of this controversy. Mr. Tuck goes on:

I do not think it generally known that the whole difficulty about the fisheries is about our right to take mackerel. The cod fishing privileges are adequate already; and no vessel in that business has ever been seized or interfered with. I think it is proper to go still further and to state frankly what, after a patient investigation of every source of authentic information within my reach, I believe to be the real difficulty.

The truth is, our fishermen need absolutely and must have, the thousands of miles of shore fishery, which have been renounced, or they must always do an uncertain business. If our mackerel men are prohibited from going within three miles of the shore, and are forcibly kept away, (and nothing but force will do it), then they may as well give up their business first as last. It will be always uncertain, and generally unsuccessful, however, well pursued.

Perhaps, I shall be thought to charge the commissioners of 1818 with overlooking our interests. They did so, in the important renunciation which I have quoted; but they are obnoxious to no complaints for doing so. In 1818, we took no mackerel on the coasts of the British possessions and there was no reason to anticipate that we should ever have occasion to do so. Mackerel were then found as abundantly on the coast of New England as anywhere in the world, and it was not until years after that this beautiful fish, in a great degree, left our waters. The mackerel fishery on the provincial coasts has principally grown up since 1838, and no vessel was ever licensed for that business in the United States till 1828.

So Sir Robert B. Finlay, in pressing his argument before the arbitration tribunal at The Hague, quoted from Hon. Amos Tuck—I wonder with what success, if we subsequently submit the question as to His Britannic Majesty's rights in the Bay of Fundy to a new tribunal. I wonder what effect the speeches of the minister on the 2nd December last, and before the Ontario

Bar Association on the 29th December, 1910, would have? Speaking before the Ontario Bar Association at Osgoode Hall, he said:

Take the whole coast line of Nova Scotia, never mind the Bay of Fundy for the present——

The Bay of Fundy was a tender spot with the minister when confronted with the whole array of the Ontario Bar.

—and we remember how it is indented every few miles with harbours and inlets of different dimensions, shapes and sizes, but all alike bays, and many of them across the entrance much more than six miles in width. Now the United States fishermen wants to get into those bays—probably there is the best fishing there, at any rate he says when I am abreast a wide bay like the Baie des Chaleurs, or if you please, Miramichi bay in New Brunswick, Egmont bay in Prince Edward Island, or Mahone bay on the south coast of Nova Scotia, and I find a sheet of water which measured across from headland to headland, might be anywhere from 10 to 15 or 20 miles, and I am supposing I am in the centre of that 10 miles from the land on either side of me, and perhaps 100 miles from land ahead of me, do you mean to tell me I am in territorial waters? I am in the open sea, and I am not within his Britannic Majesty's dominions in America, and so in a case such as I have put, like the Baie des Chaleurs, which is 16 or 17 miles across at the entrance and up which you can sail for 70 miles without getting within three miles of either shore, the fishermen of the United States said, we are here fishing not under any treaty at all, we are here fishing by the common right of nations, because we are in the open sea exactly as much as though we were on the great banks of Newfoundland itself. And Nova Scotia, taking the opposite view and ably supporting it by its learned attorney general of 70 years ago, Great Britain adopted that view of Nova Scotia, and maintained at least from 1840, that the true method of measurement was by going from headland to headland right across the mouth of any bay regardless of its width. It was impossible to reconcile these two views.

I wonder how the following part would sound before a tribunal, which may subsequently be convened to determine our rights in the Bay of Fundy. He goes on to say:

In 1845, Great Britain as a concession, stating it to be a concession, gave up, or to use the language of the diplomatic letter which at that date Lord Aberdeen wrote to the minister at St. James, of the United States, Great Britain decided to relax her right so far as the Bay of Fundy was concerned, and since then there has been no more difficulty over the Bay of Fundy; but that was the extent of any relaxation which Great Britain was willing to make or ever did make. So in all the years, from 1840 to the present time, Great Britain had consistently maintained the contention that all these bays and inlets in the remainder of British North America, that is to say, in what is to-day Canada, are bays and inlets, the right to enter which the fishermen of the United States have for ever renounced.

These were his observations with regard to the Bay of Fundy before the Bar Society of Ontario. I read his observations of December 2nd., in this House and he further makes the statement to-day that from 1845 down to the present, no one has asserted on behalf of Great Britain, rights over the Bay of Fundy. I join issue with the minister when he makes an assertion of that kind. I would point out that a relaxation is a concession, but a concession is substantially more than a relaxation, the word concession is the broader of the two and covers the lesser term relaxation. The word relaxed, was used in Lord Aberdeen's letter of March 10, and as the minister pointed out on December 2nd, not only was this relaxation made, but it was made conditional, and the minister himself expressed regret that the conditions had not been complied with. Does the minister wish to treat members of this House as if they knew nothing of the law of contracts? One of the elementary principles of contracts is that it requires two persons to make a contract, and that there must be a consensus of mind between the two parties, that they must agree together upon the terms of the contract upon which they are entering or there is no contract at all. No reasonable man, be he lawyer or layman, can take the correspondence of March 10, 1845, in which this relaxation took place, and in which it was expressly stated that the United States were to abandon for ever their claim to the coasts of other bays of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec, and read the reply of Mr. Everett, without arriving at the conclusion that the offer of relaxation at all events, as it was made on the part of Great Britain, for the purpose of reducing the friction then existing, was spurned by the American minister at St. James, and was never acted upon from that day to this. The hon. gentleman says that Britain has never asserted her claims in regard to this matter. He pointed out in the House, as he did in Toronto, that that distinguished Nova Scotian, James W. Johnston, had prepared an argument on the headlands and submitted it in 1841 to the law officers of the Crown of the imperial government, in Great Britain, that the law officers, Her Majesty's advisers, approved and endorsed the views expressed in the memorandum set forth by Mr. Johnston, in 1886 the parliament of Canada passed an Act, and when it came to receive the assent of the Governor General, it was held in suspense, until correspondence had been exchanged with the home Secretary of State, in the old country, and then acting

on the advice of His Majesty's advisers in England that Statute of 1886, was assented to by the Governor General of Canada and became part of the statute law of this Dominion. Under that statute, assented to after inquiry and advice, the Dominion government undertook to regulate the fisheries of the whole Bay of Fundy. Objection was raised to it but a few years afterwards, in 1870, Mr. Peter Mitchell, then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, issued instructions to His Majesty's government vessels for the protection of Canadian fisheries as follows:

The limits within which you will, if necessary, exercise the power to exclude United States fishermen, or to detain American fishing vesels or boats, are for the present to be exceptional. Difficulties have arisen in former times with respect to the question, whether the exclusive limits should be measured on lines drawn parallel everywhere to the coast, and describing its sinuosities, or on lines produced from headland to headland across the entrances of bays, creeks or harbours. Her Majesty's government are clearly of opinion that, by the convention of 1818, the United States have renounced the right of fishing, not only within three miles of the colonial shores, but within three miles of a line drawn across the mouth of any British bay or creek. It is, however, the wish of Her Majesty's government neither to concede, nor for the present enforce, any rights in this respect which are in their nature open to any serious question. Until further instructed, therefore, you will not interfere with any American fishermen, unless found within three miles of the shore, or within three miles of a line drawn across the mouth of a bay or creek which is less than ten geographical miles in width. In the case of any other bay, as the Bay of Chaleurs, for example, you will not admit any United States fishing vessel or boat, or any American fishermen, inside of a line drawn across at that part of such bay where its width does not exceed ten miles.

On June 6th, 1876, Lord Grenville telegraphed to the Governor General as follows:

Her Majesty's government hopes that the United States fishermen will not be for the present prevented from fishing, except within three miles of land, or in bays which are less than six miles broad at the mouth.

The result was that the Hon. Peter Mitchell modified his instructions on the 27th of June, 1870, making the last paragraph read:

In the case of any other bay, as Bay des Chaleurs, for example, you will not interfere with any United States fishing vessel or boat, or any American fishermen, unless they are found within three miles of the shore.

I submit to the minister that, as the letter written by Lord Aberdeen on the 10th of March, 1845, contains an assertion of Britain's rights in the Bay of Fundy, and a statement that, as a matter of grace and favour, these rights would be relaxed in favour of the United States, granting American fishermen common fishing in the Bay of Fundy, on a certain condition, contained in a proviso which was never accepted or acted upon, that relaxation can not be construed as conveying any right to the United States. What does he say with regard to these instructions with reference to the Baie des Chaleurs? On the 27th of June, 1870, the Canadian government acting on instructions from Lord Grenville, issued instructions which in specific terms say:

As to the Bay of Chaleur, for example, you will not interfere with any United States fishing vessel or boat or any American fishermen, unless they are found within three miles of the shore.

Was not that a broader, a greater relaxation of right than Lord Aberdeen had made in 1845? There is this difference also that it was an unqualified concession. There were no stipulations, there was nothing that the United States was obliged to do in order to enjoy the fisheries of the Baie des Chaleurs three miles from the shore.

Mr. BRODEUR. Do I understand my hon. friend that this document was communicated to the American authorities? This was a document issued by Lord Granville to the Canadian government and it was purely and simply a question between the imperial government and the Canadian government.

Mr. MADDIN. It was a pronouncement by Lord Granville to the authorities of the Dominion of Canada with regard to what he conceded at that time to be American rights in the Baie des Chaleurs. He gave instructions not to interfere with American fishermen.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The instructions were publicly given, were they not? They became a public document of state.

Mr. MADDIN. They were public and were subsequently used against the British government in the Halifax award from which I am reading them at the present time. In the matter to which I referred a few moments ago, in 1886 when this government legislated with regard to the whole of the waters of the Bay of Fundy, there was no question at all rasied by the government of the United States, and I wish to say in connection with this matter that the United States did not at any time argue and have not argued their rights to fish in common with British fishermen in the Bay of Fundy. They have not argued that they had the right to fish by virtue of the relaxation contained in Lord Aberdeen's letter of 1845. I want to refer you, Mr. Speaker, for a moment to Mr. Everett's reply to that communication. I desire to call attention

to the exact words that were used in the Aberdeen-Everett correspondence of 1845. This correspondence grew out of the claims that were set up with regard to the seizure of the 'Argus,' in what is sometimes called St. Ann Banks off the coast of Cape Breton, and also in regard to the seizure of the 'Washington' in the Bay of Fundy. It was during the course of the correspondence in connection with these seizures—seizures which were being vigorously protested against by the United States, and out of which grew so much of the friction of that time—that the letters to which I desire particularly to draw attention were written. Lord Aberdeen wrote a letter on the 10th March, in which, after some preliminary statements, he says:

The undersigned has accordingly much pleasure in announcing to Mr. Everett, the determination to which Her Majesty's government have come to relax in favour of United States fishermen that right which Great Britain has hitherto exercised, of excluding those fishermen from the British portion of the Bay of Fundy, and they are prepared to direct their colonial authorities to allow, henceforward, the United States fishermen to pursue their avocations in any part of the Bay of Fundy, provided they do not approach, except in the cases specified in the treaty of 1818, within three miles of the entrance of any bay on the coast of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick.

There was an offer with a condition attached to it and we all know that in order to get the benefit of that offer it should have been accepted and the stipulations and provisions attached to it should have been complied with. There could be no evasive reply which in years afterwards could be construed as an acceptance. No contract is complete without an offer and an acceptance. Here then we have the offer on the part of Lord Aberdeen to relax certain rights and making certain stipulations with regard thereto. How does Mr. Everett treat this situation? He says that:

While he desires, however, without reserve, to express his sense of the amicable disposition evinced by Her Majesty's government on this occasion in relaxing in favour of the United States the exercise of what, after deliberate reconsideration, fortified by high legal authority, is deemed an unquestioned right of Her Majesty's government, the undersigned would be unfaithful to his duty did he omit to remark to Lord Aberdeen that no arguments have at any time been adduced to shake the confidence of the government of the United States in their own construction of the treaty. While they have ever been prepared to admit that in the letter of one expression of that instrument there is some reason for claiming a right to exclude United States fishermen from the Bay of Fundy (it being difficult to deny to that arm of the sea the name of 'bay,' which long geographical usage has assigned to it), they have ever strenuously maintained that it is only on their own construction of the entire article that its known design in reference to the regulation of the fisheries admits of being carried into effect.

There is no acceptance, Mr. Speaker, of the offer which is submitted by Lord Aberdeen. But now let us see how he spurns this generous offer with contempt. He says:

The undersigned does not make this observation for the sake of detracting from the liberality evinced by Her Majesty's government in relaxing from what they regard as their right, but it would be placing his own government in a false position to accept as mere favour that for which they have so long and strenuously contended as due to them under the convention.

He spurned the offer. He said: We have been fishing there, you have seized our vessels and now you put a proposition up to us and call it a relaxation of your right. We do not acknowledge that you have such a right because we have been exercising our calling there as a matter of right. On the 25th March, fifteen days later, Mr. Everett wrote to Mr. Calhoun, the United States Secretary of State, referring to the correspondence which had taken place between himself and Lord Aberdeen as follows:

I thought it proper, in replying to Lord Aberdeen's note, to recognize in ample terms the liberal spirit evinced by Her Majesty's government, in relaxing from what they consider their right. At the same time I felt myself bound to say that the United States could not accept as a mere favour what they had always claimed as a matter of right, secured by the treaty.

Yet, in 1909, for the first time, since 1845, we find in the correspondence of the British plenipotentiary in these negotiations at Washington that a construction was put upon that old correspondence which is to give it the meaning of a concession by which we are alleged to have abandoned our rights in those large and important waters. The minister has used the term 'concession' repeatedly in the House, and before the Bar Society at Osgoode Hall. There was a relaxation which was spurned by the American minister and which they never accepted up to the present time. When the question of the fishing rights in the Bay of Fundy was suddenly dragged into the proceedings of the Halifax award in 1877, Mr. John S. D. Thompson (afterwards Sir John Thompson)—than whom no abler constitutional and international lawyer ever sat in this House,—contended before that tribunal that His Britannic Majesty's subjects had exclusive rights of fishing in the Bay of Fundy. The American contention then was not based on the correspondence of 1845 and the alleged re-

laxation, but, on the decree of Mr. Bates, who was the umpire in the case of the seizure of the 'Washington.' In the 'Washington' case the United States selected a representative and Great Britain selected a representative, and these two agreed upon Mr. Bates as umpire, and the tribunal met in 1856. Mr. Bates was not a lawyer; he was an American citizen, but at that time he was the junior member of an English banking firm residing in London, and having been agreed upon as umpire he rendered the decision in the 'Washington' case. The question submitted to that tribunal did not in any sense involve territorial rights in the Bay of Fundy; it was merely a question involving money damages for the seizure of the 'Washington' in the Bay of Fundy, and Mr. Bates found for $3,000 damages, but he also found something he was not asked to find, and which probably neither country would have entrusted him to adjudicate upon, namely, that the vessel was seized on the high seas. As a matter of fact the 'Washington' was seized on the western side of Grand Manan island near the entrance to Campobello bay in the Bay of Fundy, and almost three miles outside of Grand Manan. The Minister of Justice told us to-night that he thought the British case would have been prejudiced had we set up claims to a great bay like the Bay of Fundy which is nearly 60 miles across. As a matter of fact since the declaration of 1783 by which Americans reserved their rights to fish in certain of His Majesty's North Atlantic waters, no one has ever contended on behalf of Britain that she had any exclusive rights in that part of the Bay of Fundy which stretches 60 miles across. The minister was deceiving the House—whether he was doing it intentionally or not is a matter only known to himself—but when he said the Bay of Fundy was 60 miles across, he was speaking of the width of the bay at a point from near Brier island over to near the state of Maine, and it was never contended by Britain that she could treat the intervening waters there as territorial waters. What Britain did claim, and what the minister conceded would have been awarded to her had it been submitted, was the right to draw a straight line from headland to headland within British territory. Under the Treaty of Ghent the boundary line between the United States and Canada in the Bay of Fundy was defined as running at a point midway between the island of Grand Manan and the coast of the eastern portion of Maine. Under the British contention on this definition, we would draw our headland line from Grand Manan to Brier island, and from Grand Manan across Passamaquoddy bay to the nearest headland on the western part of the province of New Brunswick. This was all that any one ever claimed on behalf of Britain and the minister knows, or ought to know, that in the argument before the Hague Tribunal maps and plans were submitted which show a line betweeen these points and which show the length of that line to be 24 miles and not 60 miles. I submit that when a straight line is drawn from Brier island on the coast of Nova Scotia over to the island of Grand Manan, and from the island of Grand Manan to the nearest point in the province of New Brunswick that that is the true headland line which has been recognized at least in principle by the Hague Tribunal, and which as the minister admitted would have been drawn by that tribunal in connection with the Bay of Fundy, had the Bay of Fundy not been excepted.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is St. Mary's bay outside or inside the limit which has been mentioned by the hon. gentleman?

Mr. MADDIN. Does the minister mean outside of the line drawn from Brier island to Grand Manan?

Mr. BRODEUR. I refer to the points the hon. gentleman has spoken of.

Mr. MADDIN. Well, St. Mary's bay is outside of that line; it is almost 100 miles outside. The hon. minister said that we—that is, I presume, those who had charge of Britain's case—were undertaking a very great job in trying to get The Hague Tribunal to recognize our doctrine in regard to bays, and intimated in this House and in the discussion of this matter outside of the House, that some great and new principle of international law had been announced. Why, Sir, the method to be pursued in measuring bays and headlands laid down by this tribunal is as old as Grotius, one of the oldest authorities on international law. The hon. minister asks, wherein is it there is a dereliction of duty on the part of the government in connection with this matter, and, in answer to the hon. member for Digby, who wishes to know what our rights in the Bay of Fundy were, he said they were exactly what they were before the agreement of the 27th of January was signed, no more and no less. No one could answer a question more unsatisfactorily. What does he concede to be our rights in the Bay of Fundy under the treaty of 1818? What effect does he think this correspondence of 1845 had with regard to our rights, in the light of the claims subsequently made by this parliament, which have never been successfully refuted by the people of the United States? It was of the greatest importance to the people of this country that this question should have been determined by this tribunal when it sat last summer. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Digby, the treaty of 1908, by which these matters were to be adjusted, is to remain in force only five years. Two

years from next June it will expire. Does the minister hope to get the difficulties with respect to the Bay of Fundy settled before that time? I submit that he was guilty of a dereliction of duty in connection with this matter when he permitted the Bay of Fundy to be excepted at all. The Senate of the United States had no right to put a rider on the agreement excepting it, because article 1 of the treaty of 1908, which had been concurred in by the Senate of the United States, expressly stipulated for the adjudication of just such disputes as have been continually arising with regard to Canadian-British rights in the Bay of Fundy, and it was the duty of the minister to have pointed out to the United States ministers the terms of that treaty, and that, in adding to the agreement the rider excepting from the adjudication of the tribunal a disputed question under the treaty of 1818, they were violating the treaty of 1908, which they themselves had ratified. The question of fishing in the Bay of Fundy is one which is important to the people of the whole Dominion of Canada, but more especially to those people who inhabit the shores along the bay in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The Bay of Fundy every year produces in the neighbourhood of $1,000,000 worth of fish to Canadian fishermen. When we estimate the number of fishermen from the United States who trawl these waters and fish them from one end of the year to the other, and in violation of the Canadian fishery regulations, we may fairly estimate that the Bay of Fundy, from the headlands claimed by the British authorities, yields up each year $2,000,000 worth of fish, and when the minister stood by and neglected to have the question of the right to fish in that great and valuable fishery go before the tribunal he was guilty of a dereliction of duty. I want to point out to him that square mile for square mile the Bay of Fundy, within a line drawn from Briar Island to Grand Manan, is richer than the richest belt of soil between the lakes and the Rocky mountains, and he might just as well have ceded up an equal area of the prairie provinces to the United States as to have permitted their people to come in and enjoy in common with us the right to exploit those fisheries, which, as a matter of fairness and equity, belong to the people of His Majesty's dominions. The minister thinks that, perhaps, if he had insisted on including the Bay of Fundy in the question submitted to this tribunal he might have prejudiced the Canadian case. In fact, he expressed his pride that he himself was the one to suggest that the Bay of Fundy should be struck out. I can hardly see how he can reconcile the wish he expressed to-night with the statement he made in this House on the 2nd of December, when he said that had the question of the Bay of Fundy been submitted to the tribunal, no doubt it would have been declared to be British territorial waters. I submit that, as the Minister of Justice of this country charged with safeguarding the interests of Canada, it was his duty, even if we had only a substantial colour of right, to have submitted that question of right for the consideration and adjudication of that tribunal. How have the United States, in their negotiation with us in the past, dealt with their claims? Have they considered their claims from time to time to be shadowy? Do we not know that, after promising to admit our fish free into the United States, they imposed a duty and then pretended that it was on the tin boxes that contained the fish, and not on the fish? Do we not remember how, on another occasion, they placed a tax on the tonnage of the vessels passing through their canals, and then claimed that it was aimed at the cargoes and not at the vessels? If the minister will take a lesson from a writer on international law, he will find in 'Blackwood's Magazine' for October, 1893, an article on 'The United States in International Law,' in which it is said:

> Further, the United States in consistent pursuance of the older view of international law, have shown a remarkable tendency to assert the very oldest titles and claims that the prehistoric view of law would support by the most shadowy interpretation.
>
> (a) Thus the right of the United States to the navigation of the Mississippi, as against the claims of Spain, were based on the rights obtained through France by the voyage and discoveries of La Salle, as well as upon 'the sentiment written in deep characters upon the heart of man,' i.e., the law of nature as understood in America.
>
> (b) Thus the right to navigate the St. Lawrence as against the territorial authority of Great Britain, was based upon 'natural law and obvious necessity,' not admissible grounds in diplomatic negotiations.
>
> (c) Thus the claims of the United States to the Oregon territory were based on the shadowy claims of Spain, themselves based on papal bulls, and those of doubtful authority in view of previous bulls to Portugal.
>
> (d) Thus the right of America to Texas is also based on the traditional landing of Lasalle at the Bay of Esperitu Santo.
>
> (e) Thus the claims of the American fishermen to use the British fisheries in North America was based on the previous condition of citizenship of the British Empire, from which they had deliberately cut themselves adrift.
>
> (f) Thus the American claim to jurisdiction on Behring Sea was based on claims which Russia had put forward for quite other purposes than the prosecution of the seal fisheries, which had been repudiated by the United States at the time, but which were resuscitated when the Americans became possessed of the Russian territory.

Thus we find the United States ready to blow hot and cold in matters that involve international rights. And I submit that by all the rights of international law—and if the hour were not so late I would take up some of the authorities from Grotius down to the present—the doctrine of the headland rights has been recognized. The tribunal which recently rendered its decision of this matter certainly dealt a very vigorous blow to the party which boasts so exultingly of the diplomacy of the hon. minister because, in referring to clause 5 of the argument of the United States regarding question 5, the tribunal finds as follows:

In this latter regard it is further contended by the United States that such exceptions only should be made from the application of the three-mile rule to bays as are sanctioned by conventions and established usage.

That would apply to the Bay of Fundy.

That all exceptions for which the United States of America were responsible are so sanctioned; and that His Majesty's government are unable to provide evidence to show that the bays concerned by the treaty of 1818 could be claimed as exceptions on these grounds either generally, or except possibly in one or two cases specifically.

The award goes on to say:

But the tribunal while recognizing that conventions and established usage might be considered as the basis for claiming as territorial those bays which on this ground might be called historic bays, and that such claim should be held valid in the absence of any principle of international law on the subject, nevertheless is unable to apply this, a contrario, so as to subject the bays in question to the three-mile rule, as desired by the United States;

(b) Because neither should such relaxations of this claim, as are in evidence, be construed as renunciations of it; nor should omissions to enforce the claim in regard to bays as to which no controversy arose, be so construed. Such a construction by this tribunal would not only be intrinsically inequitable but internationally injurious; in that it would discourage conciliatory diplomatic transactions and encourage the assertion of extreme claims in their fullest extent.

I submit that the relaxation contained in Lord Aberdeen's letter of the 10th March, 1845, cannot be construed as running perpetually. It has since been renounced by Great Britain and by this parliament with the acquiescence of Britain, when the late Sir John Thompson was Minister of Justice. It seems to me that this decree expresses a principle from which it will be very awkward indeed for any future tribunal to exclude the Bay of Fundy from being declared British territorial waters. Our difficulty, however, is that there is no possible prospect of having the rights of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick insisted upon by this government. If the waters of the Bay of Fundy are British territorial waters, we should make fishing regulations with regard to them. We can control these fisheries, we can preserve and enrich them, we can also exclude all other people than His Britannic Majesty's subjects from the right to fish within these waters. In view of the regulation of these fisheries, the matter is sufficiently important to warrant the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in insisting on a speedy determination of our rights with regard to this important bay.

My hon. friend from Digby is not the only person in Nova Scotia anxious to get some information with regard to our rights. In the Morning 'Chronicle' of January 17, there is an article under a two-column heading in letters of three-quarters of an inch long, entitled 'Steam Trawling in the Bay of Fundy.' That article is as follows:

(Special to the 'Morning Chronicle.')

Ottawa, Jan. 17.—The Department of Marine has asked the Justice Department for an opinion as to whether under the terms of the award of the Hague Tribunal which dealt with the North Atlantic fisheries case, the Bay of Fundy should be considered as territorial waters from which Canada can exclude fishermen of foreign countries.

In a letter setting forth the facts of the case, Mr. Alexander Johnston, Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, wrote to Mr. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, on November 4 last, pointing out that the Fisheries Department was anxious to regulate steam trawling in the Bay of Fundy and other coast waters, but unless the government had authority to shut out American or other foreign trawlers, it would not be wise to make regulations prohibiting steam trawling in the bay by Canadian fishermen.

Mr. Johnston pointed out that up to 1853 Canada had asserted its right to control the fisheries in the Bay of Fundy and to regard it as a closed sea. In pursuance of this right an American fishing vessel named the 'Washington' had been seized when fishing in the bay six miles off the coast. By the treaty concluded in 1853 between Great Britain and the United States, the question as to the right of Canada to thus seize the vessel was submitted to the adjudication of an umpire jointly chosen by the American and British governments. This umpire was a Mr. Bates, who was a junior member of a United States banking firm in England. His decision was that the bay could not be considered as territorial waters, and under his award Canada was compelled to pay damages for the seizure of the vessel.

Mr. Johnston urges that this decision should not be considered as final, inasmuch as it was more particularly concerned with a pecuniary claim, and inasmuch as the recent Hague decision seems to lay down the general principle that the coast line should run from headland to headland. The Bay of Fundy was

expressly excluded from the consideration of the tribunal at the Hague, and beyond the general principle of law laid down, and its application, the cases of individual bays in Newfoundland and Canadian waters, there has been no specific determination of the point now raised beyond the above noted award in 1853.

Another important point raised is that the award does not clearly indicate whether Canada has a right to exclude from territorial waters vessels of other countries than those which were parties to the treaty of 1818.

Here we have the Deputy Minister of Marine intellectually at sea, he wants to know, just as my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson) did, what are the British rights in the Bay of Fundy. My hon. friend, the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) suggested that the member for Digby should read the oral argument with reference to this case, and that if he did, he would find in it a great deal of enlightenment. Well, I should like to venture the observation, that my hon. friend from Digby has read perhaps more of the oral argument in connection with this award, and perhaps more of the appendices to the argument and the case, and the counter case than even the Minister of Justice himself. While certain great newspapers in this Dominion have been giving to the Minister of Justice great praise, in connection with this decree, handed down at the Hague Tribunal last year, I am not so sure that, even on his own declaration and confession, he is entitled to all the bouquets that have been handed to him by the press supporting this government. When a press despatch announced, early in the year, that the minister was to be dubbed a knight, there was some doubt in the minds of the people of Nova Scotia whether this was due to his active promotion of that great national waterway, the Newmarket canal, or for his forensic arguments before the Tribunal at the Hague. On his own admission, supplemented by the letter published by Mr. John S. Ewart, who had charge of getting up this case, I think it can hardly be based on his services rendered in connection with the Hague award. I propose to read this letter of Mr. Ewart as it was published in the Montreal 'Gazette,' of January 9, 1911:

The Editor of the 'Gazette.'

Sir,—I have several times felt impelled to write correction of the frequently recurring statements of the newspapers with reference to the preparation and presentation of the case in connection with the recent fisheries arbitration. Till now I have refrained because of the unpleasantness of the task, and because its performance would necessarily leave me open to disagreeable reflection. I am at length convinced that I must face all that.

The Canadian newspapers credit Sir Allen Aylesworth with the preparation and presentation of the case. The Ottawa 'Citizen' for example said that the bulk of the work of preparation of the case fell on his shoulders and the wonderfully thorough presentation of the argument was the talk of the nation for some time. The 'Montreal Star' said that Sir Allen's masterly presentation before the Hague Tribunal won him international reputation. Other newspapers use similar language.

Sir Allen made generous answer to previous statements similar to these in his address before the Canadian Club at Ottawa. He said:

You will naturally ask me to what I attribute our success. I say in the first place, we succeeded because we had a just and good case. In the next place our success is due to excellent preparation, and I say that with the more freedom because notwithstanding the kind words of your president and any personal part I had in it, I give to you as the man entitled to the credit for the excellent preparation of our case Mr. John S. Ewart. Mr. Ewart took charge of this work fully two years ago and he has worked at it faithfully day and night from that day to this.

The result was that when we reached the Hague last June and throughout the proceedings in the case we found Mr. Ewart to be the man who practically knew more about this case than any other person concerned in it; we found him one to whom upon every occasion of need we could go for information with the full assurance that our desires would be gratified. I give to him first and to Mr. Tilley second the credit for the magnificent preparation which this case had at their hands.

Had Sir Allen been more familiar with the actual work he would not have omitted the name of Mr. Wormwith. Mr. Tilley did good work. His devoted and energetic services well merit encomium. But with a little help save that supplied by Mr. Wormwith the research work was almost finished, and the whole of the argument drafted, before Mr. Tilley's connection with the case commenced.

The fact is that Sir Allen not only was quite inactive with reference to the preparation of the case, but that he sedulously kept himself apart from it. He never inquired what was being done. Until after almost the whole of the research had been completed and the arguments had been drafted (nineteen months work) he and I had no conversation other than of the most general character about it. From the commencement of the work until the last word had been spoken at the Hague I can recall but one point which he and I discussed and that was only partially canvassed. Sir Allen never read a word of the hundreds of documents contained in over 1,200 folio pages of small type which contained the result of the research until after the whole of it was in print and had been delivered to the United States. Most probably he has not read a twentieth of it. That was not his part of the work and most properly he did not do it.

All that need be said about the 'masterly presentation' before the tribunal is that Sir Allen was a spectator and not a debater there. He did not even attend the daily conferences of counsel which were held at the close of each day's session when the happenings of the day were discussed and the plan for the next day arranged. That too was not his part of the work and most properly he did not do it.

Owing to lack of familiarity with the preparation of the case Sir Allen inadvertently in his speech in the House of Commons, gave Sir William Robson a little more than his due. About this I must be permitted a few words: Sir Allen said that Sir William referred to certain treaties in support of an original argument upon the question of 'bays' and that the argument 'was due altogether to the research and ability of Sir William Robson.' Taking this statement as a very serious reflection upon my work, I spoke to Sir Allen about it. I pointed out to him that the treaties were cited and an argument upon them not very dissimilar to that of Sir William's presented in my 'memorandum of facts and arguments' which has been prepared before I left Canada and before I knew of the existence of Sir William; that the treaties were all printed in the appendix to our case and delivered to the United States months before Sir William began his study of the case; and that in my address to the tribunal (which preceded that of Sir William), I had called attention to the treaties and based another argument upon them. Sir Allen was good enough to express regret at having been unaware that the research had not been done by Sir William. Sir William made a splendid address before the tribunal. Too much cannot be said in its praise. But quite naturally he did no research work.

Turning now to the work which Sir Allen did, let me say that it was of the very highest importance; that it was extremely well done; and that it amply entitled him to the gratitude of Canada. His official position precluded monetary remuneration. His knighthood is (if he values it) a most fitting reward for his work. He has already more than earned it by his splendid support of Canada's interests against the treachery of Lord Alverstone in the Alaska boundary case.

Sir Allen's work related to the negotiations with the United States which led up to the arbitration; to agreement upon the form of the questions to be submitted (a form which he never had reason to regret) to the selection of the arbitrators (a most important point); to the arrangements with Newfoundland to the settlement of all the difficulties which arose in so many unexpected ways during the three years which elapsed between the inception and the completion of the work. His too was the official responsibility for all that was done and for the selection of the men to do it. Had we failed him, he would have got the blame, and so far as I am concerned Mr. George Foster would have been able to say: 'I told you so.'

No one knows better than I do the difficulties which Sir Allen had to encounter and with what patience, tact and ability he met them and dissipated them. Personally I feel myself under deep gratitude to him not only for the implicit confidence which he placed in me but for the great consideration and kindness which he evinced at some very critical junctures.

I trust that for this letter I may be forgiven. I should rather unthanked, work up another fisheries case than write such a letter.

JOHN S. EWART.

Ottawa, January 17, 1911.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, in view of the disclosures made in that correspondence given to the public in January last, it ill becomes the Minister of Justice to suggest to a layman like my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson), that he peruse the oral argument. That letter, which was written under such painful circumstances, forced with great regret and reluctance from the man who was charged with preparing the case for His Britannic Majesty, was evoked, no doubt, by the fact, that the minister had gone up and down this country, speaking before the Canadian Club, before the Bar Association, in this House on December 2, last, and in Halifax, during the Christmas holidays, lauding men who were not entitled to his laudation, paying tribute where it was not due, heaping encomiums upon men who were not worthy of them.

It was under circumstances such as these that this letter was so reluctantly and painfully given to the press of the country in self-defence by one man who had contributed more than all others combined to such success as we may be able to gather from the award that that tribunal handed down last summer. It does appear to me that the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Justice might very well have so arranged their case as to have submitted the case of His Majesty's subjects in the Bay of Fundy to that tribunal. There is no doubt that under the first section of the treaty of 1908 which was solemnly entered into by the United States and ratified by the Senate such questions as our rights in the Bay of Fundy were intended to be dealt with. It was not legitimately possible for the United States Senate to insert that rider excepting the Bay of Fundy from the operation of this award. The minister should have stood by the people of this country and by the rights of the fishermen of the North Atlantic coasts of Canada. But, Sir, there were contingencies, the minister has served some considerable time in the public life of this country. I suppose he was looking forward to the time when he would be retiring from public life, and when this rider was introduced into the agreement by the Senate of the United States, and it was submitted to the Minister of Justice he as the man who was responsible as he told us to-day, only to the imperial authorities, agreed to it; but, Sir, we had then the first opportunity in our diplomatic relations since confederation of asserting our colonial rights and the minister who was there for the purpose of protecting those rights, lamentably failed in preserving to the people of the maritime provinces the fishing rights which belonged to them in the Bay of Fundy, and it is due to his utter disregard of these rights that the Bay of Fundy was not described in the

award as territorial waters. The minister could have submitted in reply to the resolution brought down in the Senate of the United States that he was not prepared to leave this question affecting the Bay of Fundy open for years to come, he should not have permitted this question, which has been an open question since 1818, to go unsettled. As the price of meat goes up in the United States and Canada, fish is becoming more and more a staple article of diet and the fisheries of the North Atlantic coast of Canada are becoming more valuable every year. We will never be able to preserve those fisheries in the Bay of Fundy in these modern days of steam trawl unless we assert our rights and treat the Bay of Fundy as territorial waters. The Minister of Justice had the opportunity of doing this but he comes home from the Hague and seems to feel quite satisfied with the result as indicated in the conclusion of his speech before the Ontario Bar Association when he said:

I am sure we on our part, with our fellows in Newfoundland on their part, will loyally submit to and support the decision where it is against us; and I am sanguine to believe that with equal loyalty the decision will be supported in the United States upon the points which may seem adverse to them. I think that this world-wide and more than century long difficulty which undoubtedly on more than one occasion has brought the two great Anglo-Saxon nations to the very verge of war itself, has been definitely and finally settled, and I welcome the view that there is at least an end to this long difference and a great step forward taken in the work of international arbitration which looks to the day of universal peace. (Great applause.)

I wish to say that the fishing rights of His Britannic Majesty's subjects in the Bay of Fundy according to the minister's own statement to-night are exactly no more and exactly no less than they were before the agreement was entered into which submitted the questions under consideration to the tribunal at the Hague in June last. It was clearly the duty of the minister to have replied to the Senate of the United States that he would not entertain the arbitration of these questions unless the Bay of Fundy were included in the reference. We all know very well how cases are brought before tribunals. If in any British Court of Appeal counsel cannot agree on the questions which are to be submitted to the tribunal, the court may be moved to come to their assistance and adjust the questions between them, and so the minister in this instance in answer to the proviso that was inserted in the Senate of the United States could have said: No, we will not arbitrate the remaining coast waters except the Bay of Fundy, but will submit the whole case and leave it to the tribunal to say whether or not we have such rights in the Bay of Fundy as entitle us to have them defined. He could have appealed to the very tribunal constituted for that purpose and have had that tribunal fix the case in spite of the Senate of the United States, because the Senate of the United States had already affirmed a treaty for the express purpose of dealing with such questions as arose in the Bay of Fundy. Why did he not do it? It is said of Sir Charles Tupper that when he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries on one occasion on which negotiations were being conducted at Washington, when Mr. Joseph Chamberlain was associated with him as His Majesty's representative from England, when the British diplomat tried to make concessions which Sir Charles considered unfair to Canada, Sir Charles returned to his hotel, asked what time the train left for New York and Ottawa, ordered his trunks to be packed and said he was leaving in the morning. This brought them to time, they came down and suggested that he remain, they modified the question involved and the negotiations were carried on. The Minister of Justice owed it to the fishermen of eastern Canada that he should have backed them up rather than submit the people of this country to the humiliation and the shame of having left unsettled and undefined the rights of His Britannic Majesty's subjects in these coast waters. He was looking into the near future when he was about to retire from public life. Does he realize that if there was no arbitration there would be no knighthood, and that there should be an arbitration in any event; that if sacrifices were to be made in order to bring about the arbitration it was as well that the sacrifices should be made against the fishermen of eastern Canada, and that those of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick might as well make the sacrifices as any other of His Majesty's subjects.

So I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in the presence of the diplomats of the United States and of the plenipotentiaries and ministers who were gathered at the Hague, it must have humiliated the people of Canada to realize the fact that such important rights as we have in the Bay of Fundy would go undefined and unsettled now for a period of ninety-three years, that they should remain in the same position as they were ninety-three years ago, and that, after a tribunal had been especially constituted to determine and define those rights. The minister will never again in his public career have an opportunity of having those rights defined. The Hon. Amos Tuck, in the House of Representatives in the United States, said that it was only force that would keep the United States fishermen out of the Bay of Fundy. Was the minister

afraid of this veiled threat on the part of United States diplomacy in 1852? Why Sir, if our rights in Canadian waters are to be dealt with in this light, if they are to be sacrificed in such an indifferent way as this, if the United States can come in under a pretense of right and exercise fishing privileges in our territorial waters, for well nigh a hundred years, and if we are to stand by and permit them to enjoy those privileges without protest, we had better destroy our armies and navies and use our money for some more peaceful purpose. For what object are we spending $20,000,000 a year for a navy and $800,000 for agriculture, if our rights in the fisheries of the Bay of Fundy are to be set aside, notwithstanding this treaty, at the instance of the Senate of the United States? Evidently the Canadian navy is not exciting the American diplomats to view with any dismay any consequences that might arise from the assertion of British rights in the Bay of Fundy or they would not probably have insisted on the withdrawal of the Bay of Fundy from the matters which were to go before the tribunal.

On motion of Mr. Brodeur, debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Brodeur, House adjourned at 11 o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 6, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.—CHARGES AGAINST THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT SHIPYARD AT SOREL AND THE MEMBER FOR RICHELIEU.

Mr. P. E. BLONDIN (Champlain). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege to present the motion of which notice has been given two days ago to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and to the hon. member for Richelieu.

Neither the hon. minister nor the hon. member will be surprised at my move, because they already know since a long time the facts which I will communicate to the House.

I would have been particularly grateful to them if, during the long months that have elapsed since, they had undertaken, themselves, as is was proper, to avenge the honour of the minister and the reputation of the member. But they have done nothing. They have kept about the whole thing a very long silence which I would dare to qualify as incriminating. I for one cannot allow this silence to last longer without feeling myself as conniving, or at least as failing seriously in my duty as a member of this House.

I shall read in English the declaration and the motion, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall read in French, in their original form, the affidavits which have been given me. I have added also, since the notice I have given, the years 1908 and 1909 to the year 1910, because new affidavits have come to me.

I, Pierre Edouard Blondin, a member of Parliament for the electoral district of Champlain, in the province of Quebec, Dominion of Canada, declare that I am credibly informed, and I believe that I can establish by satisfactory evidence:

10. That in the course of the years 1908, 1909 and 1910, irregularities, abuses, frauds, malversations and robberies have been committed in the shops and stores of the government of Canada at St. Joseph of Sorel and in the city of Sorel, in the electoral district of Richelieu;

20. That barrels and tins of paint and other goods of this nature have been illegally and fraudulently taken and carried away from the said stores and shops and transported to the house of Mr. Adélard Lanctôt then and now a member of the House of Commons of Canada, for the electoral district of Richelieu, which house was then being built on George street, at Sorel above mentioned, and ready to be painted;

30. That with these goods and paint, paintworks, decoration and varnish works, have been done by the employees of the government of Canada under the supervision of the painters' foreman employed by said government at the said place, at the government's expense and during the hours supposed to be devoted to the government and for which said employees were paid by the government, these men registering each day as if they had really worked for the government, and this during weeks and months; the materials and time, thus furnished, are valued at about one thousand or twelve hundred dollars;

40. That said goods were so fraudulently appropriated to, and said work so fraudulently done at the expense of the government of Canada for the benefit of the said Adélard Lanctôt then and now a member of the House as aforesaid with his knowledge, assent and approval, the said Adélard Lanctôt abusively and fraudulently profiting at the public expense and to the public detriment by his position of member of the House;

I found the belief I have just expressed upon affidavits which I desire to read and produce in support of the motion I am about to make:

(Translation).

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
District of Richelieu.

I, the undersigned, Alfred Douaire, painter, of the city of Sorel, 51 years of age, solemnly declare:

That I have been in the employment of the federal government at its shipyards situated at Saint-Joseph de Sorel, from January, 1906, inclusively to the 5th of November, 1910, as painter under the orders of J. Bte. Pagé, foreman of the painters department at the said shipyards, during the last two years;—that during these two said years, principally during the last year, and especially in July, August and September, 1910, I have been requested by the said J. Bte. Pagé to go to Sorel, at the house of Mr. Adélard Lanctôt, M.P., then being built on George street, in order to paint, cement, polish and varnish, &c., &c., the said house and that, as it was well understood, after having registered at the shipyard as present and working on behalf of the government, and my departure each morning was to be from the said shipyard.

That, as a matter of fact, I regularly registered and punched as previously mentioned, and that in conformity with my orders I left the shipyard each working day and went, as above stated, during the months of July, August and September, 1910, to the said Lanctôt house, where I have worked at the painting, varnishing and staining of the said Lanctôt house.

That this work was also done in part by Messrs. Théodore Emond, Edmond Brault, Adélard Letendre, Albérique Letendre, Omer Pagé, Arthur Trempe, Louis Paul, Adélard Alie, all painters, employed at the time by the said government, and on the working hours due to the government and each of them having punched at the same time as myself as aforesaid.

That during the time that work was going on, the said J. Bte. Pagé and Adélard Lanctôt, M.P., were visiting the job from time to time, looking at the progress of the work, Pagé giving orders for having some paint brought from the shipyard and also for the execution of the work, and that, many times to the knowledge and cognizance, and in the presence of the said Adélard Lanctôt,—this gentleman knowing also where the paint came from and that the work was being done by employees of the government whom he was seeing often and often at work.

That the said Adélard Lanctôt never spoke of paying these painters, and in fact was not paying them, but they were regularly paid their salaries by the government at each pay day, as if they had worked for the department.

That the above mentioned persons who have worked with me at this painting have given to that work, some four weeks, and others from four to ten weeks.

I positively declare:—that Mr. Adélard Lanctôt knew at the time that the paint and other goods which were used in the painting of his house, were coming from the said shipyard of the government; 2. that this work was done by the then regular employees of the government who were paid, for the time they were doing that work, by the government itself, and that for that purpose the time of each employee was punched as employee of the government.

On the seventh day of December, 1910, at 10 p.m., Mr. Alfred Lavallée, lumber merchant, of Sorel, came to my house at Sorel, asking me to go immediately to the house of Mr. Adélard Lanctôt, at Sorel, who desired to see me without fault; I went immediately and found Mr. Lanctôt who was waiting for me and who, after the ordinary salutations, showed me and read me the solemn declaration which I had given during the said month of December to the same purpose as the present one, and spoke to me the following words:—'Is it you, Mr. Douaire, who gave this affidavit?' I answered: 'Yes.' He added: 'You have signed it?' I answered 'Yes.' He asked me if I would see Albert Thibaudeau and try to lay my hand upon certains papers relating to this affair, which he did not like to see circulating. I answered that it was not easy to get hold of these documents, principally the affidavit dated at Sorel, the 30th of November, 1910. Mr. Lanctôt added: 'I will look to that myself, and I will try to get hold of them. Mr. Lanctôt wanted me to change my course of action, he offered me a position under the government, which I refused. He told me that if some one was troubled about that affair, principally Mr. J. Bte. Pagé, I would be treated the same way he would be. I answered that I was not afraid. Before leaving, I told him that the affidavit which he had in his hands, and which he got, I did not know from whom, was true and signed by me in perfect knowledge and without any outside influence, as I gave the present one.

And I make this solemn statement, believing it conscientiously to be true, and knowing that it has the same force and effect as if it was made under oath, under the witness law of Canada, and I have signed.

ALFRED DOUAIRE,

Declared before me, the undersigned,
at Sorel, the first of March, 1911.

VICTOR A. BOURGEOIS,
Notary.

(Translation).

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
District of Richelieu.

I, the undersigned, Henri Proulx, painter, of the city of Sorel, aged 34, do solemnly declare:

That I have been in the employ of the Dominion government at its shipyards situated at St. Joseph de Sorel, from February 16, 1909, to November 5, 1910, as painter and under the orders of J. Bte. Pagé, head of the painting department.

That in the course of the month of August last (1910) the said J. Bte. Pagé instructed me to proceed, in company with Omer Pagé and Henri Paul, two government employees, painters like myself, working under his orders at the time, to proceed to the paint shop of the department for the purpose of taking the paint there, the property of the government, and carrying it to the said Lanctot house at Sorel, with instructions in going through Sorel to follow Augusta street so as to avoid being noticed, as would have been the case had we gone directly to the spot.

That accordingly I proceeded in August, 1910, together with the said Omer Pagé and Henri Paul, to the paint shop, and that there we loaded ourselves with boxes, barrels, and packages of paint neither weighed or measured, as well as of oil and varnish and thence

carried our load of wares to the said Lanctot's house in Sorel, following Augusta street, so as to let people believe that we were coming from the shops in Sorel, in accordance with the instructions received from the said J. P. Pagé; that on reaching the said Lanctot house we deposited on the floor our three loads of paint, in the presence of the said Adélard Lanctot, who was then at the said house. There Messrs. Théodore Emond, Edmond Brault, Adélard Letendre, Alberic Letendre, Omer Pagé, Arthur Trempe, Louis Paul, Adélard Alie and Alfred Douaire, all at the time in the employ of the government, as painters, under the orders of J. B. Pagé, their chief, with the knowledge of the said Adélard Lanctot, who knew these men, who knew where they were supposed to be working, took hold of the paint and utilized it to whitewash the inside and outside of the Lanctot house, while every morning having their cards punched so as to get their pay from the government, which as a matter of fact they did get, and this again to the knowledge of the said Adélard Lanctot who was aware that the government was paying these men for the time they had spent working in his house.

I know personally that morning, noon and night the said Pagé proceeded with me from the Lanctot house to where the punch was located and that he punched on his own account, and that as long as the work lasted. It is also to my knowledge that in the course of the said work, Cuthbert Champagne, another government employee, and keeper of the punch, had instructions to punch on behalf of the aforesaid painters who did not see to it themselves, in the course of said work, at the said Lanctot house, and that indeed he punched once for me before my arrival, stating: your card is punched as well as the others. Besides, I declare that the said J. Bte. Pagé, while I was present, addressed the said Cuthbert Champagne, then close to the punch, and inquired from the said Champagne, keeper of the punch, whether he was careful to punch regularly on behalf of the men working at the time at Mr. Lanctot's. Mr. Champagne having answered in the affirmative, Mr. Pagé declared himself satisfied.

I declare lastly that on the afternoon of the twelfth day, January 6, 1911, I was requested by a friend of Mr. Lanctot to proceed to the latter's office. Accordingly, I went and found there Mr. Lanctot, Mr. Joseph Proulx, of Sorel, and Mr. Napoléon Proulx, of St. Victoire, two of my uncles, and here is what happened: 'Mr. Adélard Lanctot, M.P., inquired: 'Mr. Proulx, I heard that you were anxious to get your position; I can have you reinstated provided you sign the paper which I have prepared and which I shall read to you. The grist of the paper he then read, was as follows. Hon. minister, I request that you put aside the statement which I signed on November 10, 1910, which you have in your hands. I signed that paper when in a passion and after thinking over it I realized that some things which I had included had no foundation in fact, and that in the interest of the party as well as in my own personal interest such a course would be preferable, and at the same time I beg to be pardoned by you and by the member.' Having ascertained what use the member Lanctot intended to make of this letter, I answered that it was useless to read any more. 'You should have a better knowledge of the Proulx family; we are not of the kind who sign on Monday and withdraw their signature on Tuesday. I want you to bear in mind Lanctot that all the affidavits declared and signed by me will remain exactly as on the day I signed them.' Then, Joseph Proulx, ticket agent addressed Lanctot as follows: 'You should not have a grudge against my nephew, but instead against those d——— fools on the other side whose inspirations you follow.' And the discussion on that subject lasted a couple of hours.

And I make this solemn declaration believing it conscientiously to be true and knowing that it has the same force and effect as if it had been made under oath under the Evidence Act of Canada, and I have signed,

HENRI PROULX.

Declared before me, undersigned at Sorel, on this 1st day of March, nineteen hundred and eleven.

VICTOR A. BOURGEOIS,
Notary.

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
District of Richelieu.

I, the undersigned, Dieudonné Péloquin, joiner and contractor of the city of Sorel, do solemnly declare:

1. That I am 34 years of age and that I have never obtained any contract, or favour, or employment from any of the political parties, and that I am independent of them.

2. That, to my personal knowledge, during the past five or six months, several men employed in the Dominion government shipyards situated at St. Joseph de Sorel, accused each other of thefts and plunderings of cement, lumber, iron, paint, and especially of time as government employees working for private persons while in the departmental pay; the whole being evidenced by several solemn declarations which have been put in my hands in the course of the last two or three days for the purpose of enlightening me and inducing me to request an investigation.

3. That in the course of November last and of December instant politicians, officials of the department high and low, accusers and accused, have travelled to Ottawa; one of the storekeepers has been suspended, then reinstated as he threatened to tear asunder the curtain which covered many a deed. Finally calm was restored, and it was rumoured that matters would be set right, the accusers giving way as a rsult of promises of employment, and the accused being compelled to pay back the value of the goods and time received. Hence an unforeseen appraisal for the purpose of determining the value of certain things which parties interested put down at $292, and which people who have no interest in the matter figure at $800 or $1,000, or even as high as $12,000.

4. That basing myself on the written and oral statements which have been made and communicated to me, and on rumours deemed trustworthy here, I believe that the government, within the last two years, must have suffered a loss of over fifty thousand dollars, through fraud, embezzlement, etc.

5. That to my personal knowledge painters

in the employ of the government have painted the inside and outside of the house of our Dominion member of parliament, Mr. Adélard Lanctot, who was aware that such work was being carried on by these men, at his house situated on George street, in the city of Sorel; one of the best finished and the best painted in this city, and the painting of which is estimated at prices varying several hundred dollars.

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

DIEUDONNE PELOQUIN.

Declared before me at Sorel,
December 29, 1910.

VICTOR A. BOURGEOIS,
Notary.

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
District of Richelieu.

I, the undersigned, Andronique Sénécal, carpenter and joiner, of the city of Sorel, agd 45 years, do solemnly declare:

1. That I am employed at the Dominion government shipyards, situated at St. Joseph de Sorel, at the present time, and have been so employed for the last nine years; that on or about the third of May, nineteen hundred and nine (1909), Oscar Champagne, a man in the employ of the same government, in the same place, as time-keeper, summoned me from my work to his office and instructed me to proceed at once to Sorel, to the house of Adélard Lanctot, then in course of construction on George street, that there I would find Lanctot waiting for me and would be told what to do. That accordingly, in compliance with that order from Champagne, I left forthwith, taking with me two ferry tickets, the property of the government, which Champagne handed to me to reach the place of the said Adélard Lanctot at Sorel. On my way I saw Mr. Lanctot at the Hotel Quebec, notwithstanding which I proceeded to his house and waited for him until the following day. In fact, on the following day, I met Mr. Lanctot at his residence about nine in the morning, and told him that Mr. Champagne had sent me to him for some work that was to be done.

Mr. Lanctot then instructed me to work about the house on his property, repairing and resetting the fence which surrounded it; I got to work at once and worked three days in succession without interruption. I was paid by the government for these three days' work spent at Mr. Lanctot's; I was working under the latter's instructions and he must have seen to have my card punched by obliging hands, for I was paid in full as usual.

And I make this solemn declaration, believing it to be conscientiously true and knowing that it has the same force and effect as if it had been made under oath under the Evidence Act of Canada,

And I have signed,

A. SENECAL.

Declared before me the undersigned at Sorel, on this 1st day of March, nineteen hundred and eleven.

VICTOR A. BOURGEOIS,
Notary.

Mr. BLONDIN.

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
District of Richelieu.

I, the undersigned, Napoléon Laroche, formerly painter and at present joiner, in the parish of St. Joseph de Sorel, do solemnly declare:

1. That in the course of the winter, spring, summer and part of autumn of last year, 1910, I was employed at the Dominion government shipyards, situated at St. Joseph de Sorel, as painter and under the orders of J. Bte. Pagé, head of the painting department.

2. That to my personal knowledge, in the course of that year, 1910, a complete staff of painters, then employed, as myself, by the government and paid by the government, was painted, varnished and decorated the inside and outside of the house of Mr. Adélard Lanctot, M.P., for the electoral district of Richelieu, then in course of construction on George street, in the city of Sorel.

3. That, as a matter of fact, Messrs. Omer Pagé, Louis Paul, Alfred Douaire, Théodore Emond, Edmond Brault, Octavien Lafernière, Arthur Trempe, Adélard and Alberic Letendre, all painters employed and paid by the government and on government time, have painted, varnished and decorated the inside and outside of the said Lanctot house, and that with that object in view they worked almost uninterruptedly from about the end of June up to late autumn; work which to the best of my knowledge I estimate to be worth between twelve and thirteen hundred dollars.

4. That these persons registered or caused themselves to be registered as being present and working for the government, since they came up at every pay-day for the purpose of getting their money, and indeed were paid by the government for time which they supplied to a private party.

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

NAPOLEON LAROCHE.

Declared before me at St. Joseph de Sorel, on this 28th day of December, nineteen hundred and ten.

RENE CHAMPAGNE,
C.S.C. for the District of Richelieu.

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
District of Richelieu.

I, the undersigned Herminégilde Lambert, of the parish of St. Joseph de Sorel, aged 37, do solemnly declare:

1. That I have been in the employ of the Dominion government at their shipyards, situated at St. Joseph de Sorel, from 1900 to 1910, inclusive, that is to say ten consecutive years, the first four years as caulker, and the six last as overseer of labourers. I have given up that work on December 28 last, and have not taken it up since, although I have been offered an increase of salary of fifteen cents per day.

2. That while I was thus in the service of the said government, especially within the last three years, Mr. Alex. Gendron, then and

still of the labourers' department, head man, and consequently my superior, has often instructed me to send sometimes one, sometimes two and sometimes three of the men under my orders and in my gang to work at Sorel for private parties, especially for Alfred Baril and Oscar Champagne, two high officials at the time, and still in the same department, and for Adélard Lanctot, M.P., to carry on works and repairs at various buildings.

3. That on receiving these applications, I sent the number of men required to work for the benefit of these persons, and when each foreman was called to give to the head foreman the time of these men, I said to Mr. Alex. Gendron: 'I have one, or two or three men who have been working at Sorel for the above mentioned.' Then Alex. Gendron, when he was present, and Adolphe Joubert, his clerk representing him, when the latter was away, would say: 'Do not mention the absences which go unnoticed; these men have punched and will be paid by the department.'

4. That Mr. Oscar Champagne, employed in the government stores, has had turf taken at St. Joseph's taken to Sorel to grade his property and embellish the grounds around his house at Sorel, which work was done by Michel Lambert and André Cotnoir, two men in the employ of the government, who worked between three and four days, while at the same time having their cards punched every morning and getting their pay from the government, at the knowledge of the said Oscar Champagne.

5. That in the course of the summer of 1910, that same Mr. Oscar Champagne caused to be drawn, by government teams and by men in government pay, iron pipes taken from the government and had these carried to Sorel and utilized for a tunnel in a stream going through his property, and that this whole expenditure has been supported by the government, which is the looser in this last instance of about $200. That to my knowledge instructions have been given to the men entrusted with the drawing of the pipes to do so in such a way that the great Chief Papineau should have no knowledge of it. As a matter of fact, the drawing was effected about seven o'clock in the morning previous to Mr. Papineau's arrival.

6. That in every instance where time or material was thus embezzled, urgent departmental work was interfered with.

7. That if, to the losses aforementioned, are added those inflicted on the department in the shape of thefts of wood, iron, cement, etc., I may say that these aggregate an enormous amount.

8 I am free to acknowledge that Mr. L. G. Papineau (great chief) of the department, is an honest man, but I will add that either through lack of sternness or some other cause, he finds himself unable to keep in the right path certain subalterns who are not very scrupulous in the handling of the punch. That without the benefit of an investigation for the purpose of finding out those actually at fault, the country will still suffer considerable losses.

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

H. LAMBERT.

Declared before me, the undersigned, at Sorel, on this 18th day of February, 1911.

VICTOR A. BOURGEOIS,
Notary.

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
District of Richelieu.

I, the undersigned, Alfred Douaire, painter, of the city of Sorel, aged 51, do solemnly declare that I have been in the employ of the Dominion government at their shipyards, situated at St. Joseph de Sorel, for several years, especially during the years 1909, 1910, and 1908; that, in the course of the month of October, 1908, J. Bte. Pagé, then employed in the same yards as head of the paint department, instructed me to go and paint the house of Mr. Adélard Lanctot, member for the county of Richelieu, at the time and still representing the said county, a house which he had rented from Mr. Bruno Leclair, on Roy street, in the city of Sorel.

That, as a matter of fact, following my instructions, I went to paint the said lodgings, then occupied by the aforesaid Mr. Lanctot, tenant, and did so at the knowledge and in the presence of the said Adélard Lanctot, and on government time, as an employee of the said government.

That I was paid in full and without any dockage by the government for the time I had spent painting the said Lanctot house, and never did Mr. Lanctot, or any body else on his behalf or in his name offer to pay me a cent for such work effected for his benefit, and which lasted two or three days.

That, besides, Mr. Lanctot knew that I was then the employee of the said government and that I was drawing my salary from the said government for the work thus effected in his said house.

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

And I have signed,

ALFRED DOUAIRE.

Declared before me, in the city of Sorel, on this 5th day of March, nineten hundred and eleven.

VICTOR A. BOURGEOIS,
Notary.

Mr. Speaker, the charges which I have just read are sufficient, it seems to me, to allow me dispensing with making any comment. I venture to hope that the government will grant the motion which I have the honour to introduce:

That, under the circumstances, I move that the declarations and matters above set forth be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections of this House to inquire fully into the same, with power to send for persons, papers, records and such articles as may be necessary for such investigation, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, and that the committe do re-

port in full the evidence taken before them and all their proceedings on the reference and result of their inquiries.

I even entertain the hope that the hon. member for Richelieu will join hands with me in requesting that the government grant this inquiry so that he may be in a position to vindicate himself, if possible, and enable us to continue having for him that esteem we have always had heretofore.

Mr. ADELARD LANCTOT (Richelieu). I must say that I have no objection whatever to the motion of the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin) asking that the charges preferred against me as a member of this House be referred for investigation to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I am glad he has brought this matter to the attention of the House, and I court the fullest and most complete investigation of it.

The facts are simply these: During the month of June last, I was building a house in Sorel, and when it was ready to be painted I had at the time to leave Sorel very frequently to go to Saranac lake where my wife was lying ill. Not having sufficient time to bring painters to Sorel from any outside place, and knowing that none could be had in the town of Sorel except at the Marine Department shops, and at the Richelieu and Ontario shops, I went to the Marine Department to ask the superintendent Mr. Papineau, to send me a few painters to finish my work. Mr. Papineau being absent, I spoke to Mr. Champagne, the timekeeper, and requested him to send me painters when he could spare them without delaying the work of the department, and I told him to keep an exact, accurate and separate account of the time of these men while working at my house; at the same time, I informed Mr. Pagé, the foreman, that I had asked for painters from Mr. Champagne, and that Mr. Champagne would keep the time of the men while they were working at my place. I told Mr. Pagé to get all the necessary materials from Cyrille Labelle & Co., with whom I was dealing, and where I had an account current for supplies used in my building. I also explained to Mr. Pagé that I was leaving for Saranac lake to join my wife, and that I relied upon him to see that the men did their work properly, requesting him at the same time to render me the accounts as the work was proceeding that I might pay them, to avoid any misunderstanding in the matter. Men were sent at various times between the months of June and November to do this work, and during that period, when I asked at different times that the account be rendered to me, I was told that it would be more simple and would involve less work to render the account when the work was finished. The men did the work, and when the same was finished, the bill was rendered to me by Mr. Champagne for the department and I immediately paid it in full upon its production.

Some of the paint, varnish and other materials used were obtained from the shops of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. An accurate account of such materials was kept, and goods of the same quality and to the same quantity were purchased to replace the same, and the account for the goods so purchased together with costs of carriage to Sorel was paid by me and goods were returned to the department immediately.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—TYPHOID EPIDEMIC IN OTTAWA.

Mr. J. B. BLACK (Hants). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. On Thursday last, I made a few remarks in which I referred to the water service of the city of Ottawa. I also referred to some statistics of infantile mortality in Ottawa. In Saturday's Ottawa 'Citizen,' there was an editorial commenting upon what I said. The editorial reads in part as follows:

DR. BLACK'S STATEMENTS.

The attack of Dr. Black, M.P., upon Ottawa water conditions in the House of Commons has, unfortunately, attracted much outside attention. The term unfortunate is used because it is a matter of regret that a statement destined to attain such publicity should have contained assertions which are, in many cases, not borne out by facts.

Dr. Black made the surprising claim that Ottawa water has been polluted for several years past and that the presence of typhoid bacilli had been demonstrated therein. As a matter of fact such a statement is at variance with the records. The tests of city water, conducted perhaps irregularly, have never shown any trace of typhoid bacilli, and to this more probably than anything else was due the irregularity of the tests. Had these shown typhoid germs at any time the medical health officer certainly would have made the fact known. Typhoid has yet to be demonstrated in Ottawa water.

Dr. Black also asserts that it is known where the present outbreak has originated. If so, it is not a matter of common knowledge and Dr. Black is not using the city fairly by withholding such information, particularly at this time. We may be getting poisoned, as Dr. Black intimates, but we can still conscientiously plead that we don't know how any more than at the beginning of the present outbreak.

It might also be interesting if Dr. Black were to give us the source or authority for the statement that 626 infants out of 2,100 born in the year ending October 31, 1910, in this city, died in infancy. The figures seem alarmingly large, but if correct, the city owes

the honourable member an expression of thanks for calling attention to such a condition.

I need not read the rest of this article. In referring to what the editor says, let me take the last statement first. The 'Citizen' wants to know where I got my figures. It affords me pleasure, and no little comfort to inform the 'Citizen' that I got these figures from the 'Citizen.' When I gave these figures, I was quoting from the 'Citizen' of December 29, 1910. I will read the paragraph to show that I made no mistake:

The city hall figures show that, excluding entirely 143 deaths in two children's homes——

I want you to note that the paragraph divides the death rate into two different lots, giving the percentage of one and not of the other, while I added them and gave the percentage of the whole.

——483 deaths of children under one year took place in the year ending October 31 last. The last birth rate published for 1908 gave 25·5 births per 1,000 in Ottawa. Taking this as a rough basis, we find that there would have been last year 2,100 births, of whom 483, or 230 in 1,000 died. Compared with the rate for all England in 1907, the rate there was only 117 per 1,000, while in Ontario in the census year it was 132 deaths per 1,000.

Add these together as I did, and you will see that, according to the 'Citizen's' figures, I am exactly right. Now, what do you think of that for a great moral and religious family journal? The 'Citizen' does not remember what it published, a short two months and a week ago, and accuses me of spreading broadcast through the country, statistics detrimental to the good name of Ottawa. These figures are so startling that, when I first saw them, I could not believe them. I admit that I am not educated up to the point of believing everything that is in the Ottawa 'Citizen,' so I had these figures verified at the city hall. I state again that these figures, according to the city hall, are perfectly correct. The 'Citizen' says:

If correct, the city owes the hon. member an expression of thanks for calling attention to such a condition.

I will waive all this, I will give the whole of that to the 'Citizen'—after you, my dear Alphonse! Now, we will come back——

Mr. SPEAKER. If I understand the hon. gentleman is rising to the correction of a statement?

Mr. BLACK. I am rising to the correction of a statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. He will have to limit himself to that correction.

Mr. BLACK. I am limiting myself to it, and if I get beyond that please correct me. This paper said that I said that typhoid bacillus was in the water. I did unfortunately say that, but it was a slip of the tongue, and not due to a lack of knowledge of the matter. My mind was so full of typhoid at the time that I said 'typhoid bacillus' instead of 'colon bacillus'. The merest tyro in water analysis knows that the typhoid bacillus is the most difficult bacillus to find in water. Sometimes, with great difficulty, it is found in milk, but it has been shown over and over again that colon bacilli are present in the Ottawa water and have been. Colon bacilli and typhoid bacilli are room mates living side by side in the same space in the human system. Their lives run parallel in the human body and when present in the Ottawa river their lives run parallel and the tendency is to die. You find colon bacilli quite readily by analysis, but the typhoid bacillus is very, very difficult to find, so difficult that whenever colon bacilli are found it is assumed, as a matter of course, that their running mate, the typhoid bacillus is there also. When colon bacilli are found it follows as a natural assumption that typhoid will result. Colon bacilli have been found in the water year after year, and this proves that the trouble exists in the water. To contradict this statement, I want to say this: There are four wavs in which typhoid is carried—water, milk, flies, contact. Let us take them one by one.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman think this is the correction of a statement?

Mr. BLACK. I think it is a contradiction. This editor says that I am wrong, that there is no evidence that there is typhoid in the Ottawa water.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is not the time to discuss that question; there is nothing before the Chair. The hon. gentleman has risen to a question of privilege. If the hon. gentleman desires to correct a statement he must confine himself to that and not discuss typhoid at this stage.

Mr. BLACK. I do not want to discuss typhoid, but I want to show that I am correct with regard to typhoid in the Ottawa water.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point is not well taken at this stage because there is nothing before the Chair. When the hon. gentleman says that he will limit himself to a correction he should do so.

Mr. BLACK. Well, I am very sorry, but I think I have been greatly wronged here, and I want to make myself right. I do not want to break the rules of the House, but I want to make myself exactly right. The

'Citizen' says that I am wrong, and I am positive that I am right.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity when we move to go into Supply.

Mr. BLACK. All right.

NAVAL SERVICE EXPENDITURES.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) asked me the other day to comply with an order which had been passed by the House on the 5th December for a statement of the expenses in connection with the Naval Service. I may inform my hon. friend that the report which he is seeking was laid on the table of the House on the 16th December. I suppose the matter escaped his attention.

Mr. MONK. I got the report from Mr. Dubé upstairs that there had been no return to that order of the House, and that is why I asked the question.

Mr. BRODEUR. I see the following entry in the Votes and Proceedings of December 16, which I suppose covers the case:

Mr. Brodeur presented return to an order of the House of the 15th December, 1910, for a statement showing the detailed expenditure to date out of the sum voted by the House in connection wtih the new navy, giving in each case the amount paid, to whom paid and the object of the expenditure.

Mr. MONK. The report evidently has not been entered upstairs.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose the clerk will look after that.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if he has yet brought down the information I asked from him the other day—the minute of the Treasury Board of the 30th November, 1906, and the names of the component members of the board?

Mr. FIELDING. I gave directions to have that prepared. I will try to have it brought down to-day.

CORONATION CONTINGENT.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden). Perhaps I can do it better by reading the following despatch:

ABUSE OF PATRONAGE

Claimed in Connection With the Coronation Contingent.

Ottawa, Feb. 20.—(Special.)—Members of parliament are considerably aroused over what is claimed to be a shameful abuse of patronage in connection with the selection of the officers for the Canadian coronation contingent. About thirty officers are to be chosen, and in Toronto and other places the local patronage committees are dealing with the matter and passing their recommendations on to the Minister of Militia.

It is stated: 'Instead of a fine body of men chosen to represent Canada on their merits being sent to the coronation, faithful friends of the government will be among the elect.' Officers whose service and seniority entitle them to place are being ignored.

I do not know anything of the correctness of this report, but I thought I would give the minister an opportunity to deny it here.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Who sends the telegram?

Mr. BLAIN. It is a newspaper despatch; I will hand it over to my hon. friend.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. From what newspaper?

Mr. BLAIN. It is a despatch from Ottawa to Toronto 'World.'

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, from Ottawa! Mr. Speaker, a question was asked in the House by two or three hon. members as to the principle upon which the selection would be made for the coronation contingent. I answered the question very fully. As far as the selection of the men who will compose the contingent is concerned, they will be selected absolutely and entirely by the commanding officers of their respective corps from which the men are taken. There will be a proper percentage selected from every corps, or every regiment in the whole Dominion. No selection will be made from Ottawa; the headquarters' staff or the minister will have absolutely nothing to do with the selection. That is, as far as the non-commissioned officers and men are concerned. In so far as the officers are concerned, the principle upon which they are being selected is also laid down in the answer which I gave. No officers who have already attended a similar function, for instance, the coronation of 1902 and the jubilee of 1897, will be allowed to attend the coronation. Officers who have had war service and medals will be preferred. No officer will be allowed to serve in a rank junior to that in which he is serving in the militia. That is to say, no officer will be allowed to attend the coronation in a rank junior to his own if he is not within the age limit of that junior rank, the reason being that there are officers who are very keen to attend this function, who, being majors, we will say, or even lieutenant-colonels, would be quite willing to attend in a junior rank for the sake of going. We have made it a regulation that, say a major, will not be allowed to attend in any

rank junior to the rank of major unless he is within the age limit. For instance, it might be convenient to take a major as captain—the next rank below—but he would not be allowed to serve as captain unless he is within the age limit of a captain.

Mr. CARVELL. If a subordinate is willing to go as a sergeant, or even as a private, what would be the rule?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think that would be right. I do not think we should allow any commissioned officer to serve as a non-commissioned officer, or as a private; that is the position I have taken. Now, as regards this telegram, I can only say it is a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end; perhaps that is the best way to describe it. Whether Liberal committeees, or Conservative committees for that matter, may have met and passed resolutions; I do not know for a fact, although I do not think it is a fact. But if it were a fact I wish to say at once, Mr. Speaker, it would have no influence whatever on me. Regiments have met—one regiment of the city of Ottawa has indicated that they wish a certain officer to be taken if any officer is to go from that regiment. The officers of the 5th Royal Highlanders of Montreal have also met and selected an officer, and I would think, Mr. Speaker, that assuming the officer so selected came within the regulations, I should be under an obligation to accept that officer if any officer is to be taken from those regiments. I wish to say, if I may add a word, that the difficulty of the situation is very considerable. There are to be chosen 48 officers altogether, eight or ten of whom will necessarily be of the permanent force, so that there will be some thirty-eight officers to be chosen from the active militia of Canada, which comprises between 3,500 and 4,000 officers. There are something like 100 or 120 different military corps, regiments, squadrons, or units in the militia, so that on an average there will be one officer from every 3 or 4 corps.

Mr. BLAIN. Will there be representatives taken from each province?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. Is it the purpose to send a detachment of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There will be, as there was in 1902, a certain percentage of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police in the contingent, but that is being attended to by the department in charge. It is, perhaps, convenient for me to say now that the first thing we have to do is to carefully consider the relative number of the different branches of the service, cavalry, artillery, infantry and some of the minor services, and if possible, and so far as possible, to properly divide the contingent up according to strength among these different branches of the service. Then we have to consider provinces; every province in the Dominion must be represented by both officers and men. Some of the provinces may not be entitled to more than one officer, but every province will receive its fair share of representation among the commissioned officers, the non-commissioned officers and men. It is a difficult task. I am getting the best help I can from headquarters here and from other parts of the militia throughout the country to enable me to solve the difficulty fairly and with due regard to all interests, and also to enable Canada to present, on such a memorable occasion, a contingent which in every respect will be worthy the country it represents.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Have the commandants been selected? It is reported in the newspapers that Col. Woods and others have been selected?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The commandant is to be Col. McLean, a member of this House. No other selections have been absolutely determined. At an early date, perhaps when the militia estimates come up, I hope to be able to submit to the House at least a progress estimate as to what has been done.

Mr. DANIEL. If one of the officers of the contingent should be serving in a rank junior to that which he holds in the militia, what uniform will he wear in the contingent, that of his actual rank or that of the rank he is serving in?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is a question of detail which I would not like to answer, but as I understand it—I think it was done in 1902—an order in council will be passed appointing all the officers to this special service, so that I should think—although I speak now under correction—that the officer should wear the uniform of the rank in which he serves in the contingent.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). What will be the strength of the contingent?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think we are invited to send a contingent about 700 strong, which would, of course, include officers.

Mr. LAKE. Perhaps the Prime Minister would tell us now how many officers and men of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police will be sent on the contingent?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That has not yet been arranged.

RECIPROCITY AND THE FARMERS.

Mr. LENNOX. Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance to a statement appearing in the 'Globe' in reference to a meeting held recently at Woodstock, at which the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) spoke, and at which he was reported as saying:

He thought the manufacturers opposed reciprocity because of what might follow the thin edge of the wedge; but he had been assured by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding that nothing of the sort would follow. They had gone as far in the farmers' interests as they would.

I wish to ask the Prime Minister if it is correct that the hon. member who was speaking had been assured by him and by the Minister of Finance in the way the hon. member said, and, if so, is it a fact that the government have gone as far as they will go in the interests of the farmers? Is this to be considered as final as regards the representations made by the grain growers of the west, for instance, and is this the reason that the Prime Minister has prevented the further discussion of the motion made by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) in reference to a reduction of the duties on farming implements?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to say to my hon. friend, with regard to the latter part of his statement, that I have not prevented the hon. member for Portage la Prairie going on with his motion. It is on the Order Paper and is liable to be discussed if it is called again in the present session. With regard to the other question, I think my hon. friend had better wait until the hon. member for North Oxford is in his seat.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand that on one occasion, some time ago, perhaps for very good reasons, when the motion of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie was called, the right hon. the Prime Minister said, 'Stand.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is quite correct. On one occasion I did not see the hon. member for Portage la Prairie in his seat, though I was afterwards informed he was in his seat.

Mr. LENNOX. There can be no reason for letting my question stand so far as the assurances given by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance is concerned. He knows whether he gave that assurance or not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, but I do not know exactly what the hon. member for North Oxford said:

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Sterling Trust Company.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill No. (127) to incorporate the Capital Life Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Low.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

FISHING RIGHTS ON NELSON AND JAMES BAY.

*Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. When was the lease of fishing rights on Nelson river and James Bay granted to Markey?
2. What territory in square miles does it cover?
3. For how many years is it granted, and what is the annual rental?
4. What amounts have been expended for inspection?
5. What amounts have been collected from the lessee, year by year?
6. When did the Department of Marine and Fisheries determine to cancel said lease?
7. Why has it been transferred to the Department of Justice for decision?
8. When was Mr. Shepley retained to give an opinion re cancellation of said lease?
9. What will his probable fee be for such service?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH:

1. The lease of fishing privileges in the Nelson river was granted to Mr. Markey 19th April, 1904, and was on that date transferred to the British-American Fish Corporation, Limited. It did not embrace fishing privileges in James bay.
2. The area covered by the lease is the Nelson river and tributaries from West river to its mouth, the estuary of the Nelson from Cape Tatnam to Owl river, extending three miles from land; the Hayes river and tributaries, the portion of Pigeon river in Keewatin and Great Slave lake.
3. 21 years. $10 per annum.
4. The inspection has been made by the inspector of fisheries for the district. No separate statement of the cost of this particular work has been kept.
5. $10 up to the year 1910.
6. In September, 1908.
7. To take the necessary proceedings to bring about the cancellation of the lease.
8. No record was made of the date when Mr. Shepley was first consulted in the matter. It was in a personal interview between Mr. Shepley and the Minister of Jus-

tice, which took place some fifteen or sixteen months ago.

9. It will depend on the extent to which his services may be required.

NAVY REGULATIONS.

*Mr. MONK:

1. Has the government adopted regulations under the recent Navy Act passed by parliament?

2. If so, have the said regulations been printed for distribution?

3. Have said regulations been translated and printed?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. These regulations have been translated and have been printed and published in English and French in 'The Canada Gazette.' Booklets have been printed in English and French for distribution, embodying the regulations for joining the naval service, and for the entry to the naval college.

FAVOURED NATION TREATY.

*Mr. EDWARDS:

In addition to the following countries, viz.: Argentine Republic, Austria-Hungary, Bolivia, Columbia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Venezuela, that will have the same privileges as the United States in importing goods into Canada, as stated by the honourable the Minister of Finance, in answer to question on February 23, 1911, what other British possessions or dominions will have the same rights on account of their coming under the Favoured Nation Treaty or their being British possessions?

Mr. FIELDING. All British countries, without exception, where they are not already in the enjoyment of similar concessions through the operation of the French Convention Act, or where they are not enjoying the more favourable rates of the British preferential tariff, under section 3 of the Customs Tariff Act, will receive the benefit of the reductions proposed in the agreement with the United States.

QUEBEC BRIDGE.

* Mr. LENNOX:

1. Referring to the item of about $7,000,000, stated by the minister as the cost of the fallen Quebec bridge, how did the government finance this expenditure?

2 If by loans, at what dates, for what sums, at what rates of interest, and at what cost for placing the loans?

3. How are the interest charges met?

4. What amount has been charged up as interest on the above sum since the above return?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. When the bridge was taken over by the government from the Quebec Bridge company, the funds required, were provided out of the general consolidated fund of Canada.

2 and 3. No special loans were made on account of the bridge.

4. No amount.

ST GABRIEL DE STRATFORD WHARF.

* Mr. MONK:

1. Has the contract been awarded for the construction of a wharf at St. Gabriel de Stratford, in the province of Quebec? If so, to whom?

2. How many tenders were received, from what parties and at what amounts?

3. Is the contract signed, and at what figure?

4. Does the contract contain a fair wage clause or schedule?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes, to McLaughlin Brothers, Ottawa.

2. 11 tenders were received.

McLaughlin Brothers, Ottawa, Ontario, $5,975; Leacey, W. M., Prescott, Ontario, $6,370; Bridge & Wharf Builder Company, Montreal, Quebec, $6,484.37; Carbonneau, C. W., Sorel, Quebec, $6,500; Crombie, Reginald H., Montreal, $6,832; Fortin, Louis, Lac Weedon, P.Q., $7,075; Phillips, G. R., Cornwall, Ontario, $7,375; Morin, Edmond & Leblanc Frs., Lac Weedon, P.Q., $7,750; Begin, O., & Begin, D., Disraeli, Quebec, $8,350; Beauchemin, L. A., Sorel, Quebec, $9,400; Levesque, Michel (Stratford Centre, Quebec), $14,500.

3. Yes, for $5,975.

4. Yes.

MARIEVILLE POST OFFICE.

* Mr. MONK:

1. Has the government purchased a site for a new post office at Marieville, county of Rouville, province of Quebec?

2. If so, from whom was said site purchased, at what price and what are its dimensions?

3. Was there a valuation made of said site and by whom?

4. What is the municipal valuation of the said property?

5. Upon whose report was the property purchased?

6. Was any order in council passed in regard to said purchase? If so, at what date?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes.

2. From corporation of town of Marieville, for $1,500, is 84 feet on Dupont by 61 on Ste. Marie street.

3 & 5. Site was purchased on the report of an agent of the department, who personally visited Marieville and inspected and valued the property.

4. Not assessed.
6. Yes, on 19th June, 1908.

MILITIA SUPPLIES.

Mr. CROSBY:

1. Is it the intention of the Militia Department to call for tenders for all supplies required for the incoming year?
2. If so, is it intended to have the different tenders for the different supplies separated as much as possible in order that the person to supply the goods may be able to tender for that portion which they themselves produce or manufacture?
3. When will the tenders be asked for?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1 & 2. Tenders for provisions, supplies and barrack services for the permanent force, for the 12 months beginning April 1, 1911, have already been called for in the usual way; the only change in the procedure being that arrangements are being made to procure the supply of tea and coffee required from wholesale dealers or importers, instead of from retailers as before; and that the supply of yeast required is to be obtained from the manufacturers, instead of from retailers.

3. Tenders for supplies for the permanent force were called for some weeks ago. Tenders for supplies for the various camps of instruction will be invited from time to time during the spring and summer. The dates have not yet been fixed, either for the camps themselves or for the calling of tenders therefor.

DECORATION OF BUILDINGS DURING EUCHARISTIC CONFERENCE.

Mr. BEST:

1. How many buildings were decorated during the time of the Eucharistic Congress at the expense of this government?
2. Who asked for the decorations and by whom was it granted?
3. If any were decorated, what was the total cost to the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Two.
2. (a) Minister of Marine and Fisheries.
(b) Deputy Minister Public Works, and chief architect.
3. $480.

MUTILATION OF MAILS, DELAYS IN DEAD LETTER BRANCH.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. Has the government ever tried using elastic bands instead of string to hold bundles of letters together, in outside offices? If so, with what success, and if not, why not?
2. Has the government recently investigated the carriage of mail matter between Kingston and Ottawa? If so, what irregularities have been found as to delays in transmission of mail, irregular delivery at Ottawa, and careless handling of His Majesty's mail?
3. If this investigation has not been made, why not, and will the government institute an immediate investigation into these complaints?
4. Has the government inquired into the cause of delay in returning letters sent to the dead letter office, and have instructions been given to return them more promptly to the owner?
5. Does the government make frequent tests of the tensile strength of the paper out of which the mutilated envelopes, sent in along with complaints, are made?
6. Does the government make inquiry into all the complaints received regarding mutilated envelopes? If so, what action is taken to improve the system?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. No. It has never seemed a necessity to do so, as tying them with twine has been an absolute success, and is in use in every postal country in the world. Elastic bands after being once or twice used could not be relied upon, owing to the loss of elasticity, and would be of no use in keeping letters together. The use of elastic bands would, as compared with the cotton twine now specially manufactured for the purpose, immensely enhance the cost of the transmission of the mails, since, in addition to the perishability of the bands, a large variety, as regards size, thickness and width, would be required to be held in stock at every post office. Moreover, no complaint has been made throughout the whole of Canada, except by the one business firm.

2 and 3. The department has no reason to believe that other than the schedule time is required for the transmission of mail matter between Kingston and Ottawa. A search of the departmental records covering a period of one year, however, reveals the fact that three complaints were received from the E. B. Eddy Company, Limited, Hull, respecting delay in the transmission of their correspondence between Kingston and Ottawa, and investigation showed that in only two of the cases was delay attributable to the postal service. The first case concerned a letter mailed at Kingston on the evening of Friday, the 25th of November, and which, it was stated did not reach the addressees until Monday, the 28th of November. In some way or other this letter was missent upon the mail clerk of Ottawa and Calumet, and if Sunday had not intervened, delivery could have been effected one day earlier. The second case referred to a letter mailed at Kingston on the 22nd December, and said not to have been received until the morning of the 24th. Careful inquiry failed to locate responsibility, but it should be pointed out that this alleged delay occurred during the extraordinary pressure of work consequent upon the Christmas season when the mail service was naturally somewhat

congested with the enormous quantity of matter in course of transmission. The final case related to a letter posted at Kingston at 6 p.m. on the 27th of December, and received by the addressees at 11 a.m. on the 28th. No delay occurred in this instance and the complainants were so advised.

4. The department has no reason to believe that there is any avoidable delay in the disposal of mail matter received at the dead letter office. The matter was very fully taken up with the dead letter office less than a month ago, and every possible effort is being made to secure promptness in the return of dead letters.

5. No. The complaints which have been received in regard to this matter have been exclusively from one source. In this case, the company in question make use of envelopes which are much larger than those usually employed besides being of a more or less brittle character. The consequence is that the damage complained of is probably due as much to the unusual size of the envelope as the character of the paper of which it is made.

6. Careful investigation is always made into each complaint, and when it is ascertained that the irregularities complained of could be properly charged against the postal service, steps are taken to prevent their recurrence.

DIXON POST OFFICE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. Is the Postmaster General in possession of affidavits of sixteen responsible persons from the locality of Dixon, Ontario, affirming that after the resignation of the postmaster of the Dixon post office in 1907, the office was for several months temporarily located on a site at the factory corner, a few rods east of old site of 30 years standing, viz.: at factory corner, of excellent convenience to the general public, and from thence transferred to the present location, a distance of over one-half a mile away, out in the country, where it is giving no extended accommodation to a single individual outside the regular post office patrons?

2. Is the Postmaster General also in possession of additional affidavits from six responsible persons residing at the east of this section contiguous to Northfield Station post office testifying that the Dixon post office has always been their office, and if located at the business centre of village would be far more convenient for them than Northfield Station post office, as Dixon is their business centre?

3. Is the Postmaster General in receipt of two petitions signed by over three-fourths of the people of the locality of Dixon respectfully asking that their post office be transferred to the proposed site, viz.: at factory corner, on the ground that the inconvenience to the general public due directly to the present location of said office is in the ratio of at the very least calculation, five to one?

4. Has there been a loss of revenue to the Post Office Department by said transfer? If so, how much?

5. Is the Postmaster General in receipt also of the report of the assistant post office inspector, Mr. Coolican, in regard to this matter corroborating the statements contained within the above-mentioned affidavits?

6. If these allegations should be correct, will the Postmaster General restore to the people of Dixon their rights of a centrally located post office?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Yes. An affidavit to this effect, signed by sixteen persons, was received.

2. Yes. An affidavit to this effect, signed by six persons, was received.

3. Two petitions were received asking for the removal of the post office to the proposed site. A petition was also received asking for its removal to the present location.

4. There has been a diminution of $22.75 in the revenue of the office. But the revenue of this office has varied considerably during the past few years, and the decrease in revenue is not necessarily due to the change in location.

5. The post office inspector's report does not support the statements contained in the above affidavit. On the contrary, the inspector stated that 'the present site of the Dixon post office is as near the geographical centre of the district it is intended to serve as it is possible to get.' The inspector further reported that many of the names on the petition for the proposed change were those of persons who received their mail at the neighbouring post office at Northfield station.

6. It is not considered advisable to make any further change in the location of the office.

MR. JOHN JARDINE.

Mr. BARNARD:

1. Referring to question and answer re Mr. John Jardine, set out in column 3926 of Unrevised Hansard, did Mr. Jardine receive any money for work in excess of what he was authorized to do? If so, how much?

2. Was such money paid to or received by said Jardine without the knowledge of the government, as stated in said extract?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1 and 2. Mr. Jardine was paid for all work done by him which exceeded by $4,986.77 the amount he was instructed by the department's resident architect at Victoria to do. He was paid by the department on accounts duly certified and sent in by the resident architect out of the general vote for Williams Head quarantine station for the fiscal year 1908-9.

IMPORTS OF BUTTER AND EGGS.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. How many packages of butter have been imported into Canada during the months of

October, November and December of 1910, and for the month of January, 1911?

2. What was the weight and value thereof, and the countries from which it was imported?

3. What was the number of dozens of eggs imported during the same months, the value thereof and the countries exporting same?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The number of packages of butter imported into Canada are not recorded in statistics, the quantity in 'pounds' simply being shown.

2. The quantity and value of butter imported into Canada, by countries, during the months of October, November and December of 1910, and the month of January, 1911, were as follows.

—	Countries.	Pounds.	Value.
			$
October, 1910...	Great Britain....	201	31
	United States...	5,496	1,707
November, 1910.	Italy	213	71
	United States...	3,917	1,161
December, 1910.	Australia	72,800	17,219
	New Zealand ...	19,600	4,815
	United States...	5,563	1,453
January, 1911...	Great Britain....	19,333	4,776
	Australia	101,920	23,957
	New Zealand....	115,800	30,175
	Asia, Turkey in..	142	33
	United States...	2,132	640

3. The quantity and value of eggs imported into Canada by countries, during the months of October, November and December, 1910, and the month of January, 1911, was as follows:

—	Countries.	Dozens.	Value.
			$
October, 1910...	Hong Kong.....	2,855	121
	China	1,075	53
	United States...	14,056	4,994
November, 1910.	Hong Hong. ...	4,290	273
	China	1,930	114
	Germany.....	24,000	3,942
	United States...	26,440	8,159
December, 1910..	Great Britain ...	12,000	2,117
	Hong Hong.....	10,966	977
	China	10,450	2,118
	Germany.....	12,000	1,971
	United States...	41,930	11,922
January, 1911...	Great Britain ...	40	11
	Hong Hong.....	4,704	219
	China	10,485	2,364
	Germany.....	12,000	1,971
	United States....	165,026	36,622

'REXALL.'

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Has the United Drug Company of New York obtained or applied for registration under the name of 'Rexall' or registration of the name 'Rexall' in the Dominion of Canada?

2. Is it a fact, as alleged, that this company has been refused registration in the United States?

3. Does the government propose to grant registration to this company in Canada?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. The United Drug Company of New York has not obtained or applied for registration under the name of 'Rexall,' as there is no statute of the Dominion of Canada providing for the registration of such a company. The word 'Rexall' was registered as a general trade mark on the 21st April, 1903, in the name of Nelson Burgess and Henry Edwin Hill of Toronto, Ontario. It now stands in the name of the United Drug Company of Boston, Massachusetts.

2. The government has no information on this question.

3. Answered by No. 1.

CLEARANCE OF CANADIAN VESSELS.

Mr. LANCASTER:

1. Is it possible, under existing regulations, for a citizen of the United States of America to clear a Canadian vessel at a Canadian custom house?

2. If so, what are the regulations governing such a clearance?

Mr. PATERSON. The reports of vessels at the Custom House are usually made inwards and outwards by the masters of such vessels. The following provisions, however, respecting reports by the purser of coastwise steamers are contained in the Coasting Trade General Regulations, approved by order in council, April 17, 1883:

Sec. 13. The reports inwards and outwards coastwise required by these regulations may, in the case of any steam vessel carrying a purser be signed by such purser, with the like effect in all respects, and subject to the like penalty on the purser, and the like forfeiture of the goods, in case of any untrue statement, or violation of customs laws as if the report was signed by the master; and the word 'master' for the purposes of these regulations shall be construed as including the purser of any steam vessel; but nothing herein contained shall preclude the collector or proper officer of customs from calling upon the master of any steam vessel to answer all such questions concerning the vessel, passengers, cargo and crew, as might be lawfully demanded of him if the report had been made by him, or to exempt the master from the penalties imposed by these regulations for failure to answer any such questions or for answering untruly or to prevent the master from making such report, if he shall see fit to do so.

Under this section, if the purser were a citizen of the United States, he could sign these reports.

POST OFFICE AND CUSTOMS REVENUES.

Mr. MACDONELL:

What was the Post Office revenue and the Customs revenue, respectively, for the years from 1906 to 1910, inclusive, for the cities of Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw?

Mr. MURPHY:

Postal Revenue:

—	Montreal.	Toronto.	Moosejaw.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1906	906,140 30	1,194,382 16	12,708 32
1907	660,317 61	998,951 09	*14,581 45
1908	938,936 53	1,478,195 66	22,819 61
1909	963,729 22	1,513,310 52	25,601 51
1910	1,063,228 35	1,709,493 34	33,307 73

* 9 months.

Customs Revenue:

—	Montreal.	Toronto and West Toronto.	Moosejaw.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1906	13,226,219 72	9,566,250 86	24,094 05
1907	11,404,462 25	8,101,233 45	21,091 74
1908	16,371,967 24	11,279,843 25	40,877 81
1909	12,872,481 23	9,553,880 12	47,220 89
1910	16,268,416 51	12,517,244 18	79,996 27

The figures for 1907 are for a period of nine months only.

ALGOMA TIMBER PERMITS.

Mr. BOYCE:

What amount of dues were paid to the Department of Indian Affairs for timber cut in the township of Laird, district of Algoma, during the year 1910, and upon what quantity of timber was the same paid?

Mr. OLIVER:

No dues have yet been received by the department for timber cut in the township of Laird, for 1910. Sworn returns of last season's operations by the licensee have not, so far, been received by the department.

WEST INDIES STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. CROSBY:

1. What arrangements are being made, if any, for steamship communication between Halifax and the West Indies?

2. As the present contract expires shortly, when will the tenders be asked for the new service?

3. What specifications will be placed before the public regarding boats for the service?

4. What will their passenger accommodation and freight capacity require to be, and what will be the speed required of the boats?

5. Has the government decided whether we are to have a weekly or tri-weekly service instead of the present service?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. The government is awaiting a call for tenders which the British government, who pay half the subsidy, has informed the Canadian government will be issued simultaneously in the United Kingdom, Canada and the British West Indies.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3 & 4. Adequate passenger and freight accommodation will be required, and tenders, including speed, will be considered upon their respective merits.

5. Alternative tenders will be asked as to frequency of the proposed new service.

IMPORTS OF COAL AND COKE.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. What are the quantities and values, respectively, of the several classes of coal and coke imported into Canada from the United States in each of the years since 1894 and up to the present date?

2. What were the rate of duties imposed by Canada on the several classes, respectively, in each of said years?

Mr. PATERSON:

1 & 2. The quantity and value of coal and coke imported into Canada from the United States, together with the rates of duty imposed thereon, during the fiscal years from 1894 to 1910 was as follows:

Year.	Bituminous, Round.			Bituminous, Slack.		
	Quantity.	Value.	Rate of Duty. ton.	Quantity.	Value.	Rate of Duty.
			$ cts.			p. c.
1894	1,330,155	3,228,551	0 60	111,675	43,399	20
1895	1,547,057	3,545,523	0 60	145,145	38,019	20
1896	1,635,114	3,520,499	0 60	181,943	42,323	20
1897	1,630,250	3,408,483	0 53	190,901	39,650	20 p.c. but not over 13c. ton
1898	1,876,020	3,480,617	0 53	201,010	29,251	"
1899	2,123,112	3,609,389	0 53	271,631	37,978	"
1900	2,891,443	4,410,140	0 53	322,098	84,241	"
1901	2,649,768	5,191,623	0 53	400,389	258,051	"
1902	3,204,627	5,924,670	0 53	469,568	234,559	"
1903	3,642,296	7,803,648	0 53	552,175	434,225	"
1904	4,252,333	9,416,974	0 53	596,216	548,257	"
1905	4,424,179	8,741,748	0 53	614,429	334,300	"
1906	4,742,485	8,748,496	0 53	750,489	492,381	"
1907	4,081,682	8,040,285	0 53	635,726	571,499	14c. per ton.
1908	7,220,672	14,895,111	0 53	1,236,503	1,400,791	14c. "
1909	6,036,621	12,072,252	0 53	1,083,207	1,335,190	14c. "
1910	6,745,967	12,901,418	0 53	1,291,573	1,522,077	14c. "

Year.	Anthracite Coal.			Coke.		
	Quantity.	Value.	Rate of Duty ton.	Quantity.	Value.	Rate of Duty.
1894	1,527,252	6,343,500	Free	39,969	168,892	50c. a ton to
1895	1,397,287	5,333,971	"	42,472	146,256	March 28,
1896	1,570,014	5,656,572	"	60,025	201,835	then free.
1897	1,457,262	5,695,088	"	75,854	228,712	Free.
1898	1,460,701	5,847,685	"	134,489	344,694	"
1899	1,745,332	6,490,147	"	138,717	355,883	"
1900	1,654,401	6,602,912	"	187,665	505,712	"
1901	1,919,841	7,871,406	"	308,743	679,915	"
1902	1,652,451	7,021,939	"	244,975	775,774	"
1903	1,394,675	6,683,649	"	241,085	1,152,287	"
1904	2,261,607	10,409,867	"	214,177	743,683	"
1905	2,584,338	12,011,862	"	368,863	799,329	"
1906	2,152,616	10,141,350	"	474,208	1,280,064	"
1907	1,991,926	9,405,230	"	392,941	1,087,955	"
1908	3,056,600	14,064,434	"	616,015	2,147,781	"
1909	3,022,970	13,886,861	"	456,591	1,072,853	"
1910	3,113,860	14,300,304	"	700,081	1,689,938	"

CANADIAN COASTING ACT.

Mr. CROSBY:

With regard to the new Canadian Coasting Act which comes into force the beginning of next year, whereby no foreign vessels are allowed to trade between Canadian ports, is there any possibility or expectation of this law being changed, or is it to be carried into effect without any alteration, so that only vessels of British register and carrying British flags shall be allowed to enter our interprovincial coastwise trade on and after the expiration of the present time allowed?

Mr. PATERSON:

The government has not decided whether to take action or not in regard to the opening of the coasting trade in part to foreign vessels after 31st December, 1911.

Mr. PATERSON.

OTTAWA TYPHOID AND SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron):

Is there any truth in the rumour that on account of the fearful epidemic of typhoid fever now prevailing in Ottawa and the consequent danger to the lives and the health of the members of parliament, their families and others, the government intend in the near future to prorogue parliament and afterwards to call a short summer session after the coronation for the purpose of finishing the public business?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Everybody in this city is aware that the epidemic of typhoid which has prevailed here for some time past appears to be not abating but rather spreading and increasing. The gov-

ernment, however, have seen no reason, so far, why they should adopt such an extreme course as to prorogue or even adjourn parliament. But, of course, we do not know what will take place in the future; and if such a contingency should arise we will be guided largely by the views of members of this House.

ANIMAL INDUSTRY IN CANADA.

Mr. MAGRATH moved:

For a copy of all reports, data, statistics, documents, papers and information of every kind and description in the possession of the Department of Agriculture or of any department of the government touching the animal products of Canada, the packing industry, the meat trade, the advantages of a well organized system of cold storage and refrigeration, and generally touching all matters connected with the development and improvement of the animal industry in Canada.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Magrath) spoke to me a few minutes ago. I had explained to him that this was a very comprehensive and omnibus motion and that it would take a very long time to obtain the information called for. He said he would be glad to confer with me and explain what he needed. On these conditions, I should be glad to have the motion adopted.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of the order in council appointing or providing for the appointment of the engineers to prepare and determine upon plans and specifications and superintend the construction of the Quebec bridge, and of all instructions, correspondence, writings and documents in connection with these appointments, including the two additional engineers; and also a copy of any subsequent orders in council, or any instructions, correspondence, &c., relating to the refusal of any of the engineers to act, or continue in office, or the retirement, or substitution of engineers. —Mr. Lennox.

For a copy of the report of the engineers who investigated over-classification, over-break or other alleged over-allowances on progress or final estimate on the eastern division of the Transcontinental railway, the evidence taken, or other data collected, and of all letters, instructions, agreements, plans, drawings, photographs, memoranda and writings sent, given, had or used in connection with said investigation, not already brought down, together with a reference to the previous return where papers are already down; also a copy of the previous report made by Messrs. Schreiber, Kelliher and Lumsden; immediately before Mr. Lumsden's resignation.—Mr. Lennox.

Copy of all papers, reports of appraiser, letters and correspondence relating to the appraising and passing the customs of the vessel 'Wanda,' owned by one William R. Travers, Toronto, on the 20th October, 1909.—Mr. Sharpe (Ontario.)

SUPPLY—HAGUE ARBITRATION; ATLANTIC FISHERIES.

House resumed the debate on motion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Mr. Speaker, resuming the adjourned debate on the question raised by my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson), let me say at once that I find no fault with the hon. gentleman for bringing this question before the House. It is certainly an important question, and, under the circumstances, perhaps it is advisable that the matter should be discussed. At the same time, it must be admitted that there is great difficulty in discussing a question which may be, later on, the subject of further negotiations between Great Britain, on behalf of Canada, and the United States. In such a discussion, views might be expressed that would later on impair the value of negotiations. Consequently, perhaps, it would be better that parliament should refrain as much as possible from discussing such questions. But in such discussions, we should certainly eliminate considerations of party advantage. These international questions are of such importance that the country should be a unit upon them. If it were found that great differences of opinion existed between members of this House upon questions which may be the subject of future negotiations, the freedom of negotiation would be impaired. My hon. friend from Digby and my hon. friend from South Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) have thought fit to bring into the discussion questions of party politics. I am extremely sorry that such a thing should have been done. I may be in a position, later on, to show that, so far as the government is concerned there is certainly no responsibility, because what has been done has been done in such a way that the government could not be held responsible. If hon. members opposite find it prudent to discuss the question from the party point of view, I would call their attention to the fact that this question of the Bay of Fundy was practically settled by the treaty of 1888, which was negotiated by Sir Charles Tupper, who was at one time leader of the Conservative party and thought fit to exclude the Bay of Fundy from the effect of the treaty.

Now, Sir, my hon. friends opposite have found it advisable to discuss the part taken by the Minister of Justice in connection with the settlement of this question, and of other questions which were settled by the

Hague Tribunal. The hon. the Minister of Justice, along with the British Ambassador, had charge of those negotiations, and I think the success which Canada has achieved before that tribunal shows that very great credit is due to the Minister of Justice for the work he performed in relation thereto. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson) and my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) have said that the Minister of Justice had gone up and down the country giving lectures upon this question. That is quite true, but it was not done at the initiative of the Minister of Justice himself, but in obedience to invitations from clubs and public bodies to discuss these important national questions. He could not do otherwise, under the circumstances. The facts that he brought out in those addresses have given us more information upon the subject than the community generally was aware of. It is certainly unfair to disparage the work which has been done by the Minister of Justice in connection with the Atlantic fisheries. He devoted many months to that work, not only in the preliminary negotiations, but in the preparation of the case, and in the conduct of the case after the matter was brought before the court at the Hague. I think Canada must feel great satisfaction in the fact that we have won on the two most important points submitted to that tribunal, namely, our right to legislate with regard to the treaty coast, and on the question of the bays. When I was in Washington the other day with the Minister of Justice I was able to observe the high opinion which is entertained of him by the representatives of the United States government, and the respect which they have for his legal attainments. His opinion is regarded there, as it is regarded here, as that of a gentleman of the highest legal ability.

Now, Sir, my hon. friend from Cape Breton has thought proper to introduce into the discussion a letter which was written by Mr. Ewart some time ago, and which was published in the newspapers. Mr. Ewart thought that the construction which was put upon his letter was not an accurate one, and when he knew that this debate had been adjourned, he called upon me and asked me if I would be kind enough to read before the House a letter which he gave me. I will read the letter, because I think it is only fair to the Minister of Justice, and to Mr. Ewart also, that it should go upon the 'Hansard'.

March 4, 1911.

Dear Mr. Brodeur,—Mr. Maddin is quite mistaken in his belief that my letter 'was evoked, by the fact that the minister had gone up and down this country, speaking before the Canadian Club, before the Bar Association, in this House on December 2, last, and in Halifax during the Christmas holidays, lauding men who were not entitled to his laudation,' etc. It was written, as it says, because of newspaper statements.

I was present at the Canadian Club luncheon, at which Sir Allen spoke and afterwards I thanked him for his kind reference to my work, saying that he had been 'altogether too generous'—meaning that while he had praised my work in connection with the preparation of the case, he had said nothing as to his own, in connection with the diplomatic side of it. So far from objecting to his addresses in Halifax and Toronto, I was aware of his invitations to those places and I ventured to offer him some suggestions that might be useful to him.

And it is not the fact that I am in the least envious of Sir Allen's praise of Sir William Robson's work. I doubt if language could be found which would fully express my own admiration of it, and, I may add, of the work of Sir Robert Finlay. I envy the force and style of those men and not any encomiums which their merits have brought them.

I am, dear Mr. Brodeur,
Yours sincerely,

JOHN S. EWART.

Now, Sir, in the discussion which has taken place on this question, some disparaging remarks have been made in reference to the part which Mr. Bryce, the British ambassador, has taken in matters in dispute between Canada and the United States. I am extremely sorry that anything should have been said in this House underestimating the value of the co-operation which Mr. Bryce has given to the Canadian government. Not only in this instance, but in all other disputes between the two countries. Mr. Bryce has performed services of very great value to Canada, and not only to Canada, but to the whole British Empire. Mr. Bryce, on account of his famous book on the American commonwealth, in which he described so accurately the institutions of the United States, was in a high degree persona grata to the people of the United States. I may say, however, that when Mr. Bryce was first appointed British ambassador at Washington, there was some feeling among certain classes in Canada that he was likely to be too favourably disposed towards the United States. That feeling, I can assure the House, was not at all shared by the Canadian government, but it is a fact that some feeling of that kind did exist in certain sections of this country. I am glad to say now that this feeling has entirely disappeared, and it is now recognized on all hands that Mr. Bryce has succeeded in bringing about more cordial and friendly relations, not only between the United States and Canada, but between the United States and Great Britain. He has succeeded in maintaining harmoniously both Canadian and British interests, and I may say that he has come to be regarded even as the ambassador of Canada. Some time ago we were glad to see him visit this country, in order to get acquainted with our people and with our institutions, to

inform himself upon public questions, in order that he might be more useful in aiding to settle the issues between the two nations. His visits to Ottawa have been fruitful in that respect, and I hope we will often have an opportunity of seeing Ambassador Bryce in this country. The effort to disparage the work which has been done by Mr. Bryce since he has been the British ambassador at Washington is certainly unfair to him when we consider what he has accomplished while he has filled that important position. He was appointed in 1908. I find that since that time no less than ten treaties which concerned Canada and the United States have been negotiated by Mr. Bryce. These treaties are as follows:

1. General arbitration treaty 4th April, 1908.
2. Protection of food fishes, 11th April, 1908.
3. Demarcation of boundaries, 11th April, 1908.
4. Conveyance of prisoners, 18th May, 1908.
5. Reciprocity in towing and wrecking, 18th May, 1908.
6. Boundary waters, 11th May, 1908.
7. North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration, 27th January, 1909.
8. Passamaquoddy Bay boundary 1st May, 1910.
9. Pecuniary claims, 18th August, 1910.

Then there is the agreement which was made the other day when my hon. colleague the Minister of Justice and myself were in Washington, to settle the legality of the legislation which has been passed by the Canadian parliament concerning fisheries on the Atlantic coast. There is also the treaty with reference to pelagic sealing. I do not know whether that treaty has yet been signed, but it is certainly to be signed in a few days, if not already signed. Every hon. member of this House knows that the North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration Treaty, signed on the 27th January, 1909, made provision for the settlement of a difficulty which has been existing between the two countries for nearly a century. So, Mr. Speaker, within a period of a little more than two years, Mr. Bryce has been able to settle all of these outstanding difficulties, some of which were in existence for many years and, under these circumstances, I say that it is unfair to disparage the work which has been carried on by him.

Mr. MADDIN. If I have the permission of the minister, I would like to say there was no observation made from this side of the House on Friday afternoon last disparaging to the British ambassador or casting any reflection upon him whatsoever. He will read 'Hansard' in vain to find any reflection. But, it was pointed out from this side of the House that the Canadian government had the right to confirm any contract which was submitted to the tribunal, and that this government in ratifying that contract or agreement, or in failing to ratify it, had neglected the rights of the Atlantic fishermen, and we cast the responsibility upon this government and not upon the British ambassador.

Mr. BRODEUR. There were some things with which the government had not a great deal to do which were brought before the House the other day, but I am very glad to see that my hon. friend states formally that they did not intend to disparage the work which was done by Mr. Bryce. But, there were some references made to a mysterious subsequent agreement which was made by Mr. Bryce. It was stated in another part of the discussion that it was strange that with the documents brought down in February no reference had been made to a subsequent mysterious understanding. It was stated again that there was a mysterious understanding and these statements were made in such a way that I thought they were to be construed as disparaging to a certain extent the work that had been done by Mr. Bryce. I am very glad to hear my hon. friend declare formally that he did not intend to do anything of the kind. It was stated in connection with this matter that the proceedings of the United States Senate were held in camera. The treaty-making power in the United States, as my hon. friend must know, is not vested in the King with the advice of his ministers as it is in Canada or Great Britain, but is vested in the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate. The treaty-making power which exists there is the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate. When the Senate of the United States acts in its executive capacity its sittings are always secret. That is a well recognized fact and nobody can dispute it. The United States Senate while acting in its executive capacity and sitting in secret, simply acts in the same way as the Privy Council in Canada or in England would. So that, when my hon. friend the member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) referred to these proceedings being carried on in camera he was stating what no doubt was true, but he was merely stating the procedure which obtains in connection with the negotiations of this kind.

My hon. friend was surprised that there were some notes or modalities attached to the treaty of the 27th of January, 1909, which were not embodied in the treaty. My hon. friend must be aware that this is the procedure which is followed in many instances. He quoted extensively from the Appendix to the Case presented on the part of the government of His Britannic Majesty before the Hague Tribunal. He will find on page 11 of this same book the modal-

ities or notes which had been exchanged between the contracting parties, but which were not included formally in the treaty itself. It very often happens in these negotiations that these notes are not included in the treaty, but form part of what we call modalities.

Mr. JAMESON. Is the note exchanged between Mr. Bryce and Mr. Root of the 27th January, 1909, to which I referred included and printed in the case which he has in his hand?

Mr. BRODEUR. I see it is not printed, and I do not know whether there has ever been any such document exchanged. From reading over the documents which we have before us I get the impression that no such note was exchanged between Mr. Bryce and Mr. Root on the 27th January, 1909. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has stated the circumstances under which that agreement came to be made, and I do not know why I should not immediately discuss this point. In negotiating the treaty they came to the discussion of the merits of question number five which was as to whether the three marine miles should be measured from headland to headland of bays and whether the Bay of Fundy should be included. Mr. Root, as has been stated by the Minister of Justice, took very strong ground and said:

> Nothing in that submission is to affect one way or the other the position of the Bay of Fundy or what is termed, innocent passage through the Gut of Canso.

That, as the hon. Minister of Justice says, was made a sine qua non by the United States of the reference to arbitration.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that an exact statement by Mr. Root, and if so from what source is he quoted?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is from a statement made by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Marine did not read it from any document?

Mr. BRODEUR. I was reading an extract from the speech of the Minister of Justice reported in 'Hansard.'

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a mere matter of memory or is it a matter of record?

Mr. BRODEUR. The Minister of Justice informs me that in the first draft the Bay of Fundy was specially mentioned excluding it, and then that a formal understanding was arrived at that the arbitration would not affect the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a matter of record?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I explained on Friday night the position of matters in that regard, saying that according to my best recollection the very first draft agreement to refer to the arbitration contained a separate clause that nothing in connection with the arbitration was to affect the rights of the United States in the Bay of Fundy. That clause always thereafter appeared in each subsequent draft. When it came to be a matter of settling the final details I did not like the language of the clause and I made the suggestion myself that the same purpose could be effected by an interchange of notes between the parties. That course was accordingly taken.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is abundantly clear that the exclusion of the Bay of Fundy was not a question for which this government is responsible, but was a condition sine qua non set up by the United States government before entering the arbitration.

Mr. JAMESON. We have not yet cleared up the question in regard to this note of January 27, 1909.

Mr. BRODEUR. So far as the Minister of Justice remembers there was no formal note exchanged on that date.

Mr. JAMESON. The minister seems to think I have spoken of the absence of this note, or the non production of it as being suspicious. Perhaps he did not mean that, but that was the tenor of his remarks. I wish to say that if he has not the note before him I would refer him to a mention of it in a letter from Mr. Bryce to Mr. Bacon, dated March 4, 1909. Just read what is said by Mr. Bryce in that note:

Mr. BRODEUR. I will come to that in a minute.

Mr. JAMESON. Would it be convenient to refer to it now; the minister does not appear to have seen the reference?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have.

Mr. JAMESON. That is clear evidence that there is a note of that date.

Mr. BRODEUR. Before we come to the 4th of March; let us see what was done after January 27, 1909. There was a draft signed between Mr. Root and Mr. Bryce, but of course that did not make the treaty effective because under the constitution of the United States a treaty must be assented to by the Senate which in that respect discharges executive functions. The United States Senate did approve of this treaty but with the condition that the Bay of Fundy should be excluded from the consideration of the tribunal; and on that point I refer to a letter sent by Mr. Bacon to Mr. Bryce, which has not yet been read to the House, but which is to be found in

the appendix to the case of the United States, and which reads:

Department of State, Feb. 21, 1909.

Excellency, I have the honour to inform you that the Senate, by its resolution of the 18th inst. gave its advice and consent to the ratification of the special agreement between the United States and Great Britain, signed on January 27, 1909, for the submission to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at the Hague of questions relating to fisheries on the North Atlantic coast.

In giving this advice and consent to the ratification of the special agreement, and as a part of the act of ratification, the Senate states in the resolution its understanding:

That it is agreed by the United States and Great Britain that question 5 of the series submitted, namely,'from where must be measured the three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbours referred to in said article,' does not include any question as to the Bay of Fundy considered as a whole apart from its bays or creeks or as to innocent passage through the Cut of Canso, and that the respective views or contentions of the United States and Great Britain on either subject shall be in no wise prejudiced by anything in the present arbitration, and that this agreement on the part of the United States will be mentioned in the ratification of the special agreement and will in effect, form part of this special agreement.

In thus formally confirming what I stated to you orally, I have the honour to express the hope that you will in like manner formally confirm the assent of His Majesty's government to this understanding which you heretofore stated to me orally, and that you will be prepared at an early day to exchange the notes confirming the special agreement as provided for therein and in the general arbitration convention of June 5, 1908.

I have the honour to be, with the highest consideration, your excellency's most obedient servant,

ROBERT BACON.

His Excellency the Rt. Hon. James Bryce, &c., &c., &c.

This document, I think, answers the question which has been put by the hon. member for North Toronto, as to whether there was some document showing that there was an understanding when the treaty was signed on the 27th of January, 1909. The fact that Mr. Bacon, the Secretary of State, states in his letter to Mr. Bryce that there was an oral understanding before, makes me believe that there was no exchange of documents between them, and I am informed by the Minister of Justice that Mr. Bacon was present during all the negotiations which were carried on between Mr. Bryce and Mr. Root, and he took the place of the Secretary of State on the day of the signing of the treaty, or the next day afterwards. Now, here is the United States Senate saying: We are willing to approve of that treaty, but on the condition that the Bay of Fundy shall be excluded, and later, on the 4th of March, there was an exchange of notes ratifying the treaty made between the British ambassador and the United States Secretary of State. I suppose it is not necessary for me to read them.

Mr. JAMESON. My question had reference to the interchange of notes on the 27th of January.

Mr. BRODEUR. There was no interchange of notes on the 27th of January.

Mr. JAMESON. That is what I asked the minister to permit me to explain, but he would not allow me to do so. That there was an interchange of notes on the 27th of January, 1909, between Mr. Bryce and Mr. Root is evidenced by the fact that Mr. Bryce, in his note of the 4th of March to Mr. Bacon, uses these words:

This understanding (that is, that the Bay of Fundy should be excluded from the operation of the award) is that which was embodied in notes exchanged between your predecessor (that was Mr. Root) and myself on the 27th of January, and is that expressed in the above mentioned resolution of the Senate of the United States.

The note of the 27th of January is the one we are looking for.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Minister of Justice tells me that he did not know anything about these notes, but there seems to be some difference between the two letters. In the letter of the 21st of February, 1909, which I have just read, from Mr. Bacon to Mr. Bryce, there is reference to an oral understanding. Of course, Mr. Bryce, in his letter of the 4th of March to Mr. Bacon speaks of notes that were exchanged between his predecessor and himself on the 27th of January. Well, that does not alter the situation very much, because whether the objection was made by the Senate itself or by the United States representatives, there is no doubt of this, that the United States would not make a treaty unless the question of the Bay of Fundy were excluded When we come to discuss the treaty of 1888 we shall find that the United States then took the ground that the question of the Bay of Fundy should be excluded, and that it should not be treated the same as other bays mentioned in that treaty.

Mr. JAMESON. The minister misses the point altogether. The whole point is this, that according to the interchanged note of the 27th of January, 1909, the government of Canada consented to the exclusion of the Bay of Fundy on that date, whereas the Senate of the United States did not resolve that it must be excluded until the 16th day of the following month.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think that it makes any difference at all, or that I have missed the point of my hon. friend. He charges the government with being respon-

sible for the exclusion of the Bay of Fundy. I say that charge is not well founded, because when we came to negotiate the United States would not consent to include it. During all these negotiations the United States were against including the Bay of Fundy in the question to be adjudicated upon by the tribunal. In this connection I may say that my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) stated that the Minister of Justice was in these negotiations representing His Excellency Lord Grey, the Governor General of Canada. I think he must have misunderstood the Minister of Justice, because it was never stated by him that he was representing His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. MADDIN. Sir Edward Grey. I would like to point out to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that 'Hansard' is so mutilated and so badly reported that he cannot place very much reliance on it. That is absolutely true of 'Hansard' for the last four Friday evenings. It is not only my experience, but the experience of other hon. members who had occasion to speak in the House. I am quite sure, speaking from the front bench, my accent and pronunciation are clear and distinct enough to enable me to be properly reported in 'Hansard.' It was not done, and any one who was in the House will recognize a very mutilated report of last Friday evening. It was Sir Edward Grey that I had reference to, and not His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not a matter of great importance to the discussion whether the Minister of Justice was representing Lord Grey or the Minister of Foreign Affairs. As a matter of fact, in the negotiations carried on at Washington he was acting for the Canadian Government, and later on, when the case was submitted to The Hague Tribunal, and the preparation of the case was entrusted to him, he was not acting as the representative of the Canadian government, but as the agent of the British government, and in that way was representing, of course, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sir Edward Grey.

Mr. JAMESON. Who was representing the government of Canada on that occasion?

Mr. BRODEUR. The case was submitted, as all international questions are submitted, by the British agent, who is, of course, responsible directly to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, but in this case the Minister of Justice represented Canada also. There were counsel engaged and paid, I think, exclusively by the Canadian government, such as Mr. Ewart and some others. Why was the Bay of Fundy excluded? I have just shown that throughout the negotiations the United States refused to include it. In the report which I have just quoted of the proceedings of the Senate, I find a letter from Mr. Bacon to Mr. Bryce on the 21st February, 1909, which also shows that the American authorities were insisting on excluding the bay. Why did the United States authorities take this course? Well, the question as to whether the Bay of Fundy was covered by the treaty of 1818 is a very old one. That treaty provided that the Americans could not fish except at three miles outside the bays. But what was the meaning of the word 'Bay'? Did it cover bays like the Bay of Fundy, the Baie des Chaleurs, Plecentia Bay in Newfoundland, and some others which are more than six or ten miles across? That question caused a good deal of friction, particularly between the province of Nova Scotia and the United States, because the other provinces were not interested with the exception perhaps of New Brunswick. The main contention seemed to have been between the province of Nova Scotia and the United States. We have very often had it said that the blame for the exclusion of the Bay of Fundy should be put on the shoulders of Lord Aberdeen, because of the letter which Lord Aberdeen sent to Mr. Everett on the 10th of March, 1845, which letter I shall quote in a few minutes. But it is only fair to the British authorities that I should mention the fact that this step then taken by Lord Aberdeen, who was at the time British Minister of Foreign Affairs, was taken at the suggestion of some members of the cabinet of Nova Scotia and of the governor of that province. Mr. Everett, then United States minister, contended in his letter of May, 1844, that the Bay of Fundy was not a bay, which came within the treaty prohibition, although he admitted that the smaller bays within the Bay of Fundy did come within it. Of these smaller bays, there are not less than five, which are not more than six miles wide each. In his letter of May, 1844, to the British Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Everett said that the American fishermen had the right to go into the Bay of Fundy, but admitted that they could not fish in the other bays inside that bay. This letter of Mr. Everett was submitted to the government and the cabinet of Nova Scotia; and as the result of their deliberations, Lord Portland, then governor of Nova Scotia, sent the following letter to the Colonial Office, which will be found interesting under the circumstances. It will be found at page 136 of the Appendix. Here is what he said:

In respect to the expediency of relaxing the strict rule which has hitherto been declared applicable to American vessels found fishing within the limits of the Bay of Fundy, I have found it difficult to arrive at a con-

clusion, because although some members of the Executive Council believe, with myself, that such a concession, provided it led to no other of a like nature, would not be productive of injury to Nova Scotia, and might in fairness be granted, other members of the board, among whom is the Attorney General, entertain a strong opinion to the contrary.

When, however, I perceive that Mr. Everett, in his note of the 25th May, 1844, addressed to Lord Aberdeen, admits that (in estimating the distance of three miles from the shore within which American fishermen are not permitted to approach) it is 'the intent of the treaty as it is in itself reasonable to have regard to the general line of the coast and to consider its bays, creeks and harbours, that is the indentations so accounted, as included within that line,' which I take to be an acquiescence in the opinion of Messrs. Dodson and Wilde, that the distance within which American fishermen must not approach is three miles from the line drawn from headland to headland, taking the general configuration of the coast; I cannot but conceive that a great portion of what I have contended for (in my despatch No. 75, date May 8, 1841, addressed to Lord John Russell) on the part of the province, is conceded, and it is therefore my unreserved opinion, provided always that this interpretation of Mr. Everett's phraseology be correct, that that which is now asked by the Americans may be granted, without evil consequences, if due care be taken that no further pretentions can hereafter be founded on the concession.

In this letter we have the admission by the governor of Nova Scotia if the Canadian rights in the other bays were reserved, he did not see a great deal of harm in the concession asked for, namely, that the Bay of Fundy should be considered as an open sea. It seems to me that the letter which my hon. friend read must be interpreted in the light of the correspondence between Mr. Everett and the governor of Nova Scotia and the Minister of Colonial Affairs.

When my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson), says that there is a condition mentioned in the letter of Lord Aberdeen which has not been complied with, I think that he is making a mistake. The contention made by the American authorities is that the condition gave the exclusive right to the fishermen of Nova Scotia, to fish in the bays which are within the Bay of Fundy, but that the relaxation was made in such terms that American fishermen could fish in the bay itself. In other words, the province of Nova Scotia was willing to accept that the Bay of Fundy should be excluded, or that there should be a relaxation of the conditions though the other bays within the Bay of Fundy were not to be excluded. My hon. friend interprets the condition made in the letter of Lord Aberdeen as being a condition in regard to all the bays of Canada. He is mistaken. Let us read again this part of the letter of Lord Aberdeen:

The undersigned has accordingly much pleasure in announcing to Mr. Everett, the determination which Her Majesty's government have come to relax in favour of the United States fishermen, that right which Great Britain has hitherto exercised, of excluding those fishermen from the British portion of the Bay of Fundy, and they are prepared to direct their colonial authorities to allow, henceforward, the United States fishermen to pursue their avocations in any part of the Bay of Fundy, provided they do not approach, except in the cases specified in the treaty of 1818, within three miles of the entrance of any bay on the coast of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick.

Now, if we take the last words and compare them with the words we find in the letter of Mr. Everett, we come to the conclusion that, when they speak of the condition excluding them from other bays of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, that means bays within the Bay of Fundy and not outside.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister (Mr. Brodeur) differs from the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) in that respect. At page 671 of the Revised 'Hansard,' the Minister of Justice describes that stipulation in these words:

Upon the stipulation that as to the remainder of the maritime coasts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec, the claims of United States fishermen should cease.

Mr. BRODEUR. Precisely. If it had been a question of other bays in Quebec and Newfoundland, it would have been so stated in the letter, but it was not stated, it was simply a reference to bays of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and in reading the letter of Lord Horton and Mr. Everett, I am led to believe that there is a great deal of force in the contention of the Americans that this applies purely and simply to bays within the Bay of Fundy. I may be mistaken in my interpretatilon of the law, but I think the hon. gentleman will see from the letters I have mentioned that there is a great deal of force in the contention of the American authorities.

Mr. JAMESON. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) says I am mistaken in the view I took the other evening, he says that the Minister of Justice is mistaken.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not say that the Minister of Justice is wrong, but I say there is a great deal of force in the argument made by the American authorities. My hon. friend says that this is a condition which the Americans have not fulfilled. The Americans say: We have fulfilled our obligation; we contend that the reservation was of the bays within the Bay of Fundy

and this we have not violated. Mr. Everett in his answer to the letter of Lord Aberdeen, maintained the absolute right of the United States fishermen to go into the Bay of Fundy. This letter was dated 25th March, 1845, and the following is an extract from it:

March 25, 1845.

While he desires, however, without reserve, to express his sense of the amicable disposition evinced by Her Majesty's government on this occasion in relaxing in favour of the United States the exercise of what, after deliberate consideration fortified by high legal authority, is deemed an unquestioned right of Her. Majesty's government, the undersigned would be unfaithful to his duty did he omit to remark to Lord Aberdeen that no arguments have at any time been adduced to shake the confidence of the government of the United States in their own construction of the treaty. While they have even been prepared to admit, that in the letter of one expression of that instrument there is some reason for claiming a right to exclude United States fishermen from the Bay of Fundy (it being difficult to deny to that arm of the sea the name of 'bay' which long geographical usage has assigned to it), they have even strenuously maintained that it is only on their own construction of the entire article that its known design in reference to the regulation of the fisheries admits of being carried into effect.

The undersigned does not make this observation for the sake of detracting from the liberality evinced by Her Majesty's government, in relaxing from what they regard as their right; but it would be placing his own government in a false position to accept as mere favour that for which they have so long and strenuously contended as due to them under the constitution.

One point is very clear, and that is that a relaxation was granted under the letter of Lord Aberdeen as to the right of the Americans to fish in the Bay of Fundy. Whether there were or were not conditions attached, and whether these have been fulfilled there may be differences of opinion, but the fact remains that there has been a relaxation, and from 1845 until to-day that relaxation has always been maintained by the British authorities. If the relaxation had been made on the conditions that my hon. friend claims, and if these conditions had not been fulfilled, I suppose we should see some correspondence by which the British authorities would have mentioned the matter to the United States government. But they have not done so, and until to-day they have always declared that the Americans might fish within the Bay of Fundy.

Now, there is another point that has not been brought out in the discussion which, I think also proves to a very large extent that the contentions of the Americans that the matter was settled by a treaty, has a great deal of force and should carry weight in any negotiations we may have. I do not wish to be understood as stating that I approve of the contentions made by the Americans in that respect, because I do not think it will be advisable to do so in view of the negotiations which may be made later on. But there is a great deal of force, I must admit, in the contention that the Bay of Fundy question has been settled by the Treaty of 1853. The Americans contend, first, that there was a relaxation by the letters of Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Everett, and also that the Treaty of 1853 disposed of this question of the Bay of Fundy. This treaty is called the Russell-Ingersoll treaty, and is dated 20th February, 1853. It was made between the United States and Great Britain.

The article of the treaty provided that the pecuniary claims which were made by certain parties should be submitted to a court of arbitration, to be composed of two men, one appointed by the United States government and one appointed by the British government. The treaty further provided that if these two men could not agree upon any point then a third arbitrator should be appointed. Amongst the claims which were referred to this tribunal under this treaty was the claim made by the United States concerning the seizure of the schooner 'Washington,' which has been mentioned several times in the debate. This vessel was fishing about ten miles from the shore of the Bay of Fundy, and she was seized by the Nova Scotia authorities, I think, as fishing within the territorial waters. A great deal of correspondence was exchanged with regard to that seizure. It was contended on the part of the United States authorities that as the vessel was seized in an open sea, that as the Bay of Fundy was an open sea, consequently the Canadian authorities had no right to make the seizure. It was contended by the British authorities that the Bay of Fundy was a bay, and that consequently the United States had no right to fish there. The matter was referred to that court. I will read article 2 of that treaty in which the procedure is set out:—

The high contracting parties agree that all claims on the part of corporations, companies, or private individuals, subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, upon the government of the United States, and all claims on the part of corporations, companies, or private individuals, citizens of the United States, upon the government of Her Britannic Majesty, which may have been presented to either government for its interposition with the other since the signature of the treaty of peace and friendship concluded between Great Britain and the United States of America at Ghent, on the 24th of December, 1814, and which yet remained unsettled, as well as any other claims which may be presented within the time specified in article 111 hereinafter, shall be

referred to two commissioners, to be appointed in the following manner, that is to say. One commissioner shall be named by Her Britannic Majesty, and one by the President of the United States. In case of the death, absence or incapacity of either commissioner, or in the event of either commissioner omitting or ceasing to act as such, Her Britannic Majesty, or the President of the United States respectively shall forthwith name another person to act as commissioner in the place or stead of the commissioner originally named.

The commissioner shall then, and before proceeding to any other business, name some third person to act as arbitrator or umpire in any case or cases on which they may themselves differ in opinion. If they should not be able to agree upon the name of such third person, they shall each name a person; and in each and every case in which the commissioners may differ in opinion as to the decision which they ought to give, it shall be determined by lot which of the two persons so named shall be the arbitrator or umpire in that particular case.

Well, under the provisions of that treaty the 'Washington' claim was referred to the commissioners, who sat and heard the case. The majority of them decided that the Bay of Fundy was an open sea, and that consequently the ship's owner had a valid claim against the Canadian government. The Canadian authorities, or the British authorities, I do not know which, paid the $3,000 which were awarded as the amount of damages sustained by the seizure of the vessel.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the commissioners agreed on the $3,000 damages?

Mr. BRODEUR. Two of them agreed, the majority.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the two commissioners did not agree, they absolutely disagreed, and the umpire gave the decision.

Mr. BRODEUR. The two commissioners disagreed, and the umpire sided with the American commissioner, which constituted a majority of the tribunal. On that point I may quote the conclusion of the award on page 217, which says:—

The conclusion is therefore in my mind irresistible that the Bay of Fundy is not a British bay, not a bay within the meaning of the word as used in the treaties of 1783 and 1818.

Now that was the question discussed, or reported, in the leading cases of international law at page 125. After mentioning the facts concerning the treaty of 1818 and the question of the Bay of Fundy, we read:—

It was subsequently held by a commission appointed to adjudicate on certain claims arising between the two countries, in the case of the schooner 'Washington' which had been seized and declared forfeit for fishing in the Bay of Fundy, although at a distance of ten miles from the shore, that that bay, which is over sixty miles wide and about one hundred and forty miles long, and which is as to one of its headlands within United States territory, did not constitute a territorial bay or water within the meaning of the exclusive clause of the treaty, but must be considered an open arm of the sea.

He quotes Scott, page 153, and Taylor, page 297. Now that was the situation until 1888, until the Chamberlain-Bayard treaty. My hon. friend from Digby has tried to throw a great deal of responsibility on this government. As I have just shown, by reading the conclusion of the award, the tribunal decided that the Bay of Fundy, being an arm of the sea, the vessel could not be seized in its waters.

Mr. JAMESON. Is it not because they thought that declaration on the part of the referee, was an obiter dictum?'

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend will not dispute this fact. A seizure was made of a vessel in the Bay of Fundy. Is it true or not that what the arbitrators appointed to dispose of this question decided, was that the seizure was illegal because it was made within the Bay of Fundy and the Bay of Fundy was an arm of the open sea?

Mr. MADDIN. I would like to point out to the minister that the tribunal were only asked to fix damages. They were not asked to determine whether the water upon which the seizure took place was an arm of the open sea or a bay. They were not international lawyers, they were not men trained in the law. Mr. Bates was a member of a banking firm who knew nothing about international law, but who did know how to assess damages. He fixed the damages at $3,000 and there his function ended. It was not part of his duty to determine whether the Bay of Fundy was a bay or part of the open sea.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am afraid that the argument of my hon. friend is not founded on the facts as we find them on record. There was a claim made against the Canadian government as a result of the Canadian government having seized a vessel in the Bay of Fundy. There was not only a question of damages. If it had only been a question of damages we did not need to negotiate a treaty for the purpose of dealing with it. No treaty was necessary for that purpose, but the tribunal which adjudicated the case was called upon to decide whether the seizure was legal or illegal. The tribunal decided that as the seizure was made in the Bay of Fundy and as the Bay of Fundy was, in their mind, an arm of the open sea, damages were due to the owners of the vessel. If the Bay of Fundy had not been, in the mind of the authorities of the United States, open to question with regard to our jurisdiction why should

they have submitted this question to the court? They submitted it for the purpose of having a decision and the decision was rendered in their favour. That was the situation until 1888. In 1888 negotiations were entered into between the British, the Canadian and the United States authorities for a new treaty with regard to the fisheries. Sir Charles Tupper represented the Canadian government, and he was also one of the negotiators who signed the treaty. My hon. friend states that this government has been derelict in its duty in connection with the fact that the Bay of Fundy has been excluded from the reference to the Hague Tribunal. But what does he say of Sir Charles Tupper who, in 1888 excluded the Bay of Fundy? My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who was an active member of the government at that time, approved of the treaty although it excluded the Bay of Fundy. Provision was made for the delimitation of bays in a certain way, but in that treaty which was made by Sir Charles Tupper, in the treaty which was approved by the Canadian parliament, in the treaty which was approved by the government of that time, it was stated formally that the Bay of Fundy was excluded. I suppose this fact will not be disputed by my hon. friend. Let me read to him the treaty of 1888. First I will take article 4:

At or near the following bays the limits of exclusion under Article 1, of the Convention of October 20, 1818, at points more than three marine miles from low water mark, shall be established by the following lines, namely.

Then they start with the Baie des Chaleurs.

At the Baie des Chaleurs the line from the Light at Birch Point on Miscou Island to Macquereau Point light; at the Bay of Miramichi, the line from the Light at Point Escuminac to the light on the Eastern Point of Tabisintac Gully; at Egmont Bay, in Prince Edward Island, the line from the Light at Cape Egmont to the Light at West Point, and of St. Ann's Bay, in the province of Nova Scotia, the line from Cape Smoke to the Light at Point Anconi.

Then they speak of the bays in Newfoundland. Coming back to Canada they say:

At or near the following bays the limits of exclusion shall be three marine miles seaward from the following lines, namely:

At or near Barrington Bay, in Nova Scotia, the line from the Light on Stoddart Island to the Light on the South Point of Cape Sable, thence to the Light at Baccaro Point; at Chedabucto and St. Peter's bays, the line from Cranberry Island Light to Green Island Light, thence to Point Rouge; at Mira Bay, the line from the Light on the East Point of Scatari Island to the northeasterly point of Cape Morien; and at Placentia Bay, in Newfoundland, the line from Latine Point, on the eastern mainland shore, to the most southerly point of Red Island, thence by the most southerly point of Merasheen Island to the mainland.

Long Island and Bryer Island, on St. Mary's Bay, in Nova Scotia, shall, for the purpose of delimitation, be taken as the coasts of such bay.

We see by the provisions of article 4 that they determine where the lines are to be drawn There is no word as to the Bay of Fundy. Why should not Sir Charles Tupper have provided also for the Bay of Fundy? Why was the Bay of Fundy excluded? Because I suppose the Americans contended, as they are contending to-day, that this question was settled by the correspondence of Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Everett, or by the treaty of 1853? At all events Sir Charles Tupper did not mention the matter at all in this treaty. But I go further and say—yes, he did mention it. If the Bay of Fundy is an open sea the question is disposed of, but if it is a bay what does he say in Article 3?

The three marine miles mentioned in Article 1, of the Convention of October 20, 1818, shall be measured seaward from low water mark; but at every bay, creek, or harbour, not otherwise specially provided for in this treaty, such three marine miles shall be measured seaward, from a straight line drawn across the bay, creek or harbour, in the part nearest the entrance at the first point where the width does not exceed ten marine miles.

What is the meaning of that? First, the treaty provides that some bays will have to be delimited in such and such a way. The Bay of Fundy is not included. Then, in article 3 where the bays are not specially mentioned they say that the three marine miles shall start from the point at which the bays narrow to a width of ten miles. What is the result? The result is that according to the treaty of 1888, the line of the Bay of Fundy will not be at a point opposite the county of Annapolis or opposite the county of Digby, but near the Basin of Minas and near Chignecto bay. That is absolutely clear and my hon. friend will not dispute it, I think. How can the hon. gentleman say that the Minister of Justice was remiss in his duty in excluding the Bay of Fundy when his own former political leader Sir Charles Tupper when he was in power—and the hon. member for North Toronto was a member of his government—approved of the exclusion of the Bay of Fundy? In view of all this, is it not unfair and unjust to state that we have neglected our duty. Surely, it is plain from the correspondence exchanged between Lord Aberdeen and the governor of Nova Scotia in 1845, that the Bay of Fundy was excluded at that early date. The Americans contend it was excluded by the treaty of 1853, and in the treaty of 1888 we have a formal declaration that the Bay of Fundy, as to which my hon. friend (Mr. Jameson) says we have not fulfilled our duty, was also excluded.

Mr. JAMESON. The Minister of Marine apparently misses the point. In the case of the treaty of 1888 Canada was getting an undoubted title to the other bays as territorial waters, and was giving up or relaxing the question as to the Bay of Fundy out of the ten mile width. In the present case the whole subject matter of all the bays of Canada was to be arbitrated upon, and had the arbitration gone adversely to us we might have lost the whole of them. That was the difference between the two cases.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is it very likely that Sir Charles Tupper asked for the inclusion of the Bay of Fundy in 1888, and I suppose the representatives of the United States met that request with the same argument that was presented to us, namely, that they wanted the Bay of Fundy excluded from the reference. It was not mentioned in the treaty of 1888, and I have proven that that part of the Bay of Fundy about which the hon. gentleman is so anxious was declared to be absolutely an open sea, and that it should not be considered as a bay.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock I was discussing the effect of the treaty of 1888. I showed that that treaty had virtually withdrawn the Bay of Fundy from any claim as to our right to exclude American fishermen. In fact, as I have shown, some bays were withdrawn as being delimited in such and such a way, and no specific mention is made of the Bay of Fundy. There is a general clause in the treaty that the bays which are not specifically mentioned should be considered as territorial waters only where they are less than ten miles wide. That brings the Bay of Fundy, according to the treaty of 1888, among those which are open to American fishermen. From the mouth of the bay at Grand Manan to Chignecto, while Chignecto bay and Minas Basin can be considered as territorial waters. Now, the leader of the opposition the other day put a question to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice in regard to Placentia bay, which is in Newfoundland territory. I do not know whether he intended to state that that bay was open from its mouth to its entire depth. From the way the question was put, I inferred that the hon. leader of the opposition believed that Placentia bay, by the treaty at Washington as well as by the Hague award, was closed from its mouth, that is, Point Sculpin to Cape St. Mary. I do not know whether I interpreted clearly the opinion which my hon. friend expressed or whether my inference from the question he put is correct.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that for all these bays the line of demarcation, apart from the recommendations, is to be taken from headland to headland.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is mistaken as to Placentia bay, which by the Hague award is declared to be open sea from the mouth marked by a line 'from Latine point, on the eastern mainland shore, to the most southerly point of Red island, thence by the most southerly point of Merasheen island to the mainland.' That means that the bay from the mouth to Merasheen point, which would be about 40 miles inside, is open sea. My hon. friend the other day showed me a map with a straight line drawn. This line is not the one determined by the Hague award as the line to be recommended.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend knows that the award is one thing and the recommendations another. The same is true of all these bays, and Placentia bay does not stand alone in that respect.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is only a recommendation; but it is to be presumed that if the Bay of Fundy had been referred to the tribunal, the same judgment would have been rendered as in the case of Placentia bay, because at the mouth these bays are about the same width, namely, 45 miles, though the Bay of Fundy is much longer than the other. It is to be presumed that in such a case the tribunal would have recommended that the Bay of Fundy should be determined in the same way as it was determined in the treaty of 1888. In that case all the other parts of the bay would be open to American fishermen. Though it is only a recommendation, I suppose that the two interested parties might expect that some day a definite agreement would be arrived at based on that recommendation; and so far the interested parties have been willing to act upon the recommendations that have been made. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice the other day raised the question that if we had succeeded in having the Bay of Fundy included in the reference, perhaps it would not have been especially advantageous to us, because it would have raised the question as to whether it could be considered a bay. As my hon. friend is aware, one of the headlands of this bay is American territory. If a line were drawn from Brier island to Grand Manan, and from Grand Manan to the other side, it would extend to American territory, and that would have raised a question which might have embarrassed a settlement of the other question. For that reason I think my hon. friend the Minister of Justice was fully justified in saying that in the interest of the whole

case it would perhaps be just as well to leave the matter as it is. I say that the situation to-day, with regard to the Bay of Fundy, and which is the result of the treaty made in 1909, is far more favourable than what it was under the treaty of 1888. By the latter, the Bay of Fundy was opened to the American fishermen with the exception of its northern part, whereas by the present treaty, according to the agreement and according to the notes interchanged between Mr. Bryce and Mr. Bacon and according to the statement made in the United States Senate, it remains as it was before, and we have the same rights, advantages and privileges that we might have had formerly before the signing of this treaty. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson), said that while the situation may not have been very advantageous under the treaty of 1888, still we had something in return. True, but we had nothing in return with regard to the Bay of Fundy. We obtained some provisions regarding the exchange of products, but, in so far as the Bay of Fundy itself was concerned, we got no compensation at all. Those who are trying to belittle what the government has done, will find that the treaty we made in 1909 is far more advantageous than the treaty made in 1888 by a former government. By this award we have gained a great deal, and I am sorry to find some of our hon. friends opposite trying to belittle its results. All Canadians who are anxious to see good relations between the two countries, should rejoice in the fact that we have already on two important matters, gained a great deal. We have gained first, the admission that we have the right to legislate with regard to those treaty coasts. That is a right which the Americans were denying us. They denied that we had the right to enact any legislation which might affect American fishermen fishing on the treaty coasts. On that point, the Hague award, which is the the result especially of the work done by my hon. colleague the Minister of Justice, has given us a complete vindication. It declares that these are territorial waters, over which we have the sovereign control and with regard to which we consequently have the right to legislate. What else have we obtained? We know that, under the instructions given by Mr. Mitchell in 1870, when he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, American fishing vessels could come and fish in our bays, provided they did not come within three miles of the coast or inside the bays. But what is the decision of the award in that respect? Take the Baie des Chaleurs, under the instructions given by Mr. Mitchell, when Minister of Marine and Fisheries in 1870, American fishermen could go throughout all that bay. But under this award, that bay will be closed from Berch Point on Miscou Island to Point Macquereau where the bay has a width of sixteen miles. Take the other bays, they will be clased to American fishermen inside limits as follows:

Miramichi, 14½ miles.
Egmont 17½ miles.
St. Peter's Bay, 18 miles.
Barrington Bay, 13 miles.

So you see the judgment has given us great satisfaction and should be acceptable to all those who are anxious to see good relations between the two countries.

I do not want to detain the House longer but I thought it necessary to put before the House all those facts which prove conclusively that those who try to belittle the work done by my hon. colleague the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) and the results of the treaty, are anything but fair or reasonable. I may also say that we are greatly indebted to Mr. Bryce for the assistance he gave us and the efforts he made in order to bring about a settlement of this question, which during nearly a century was the cause of dissension between the two countries.

If the Bay of Fundy was not referred to the tribunal, that was not due to this government or the British authorities, but to the fact that the United States authorities refused absolutely to consent to its reference. Under the circumstances, would we have been justified, would my hon. colleague, the Minister of Justice, have been justified, in insisting on that point and thus preventing any reference as regards Canada and leaving solely the disputes between Newfoundland and the United States to be adjudicated by the Hague Tribunal without our being present at all? The questions which affected Newfoundland were not absolutely the same as those which concerned us. In some respects they were, but in others, they were not. Take the question of the Bay of Fundy, Newfoundland had not the same interest in that matter as we had; and if today we have succeeded in having this question settled once for all, it is due to the efforts made by those I have just mentioned and especially to the arduous work of the Minister of Justice. The matter has now been definitely settled. The United States had very good grounds for the position they took in the correspondence between Mr. Everett and Lord Aberdeen in 1845 and the treaty of 1853, and the award we have to-day is far more satisfactory than was the treaty of 1888. By that treaty, the Bay of Fundy was absolutely sacrificed, and that treaty was accepted by the government of that day and Sir Charles Tupper was one of those

most prominent in negotiating it. It was accepted also by the parliament of Canada. To-day, however, according to the notes interchanged, the question is still an open one, and in the meantime the Bay of Fundy is declared Canadian territory as it has always been considered by the British and Canadian authorities.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, this matter has been debated at such length that I do not intend to occupy very much of the time of the House in dealing with it. In fact, I rise more particularly for the purpose of correcting my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) in respect of some arguments he used. Before doing that, however, I would like to say that it certainly is a matter for congratulation to both countries that this treaty of arbitration was entered into, and that a settlement of some at least of the outstanding questions between the two countries has been arrived at. I only hope that the day is not far distant when a wider treaty of arbitration between Canada and the United States will be consummated, so that all questions, not only those within the scope of the present treaty, but also questions of even graver import, may be referred to the arbitrament of The Hague Tribunal. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) in the course of his speech on the 2nd of December last, went pretty fully into this question. I then congratulated my hon. friend and the government upon the fact that a settlement of some of these difficulties has been arrived at. I do not know that my congratulations would have been quite so warm if I had understood the award and the scope of the questions that were put as thoroughly as I think I do at present.

The Minister of Justice referred in terms of special commendation and eulogy to the work of Sir William Robson, now Lord Robson, who was one of the counsel for Great Britain before that tribunal. I have not a word to say in criticism of that; I have not the slightest doubt that Sir William Robson deserves all the encomiums that were heaped upon him with rather a lavish hand by the Minister of Justice. But I did, at the time, regard it as a little singular that several very able counsel who appeared on that occasion for Great Britain were hardly mentioned by the Minister of Justice. I have the honour of knowing Sir Robert Finlay, and happen to have been associated with him in the discussion of legal questions before the highest court of appeal on more than one occasion, and I should be surprised indeed if the argument of Sir Robert Finlay, delivered before The Hague Tribunal on behalf of Great Britain and in support of the rights of Canada and Newfoundland were not worthy of just as high praise as that which was lavished upon Sir William Robson. I think also that a word of commendation might be said for the very earnest and devoted work which Mr. J. S. Ewart bestowed upon his duties both in connection with the preparation of the case and in the discussion of the rights of Canada and Newfoundland before that tribunal. Upon Mr. Ewart devolved a double duty. In the first place, he had a very long work of investigation, to which he devoted his time and energy without stint, for, I think, eighteen months or two years before the hearing began. And not only in that respect did he do splendid work for his country, but any one who takes the trouble to read his argument delivered before that tribunal can see plainly for himself that it was an argument of great ability and of very high order.

I think also that it might not be amiss to congratulate the country that it had as a representative upon The Hague Tribunal a man of the public experience and distinguished legal ability of the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. I venture to say that all that could properly be done in the interests of this country by the British representative upon that tribunal was done by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick on that occasion, and that this country owes not a little to his ability, his tact and his discrimination throughout the course of these proceedings.

I wish to speak for a moment upon one or two of the questions involved in the hearing. The first question was with regard to the rights of Great Britain over the territorial waters in which the fishermen of the United States, by the terms of the treaty, were to enjoy rights in common with the fishermen of this country and of Newfoundland. The United States put forward, as the hon. minister has very well said, an exceedingly extreme contention in that regard. They claimed the right not only to legislate in respect of these waters, but to enforce their legislation by having their own warships, if necessary, go into these waters to carry out the behests of the Congress of the United States. The government of this country had full rights in respect of the framing of the question which was submitted to the tribunal in that regard, and the Minister of Justice has made that absolutely plain. He said that the parties were so far apart from each other with regard to this question of the inherent sovereignty of Great Britain over these waters that no common understanding could be framed, and, therefore, each party was left to state its contention to be put forward before the tribunal. The contention of Great Britain was put forward in these words:

That the exercise of liberty to take fish referred to in the said article, which the inhabitants of the United States have for ever in common with the subjects of His Britannic Majesty, is subject without the consent of the United States, to reasonable regulation by Great Britain, Canada or Newfoundland in the form of municipal laws, ordinances or rules.

That is the contention on behalf of Great Britain, and it goes on to state examples of the regulations which might be made. Now, the tribunal sustained the able contention which had been put forward by Mr. Bryce on behalf of Canada and Newfoundland. I refer to the words of the Minister of Justice as given in Revised 'Hansard,' page 681:

When the award came to be pronounced on the 7th of September last, the tribunal adopted verbatim et litteratim the language which Mr. Bryce used two years ago in stating the British contention under this clause of the treaty.

I pause there for a moment to say that no hon. gentleman on this side, as I understood the argument, has said a word which could, in the slightest degree, reflect upon Mr. Bryce. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has stated that some people in this country had apprehensions as to what might be the result when Mr. Bryce was named the British ambassador at Washington. So far as I am concerned, I have heard of none of these 'apprehensions' and know of no one who entertained them, unless it be the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself. I believe that Mr. Bryce has acted conscientiously and with ability and energy on behalf of the interests of the mother country and of Canada throughout the course of these difficulties at Washington. Any criticism of the form in which this treaty was made and in which these questions were shaped is criticism not of Mr. Bryce, but of this government who were plainly responsible for every incident in these proceedings from the first to the last. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries cannot doubt that when he looks at the terms of the treaty itself, for it would have been impossible for Mr. Bryce, representing the mother country, to bind either Canada or Newfoundland in respect to this matter without the consent of Canada and Newfoundland.

The treaty in its terms provided that Great Britain had the distinct right, and therefore having the right, would be impelled to the duty of obtaining the consent of Canada and of Newfoundland in every case where the rights of Canada or of Newfoundland came into question.

Well, I was dealing with the mode in which this question had been framed, and with the award which was made thereon. Now the Minister of Justice has quoted a portion of the award which he says sets forth verbatim et litteratim the exact argument, and the exact contention that was made by Mr. Bryce. The Minister of Justice in that respect stopped at a certain portion of the award, and I think it is only right that the whole position in that regard should be made clear to the House. Let us look at the reasons for the award—and I distinguish the reasons of the award from the operative part thereof—let us look at the reasons which were given by the tribunal in coming to the conclusion at which they arrived, and which is expressed in the operative part of the award. At pages 19, 20 and 21 of the copy of the award that I have, the United States put forward this contention:

That a concurrent right to co-operate in the making and enforcement of regulations is the only possible and proper security to their inhabitants for the enjoyment of their liberties of fishery, and that such a right must be held to be implied in the grant of those liberties by the treaty under interpretation.

The tribunal in dealing with that gave the following reasons for not acceding to that claim:

Because every state has to execute the obligations incurred by treaty bona fide, and is urged thereto by the ordinary sanction of international law in regard to observance of treaty obligations.

Further on:

But no reason has been shown why this treaty, in this respect, should be considered as different from every other treaty under which the right of a state to regulate the action of foreigners admitted by it on its territory is recognized.

Further on:

Because the exercise of such a right of consent by the United States would predicate an abandonment of its independence in this respect by Great Britain, and the recognition by the latter of a concurrent right of regulation in the United States. But the treaty conveys only a liberty to take fish in common, and neither directly nor indirectly conveys a joint right of regulation.

Further on—I am still reading from the reasons of the tribunal:

Because on a true construction of the treaty the question does not arise whether the United States agreed that Great Britain should retain the right to legislate with regard to the fisheries in her own territory; but whether the treaty contains an abdication by Great Britain of the right which Great Britain, as the sovereign power, undoubtedly possessed when the treaty was made, to regulate those fisheries.

Further on:

The sovereignty of Great Britain over the coastal waters and territory of Newfoundland remains after the treaty as unimpaired as it was before. But from the treaty results an obligatory relation whereby the right of

Great Britain to exercise its right of sovereignty by making regulations is limited to such regulations as are made in good faith and are not in violation of the treaty.

Now all that sustains the portion of the award which the Minister of Justice read, and I will read it again in order that the matter may be perfectly clear. On page 23 of the award:

Now, therefore, this tribunal decides and awards as follows:

The right of Great Britain to make regulations without the consent of the United States as to the exercise of the liberty to take fish referred to in article 1 of the treaty of October 20, 1818 in the form of municipal laws, ordinances or rules of Great Britain, Canada or Newfoundland is inherent to the sovereignty of Great Britain.

The exercise of that right by Great Britain is, however, limited by the said treaty in respect of the said liberties therein granted to the inhabitants of the United States in that such regulations must be made bona fide and must not be in violation of the said treaty.

Now so far the award is in exact accordance with that interpretation given by the Minister of Justice. But that unfortunately is not all; because if you come back to the reasons which are to be found at the bottom of page 22, you find these observations by the tribunal which have special relation to the form in which the question was proposed on behalf of Canada and Newfoundland by this government:

While, therefore, unable to concede the claim of the United States as based on the treaty, this tribunal considers that such claim has been and is to some extent conceded in the relations now existing between the two parties. Whatever may have been the situation under the treaty of 1818 standing alone, the exercise of the right of regulation inherent in Great Britain has been, and is, limited by the repeated recognition of the obligations already referred to, by the limitations and liabilities accepted in the special agreement, by the unequivocal position assumed by Great Britain in the presentation of its case before this tribunal and by the consequent view of this tribunal that it would be consistent with all the circumstances, as revealed by this record, as to the duty of Great Britain, that she should submit the reasonableness of any future regulation to such an impartial arbitral test, affording full opportunity therefor, as is hereafter recommended under the authority of Article 4 of the special agreement, whenever the reasonableness of any regulation is objected to or challenged by the United States in the manner and within the time hereinafter specified in the said recommendation.

So up to the present time we have, in the first place, the reasons set forth plainly and distinctly by this tribunal, which confine the inherent power or sovereignty of Great Britain only within these limits, that regulations made with regard to these fisheries must be bona fide and must not be in violation of the treaty. Then that is followed by a clear and distinct statement from this tribunal that the right of Great Britain is restricted by 'the limitations and liabilities accepted in the special agreement, by the unequivocal position assumed by Great Britain in the presentation of its case before this tribunal,' showing that the inherent sovereignty of Great Britain must be cut down to the mere question as to whether these regulations are reasonable or not. And so in addition to that portion of the award which was read by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, we find this in the operative part of the award, that part of the award which binds this country as well as the United States:

Regulations which are (1) appropriate or necessary for the protection and preservation of such fisheries, or (2) desirable or necessary on grounds of public order and morals without unnecessarily interfering with the fishery itself, and in both cases equitable and fair as between local and American fishermen, and not so framed as to give unfairly an advantage to the former over the latter class, are not inconsistent with the obligation to execute the treaty in good faith, and are, therefore, reasonable and not in violation of the treaty.

For the decision of the question whether a regulation is or is not reasonable, as being or not in accordance with the disposition of the treaty and not in violation thereof, the treaty of 1818 contains no special provision. By reason, however, of the form in which question 1 is put, and by further reason of the admission of Great Britain by her counsel before this tribunal that it is not now for either of the parties to the treaty to determine the reasonableness of any regulation made by Great Britain, Canada or Newfoundland, the reasonableness of such regulation, if contested, must be decided not by either of the parties, but by an impartial authority in accordance with the principles hereinabove laid down, and in the manner proposed in the recommendations made by the tribunal in virtue of Article 4 of the agreement.

The result of that, Mr. Speaker, seems to me capable of being stated in a very few words. In the one case the power of Great Britain—that is of Canada and Newfoundland—to regulate the fisheries is subject only to the qualification that the regulation must be bona fide and must not be in violation of the treaty. That is a position that we could have maintained if this question had been prepared for the tribunal in the way in which the government should have proposed it. In other words, if the contention which, as the Minister of Justice declares, was put forward by Mr. Bryce, had been maintained in the questions submitted by the government to that tribunal the part of this award which I first quoted would have been the only part to which the tribunal would have given utterance, and we would not have

been put in a position to which I shall now devote one or two words. In the one case, the power of Great Britain (i.e. Canada and Newfoundland) to regulate the fisheries would be subject only to the qualification that the regulation must be bona fide and must not be in violation of the Treaty. The other case, the case that confronts us actually at the present time, is in which the government stated our position, we have come down to the question of reasonable regulations which will undoubtedly be considered from the actual conditions confronting the United States fishermen. Under the award the United States can object to the reasonableness of any regulation that we may make and can insist upon a hearing and a decision of the Hague Tribunal, or some other body constituted under the decree of that tribunal. The right to regulate has in effect passed from Canada and Newfoundland, who possessed it by virtue of the inherent sovereignty of Great Britain in these waters, and it has passed to a foreign tribunal which would undoubtedly deal with this question in a spirit of compromise and cut something out of any code of regulations however reasonable. We have in effect abrogated our sovereignty over these waters in this respect. An exercise of our inherent sovereignty to regulate the fisheries can always be questioned by the United States and decided by a tribunal in which we have only one voice out of many. The Minister of Justice will see how remarkable a difference there is between the one position and the other. In the one case at any time, under our inherent sovereignty, we could have adopted any regulation whatever provided that regulation was bona fide and not in violation of the treaty of 1818. That right, by reason of the form in which the question was put and by reason of the decree of the tribunal founded upon that question, has been cut down to a pure question as to whether or not our regulations are reasonable having regard to the conditions which confront the American fisherman, and whatever regulations we may make can be questioned by the government of the United States, and when so questioned must be dealt with by a tribunal in which we have only one voice out of many. I think that is an unfortunate position, and I think it is a position which was entirely unnecessary. I am adopting in that regard the statement of the Minister of Justice himself who says that the portion of the award which he read—and he did not read the qualification—and which maintains the inherent sovereignty of Great Britain over these waters, was put forward by Mr. Bryce; and after it had been put forward by Mr. Bryce I see no reason why it was departed from because had it not been departed from it is perfectly obvious from the reasons of the tribunal that it would have been fully maintained in the award.

Now, I come to another question—the question of bays and harbours. The Minister of Justice seems to be under the impression that in so far as that is concerned some new and important rule of international law was settled. I venture to doubt that with great deference to the Minister of Justice, for whose ability and experience I have the utmost possible respect. As I understand the award it did not settle any new principle of international law. I have the minister's own language, but I will not stop just now to read it. He seemed to think not only that a new and important rule of international law had been settled, but that the tribunal, basing its decision upon the argument of Sir William Robson, had determined a different rule of international law for the waters adjoining the coast of this continent from that which has prevailed in Europe. With all deference to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and with hesitation owing to the view that he has expressed to the contrary, I venture to differ from that opinion. As I understand the award it simply construed the words of the treaty of 1818, taking into consideration the circumstances and conditions when it was made. The word 'bays' in that treaty had to be construed either as a term of international law—that is in what one might call the juristic sense, or it had to be construed otherwise as an ordinary geographical term, in the popular sense, in other words, as a cartological term. The tribunal simply adopted the latter construction. They said that when the negotiators of the treaty of 1818 used the word 'bays' they simply used it in the popular and geographical sense at the time and I do not find any new rule of international law laid down. Perhaps I might refer for one moment to what the Minister of Justice has said in that regard. He said that Sir William Robson had made a very novel and beautiful argument founded on the research that he had made into former treaties, and that his argument led irresistibly to the conclusion that a different rule of international law prevailed in North America from that which obtained in the rest of the world. The tribunal, as he claimed, had decided accordingly, and the tribunal in so deciding had laid down a new and important rule of international law. I am not giving the exact language of the Minister of Justice because I do not wish to take up the time of the House in listening to long quotations, but I am giving the effect of his statement on the subject in December last. But Sir William Robson does not appear, as Mr. Ewart

has said, to have conducted any particular research into these treaties, because they had all been set out in the Appendix to the British case from pages 1 to 24. I looked at this volume only the other day, and I saw that they are all there. This Appendix was prepared a year before Sir William Robson made his argument. They had been referred to in this very argument by previous counsel before Sir William Robson made his excellent argument before the tribunal. I do not think that the tribunal has laid down any different rule of international law in respect to America from that which exists elsewhere. I have the award in my hand, and I shall forbear from reading to the House the reasons of the award which lead me to arrive at that conclusion. There is only one possible passage in the award that can afford the slightest foundation for the view which my hon. friend the Minister of Justice expressed in the House, but if you take that particular paragraph which is to be found at the bottom of page 35 of the edition I have in connection with other reasons which are to be found from pages 31 to 35, it does not seem to me that you can reasonably come to the conclusion that the Minister of Justice reached in that regard. I have not one word to say in deprecation of the eulogiums which the Minister of Justice lavished upon Sir William Robson, but in so far as I understand the real character of this award, the real meaning of the award it does not justify the view that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice seems to entertain.

The Minister of Marine seems to deprecate the discussion of this award, but it was the Minister of Justice who began the discussion in this House on the 2nd of December, and because two hon. members on this side representing constituencies that are directly affected by this award put forward their views on it with great ability and fairness, the Minister of Marine thinks party politics have been introduced into the question. Well, the same hon. gentleman was not very slow to endeavour to make party capital out of the French treaty, and I should think he would be the last person to make the insinuation he has made. I congratulate the hon, member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) for bringing this question to the attention of the House. It was his clear duty to take that course. The Minister of Marine put forward some very remarkable arguments with regard to the exclusion of the Bay of Fundy from the reference, and I may say that it would appear to me that he devoted too much of his speech to advancing the favourable points in the American contention rather than the favourable points in the Canadian contention. It was not necessary that the minister should do that because from the first to last throughout the negotiations, the preparation of the case, and the argument before the tribunal it is very apparent that the negotiators and the counsel for the United States in every single instance put forward their claims in the most extreme form, which in my opinion was not done in the same way by those representing this country. The hon. gentleman attached undue importance to the award made in 1854 for damages on account of the seizure of the ship 'Washington.' If that decision has the far reaching effect attributed to it by the Minister of Marine it would have controlled not only the Bay of Fundy but every one of these bays, and yet all the other bays brought within the scope of the arbitration have been declared by the tribunal to be British territorial waters so far as the fishermen of the United States are concerned. The real explanation of the 'Washington' case was given by Mr. Dana interrupting Mr. Thompson in the argument before the fishery tribunal in Halifax, in 1877, when he said:

> This subject was referred to a commission and the commission decided, not on general grounds but on the grounds that one headland was on the American territory.

This vessel was seized outside of the line which we claim to-day. If you take a very extreme limit it may be said that one headland is on the coast of Maine and the other is on the coast of Nova Scotia, but the later contention, as I understand it is, that you must draw a line between Canadian territory in Nova Scotia and Canadian territory in New Brunswick. However, I will not waste more time on that point.

The Minister of Marine derives great comfort from the Chamberlain-Bayard treaty of 1888, when dealing with the Bay of Fundy, and he says that by that treaty the Bay of Fundy was excluded and that all the other bays were dealt with along the lines of the recommendations made by the Hague Tribunal. But, the distinction is obvious beyond question. Let us grant for the sake of argument—I have not investigated the negotiations to speak definitely with regard to them—but let us grant that Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Tupper agreed that in consideration of having the sovereignty of great Britain recognized in respect of all those other bays, they would not make any further claim in respect to the Bay of Fundy in which the American fishermen had been enjoying rights under the relaxation allowed by Lord Aberdeen in 1845. That simply amounts to this: That they were getting a certain distinct, clear advantage in consideration of not depart-

ing from the relaxation of 1845, but surely the Minister of Marine knows that the Chamberlain-Bayard treaty was not the foundation of this agreement for arbitration. Can he not see the distinction between that case and this? In that case, rights which were disputed by the Americans were made absolutely secure to us and we did not press for the discontinuance of the relaxation which had already been granted in respect to the Bay of Fundy. In 1909 the situation was entirely different because then we were not securing undisputed rights in respect to all these bays. The Americans put forward their extreme contention that the three-mile limit and that only was to be recognized in respect to all these bays. Therefore, when the whole question of right was being opened up in respect to these bays that were secure to us under the treaty of 1888, why should not the question of right be opened up with respect to the Bay of Fundy? Why was it that that which the Americans had agreed to give in 1888 they were at liberty to depart from under this agreement, and that which we had agreed to give up under the treaty of 1888 we had not the right to open up, but had to let it remain secure to the United States under the provisions of this agreement. The distinction is as plain as a pikestaff; it need only be mentioned so that any one may understand it. If the two nations had taken the treaty of 1888 as a basis the Minister of Marine would have some ground for his argument, but in as much as everything the Americans were supposed to concede by the treaty of 1888 was left open under the terms of this reference there was not the slightest reason for not contending that the Bay of Fundy should also be included and our rights asserted in respect to it. What did this tribunal decide? I will first give one or two of their reasons; I quote from page 35:

> The description of the coast on which the fishery is to be exercised by the inhabitants of the United States is expressed throughout the treaty of 1818 in geographical terms; not by reference to political control; the treaty describes the coast as contained between capes.
>
> Because it is difficult to explain the words in Art. III. of the treaty under interpretation 'country . . . together with its bays, harbours and creeks' otherwise than that all bays without distinction as to their width were, in the opinion of the negotiators, part of the territory;
>
> Because from the information before this tribunal it is evident that the three-mile rule is not applied to bays strictly or systematically either by the United States or by any other power;
>
> Because the practical distinction for the purpose of this fishery between coasts and bays and the exceptional conditions pertaining to the latter has been shown from the correspondence and the documents in evidence, especially the treaty of 1783, to have been in all probability in the minds of the negotiators of the treaty of 1818;
>
> Because the tribunal is unable to understand the term 'bay' in the renunciatory clause in other than its geographical sense, by which a bay is to be considered as an indentation of the coast, bearing a configuration of a particular character easy to determine specifically, but difficult to describe generally.
>
> The negotiators of the treaty of 1818 did probably not trouble themselves with subtle theories concerning the notion 'bays'; they most probably thought that everybody would know what was a bay. In this popular sense the term must be interpreted in the treaty.

So they go on to make their award in these words:

> For these reasons the tribunal decides and awards:
>
> In case of bays [the three marine miles are to be measured from a straight line drawn across the body of water at the place where it ceases to have the configuration and characteristics of a bay.] At all other places the three marine miles are to be measured following the sinuosities of the coast.

They go on after that to make the recommendations to which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries called attention. Those recommendations are to be distinguished altogether from the terms of the award. In this respect the award was what I have read. The boundaries referred to by the minister this afternoon are not binding on either country. They leave the matter over for further negotiations in that regard. The positive, direct, unmistakable award of the tribunal is that 'the three marine miles are to be measured by a straight line drawn across the body of water at the place where it ceases to have the configuration and characteristics of a bay.'

Now, let us see whether or not the Bay of Fundy was worth including—and I would like to make this observation just here. Neither my hon. friend the Minister of Justice nor my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries seems to claim that any attempt whatever was made to include the Bay of Fundy in the terms of this reference. I have not heard it so far throughout this debate. I waited to hear it from either of the hon. ministers. The nearest we got to it was, that the Minister of Justice said that Mr. Root seemed to take for granted from the very first that the Bay of Fundy was not to be included, and the Minister of Justice seems to have acceded to that at once. When the whole question of rights in every one of these bays was to be opened up, why should the Bay of Fundy be excluded? For the moment just let me refer to the value of the fisheries in the Bay of Fundy. From a statement made up by

my hon. friend from Digby, from returns to be found in the government blue-books, I take the following figures: Number of vessels and boat fishermen employed in the Bay of Fundy, 5,357—2,508 from Charlotte, New Brunswick; 574 from St. John, New Brunswick; 246 from King's, Nova Scotia; 751 from Annapolis; 1,728 from Digby. The total amount invested in these fisheries is $2,016,772; and the value of the catch in 1909 was $2,812,486. Considering the number of people employed, the amount of capital invested and the product of the fisheries in the Bay of Fundy, I think we were entitled to receive from the Minister of Justice, or from the Minister of Marineand Fisheries an assurance that some bona fide and earnest effort was made to have this question of right respecting the Bay of Fundy determined by the Hague Tribunal. Why should it not have been determined? The Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries have given us the American contention in that regard, and have referred us over and over again to the letter written by Lord Aberdeen in 1845. I think they have been answered in that regard by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me; but let me point out this. If that was a good ground for giving up the Bay of Fundy, it might have been a good ground for giving up something else. Let us look at that for a moment. We find that the instructions issued by Mr. Mitchell, Minister of Marine and Fisheries in 1870, were first framed in this way:

> Until further instructed, therefore, you will not interfere with any American fishermen, unless found within three miles of the shore, or within three miles of a line drawn across the mouth of a bay or creek which is less than ten geographical miles in width. In the case of any other bay, as the Bay of Chaleurs, for example, you will not admit any United States fishing vessel or boat, or any American fishermen, inside of a line drawn across at that part of such bay where its width does not exceed ten miles.

On June 6, 1876, Lord Grenville telegraphed to the Governor General as follows:

> Her Majesty's government hopes that the United States fishermen will not be for the present prevented from fishing, except within three miles of land, or in bays which are less than six miles broad at the mouth.

The result was that the Hon. Peter Mitchell modified his instructions on the 27th of June, 1870, making the last paragraph read:

> In the case of any other bay, as Bay des Chaleurs, for example, you will not interfere with any United States fishing vessel or boat, or any American fishermen, unless they are found within three miles of the shore.

As far as I understand the practice, from that time up to the present the instructions then given by Mr. Mitchell have been followed. So that if there was good ground for giving up the Bay of Fundy by reason of Lord Aberdeen's letter of 1845, there was equally good ground for giving up the Bay of Chaleurs and every other bay, because these instructions had been definitely given at the request of the British government that American fishermen were not to be interfered with, unless found fishing within three miles of the shore. Further than that, with respect to the Bay of Fundy, and the strong view expressed as to Lord Aberdeen's language in 1845, let me refer to the position taken by Mr. Phelps in 1886.

Mr. Phelps, the American Minister at the Court of St. James that year, after stating the regret of the United States government that the Royal assent had been given to the Act of this parliament passed in the previous year, touching fishing by foreign vessels, proceeded to state as follows:

> It has been pointed out in my note to Lord Iddesleigh above mentioned that the three-mile limit referred to in this Act is claimed by the Canadian government to include considerable portions of the high seas, such as the Bay of Fundy, the Bay of Chaleurs and similar waters, by drawing the line from headlands to headlands. And that American fishermen have been excluded from those waters accordingly.

This indicates in the clearest possible way that whatever the contention of the British government was regarding the Baie des Chaleurs in 1886-7, it was asserting the same contention as respects the Bay of Fundy.

My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) asked how we could have expected the authorities of the United States to enter into any agreement regarding the Bay of Fundy when they were perfectly satisfied with the position as it was. Of course they were. They had been fishing in that bay without restriction or interference; and if they could persuade this government to be foolish enough to submit the question of right in respect to all the other bays and leave out the Bay of Fundy, they naturally would be extremely well satisfied. They would then have the opportunity of making good their claims in respect of all the other bays, and Great Britain would have no opportunity whatever of making good her claims in respect of the Bay of Fundy. There was no need for my hon. friends opposite to assure us that the United States authorities were perfectly satisfied to leave that matter as it was. We understand that, but the question is could the people of Canada be perfectly satisfied

that, when this question of right was put forward, our government should have consented that the Bay of Fundy—perhaps the most important bay on the coast of Canada—should be absolutely put aside and not be submitted to this tribunal. The treaty of arbitration, under which this agreement was entered into, gave no excuse whatever for excluding the Bay of Fundy. Article 1 says:

Differences which may arise of a legal nature or relating to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two contracting parties and which it may not have been possible to settle by diplomacy, shall be referred to the permanent court of arbitration established at the Hague by the convention of the 29th July, 1899, provided nevertheless that they do not affect the vital interests, the independence, or the honour of the two contracting states, and do not concern the interest of third parties.

There you have a definite, distinct agreement to submit the differences. Was there not a difference between the government of Canada and the United States with respect to our rights in the Bay of Fundy? Was there not exactly the same difference between the government of Great Britain, as represented by the Canadian government for the time being, with respect to that bay as there was with respect to the Baie des Chaleurs? What was the difference between the two cases? Absolutely none, and the treaty called for a submission of such differences.

My hon. friends the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) did seem to rely to an undue extent on Lord Aberdeen's letter. True, the Minister of Justice said in December last that:

The result of the argument made during the present summer and the award pronounced two months ago has been to uphold to the fullest extent the British contention, and to demonstrate I think, that if the concession regarding the Bay of Fundy had not been made in 1845, that bay, as well as the other large bays of our maritime provinces, would to-day be declared British territorial waters.

I have dealt with the character of the relaxation very briefly, but I would like to read just in this connection the reasoning of the tribunal itself with regard to relaxations of a similar character. The counsel for the United States had put forward an argument based on a relaxation by Great Britain of its rights with regard to other bays, and the tribunal disregarded that claim for this reason:

Because neither should such relaxations of this claim, as are in evidence, be construed as renunciations of it; nor should omissions to enforce the claim in regard to bays as to which no controversy arose, be so construed. Such a construction by this tribunal would not only be intrinsically inequitable but internationally injurious; in that it would discourage conciliatory diplomatic transactions and encourage the assertion of extreme claims in their fullest extent;

As has been well pointed out by my hon. friends who preceded me on this side (Mr. Jameson and Mr. Maddin) the relaxation of Great Britain in that regard was not accepted by the United States subject to the stipulation which accompanied it. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) has construed that stipulation in a very different sense from that placed upon it by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries because, quoting from revised 'Hansard,' page 671, I find him using this language in referring to the opinion given by the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, the Hon. James W. Johnson:

That opinion having been pronounced by the responsible law officers of the Crown of that day, the colonists of Nova Scotia, I have no doubt, felt their case immensely strengthened, and thought they would have behind them all the prestige and power of the British government itself in defending the claim they were making to the Bay of Fundy as part of their territorial waters. But in 1845, the Lord Aberdeen of that day, then Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, wrote a letter which had been prepared as a piece of diplomatic correspondence, after the most careful and matured consideration, in which while affirming the right of the colonies, while standing upon the opinion which had been expressed by their legal advisers and by the legal advisers of the British government, none the less, on the part of His Majesty's government, as a pure matter of grace and concession, he expressed his willingness to forego, so far as the Bay of Fundy was concerned, the extreme right of the British subject in that regard, and assented to the use, by the fishermen of the United States, of the fisheries in the Bay of Fundy, in common with the inhabitants of the British colonies, upon the stipulation that as to the remainder of the maritime coasts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec, the claims of United States fishermen should cease.

That is the plain, distinct construction placed upon that letter by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, and it is a construction entirely inconsistent with that placed upon it by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur).

We are asked: What injury has been done by not including the Bay of Fundy? But an equally pertinent question would be: What injury would have been done by including it? My hon. friends the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries argued that the British case would have been greatly handicapped by the inclusion of the Bay of Fundy. As I understand it, that supposed handicap would have arisen either by reason of the shape of the bay, the different

character of the bay or by reason of the letter of Lord Aberdeen in 1845. So far as the character of the bay is concerned, any one who examines it upon the map can see that just as powerful an argument could have been made with respect to that bay on the part of Great Britain as with respect to Placentia bay, or any of the others. And any one who examines the argument made before the tribunal and the reasons given by it will see that two great factors entered into consideration.

One was the width of the bay at the mouth, and the other the depth of the bay. Taking it from shore to shore across Grand Manan, it does not seem to be wider than Placentia bay. But the depth of the Bay of Fundy is greater. Placentia bay is only 70 miles deep until you reach the ten mile line, whereas the Bay of Fundy is at least 100 miles deep before you reach the ten mile line. Therefore, so far as the character of the Bay of Fundy is concerned, there is no reason to differentiate it from the other bays that were brought before the tribunal. We are told that it would have been a handicap had the Bay of Fundy been brought into the discussion, that the British argument would not have been so strong and cogent as it was. As a matter of fact, it was brought before the tribunal. The letter of Lord Aberdeen, written in 1845, was canvassed before the tribunal. Bates' decision was canvassed. Everything was urged by the Americans at this hearing which could possibly have been urged by them if the Bay of Fundy had been included in the arbitration. The Minister of Justice practically admits this. In one part of his speech, he says that if the Bay of Fundy had been included, some great disadvantage would have been sustained. But in another part of his speech he admitted that everything was brought in question with regard to that bay. At page 4707 of the Unrevised 'Hansard,' he said:

> I venture to think our position was better before the tribunal without any reference to the Bay of Fundy being included in the matters for decision, the arrangement being that nothing in the proceedings should prejudice our claims with reference to the Bay of Fundy or the claims of the United States in reference to the Bay of Fundy.

Then, he says, at page 4696:

> The attitude of both parties in the previous years in the course of the prolonged diplomatic discussion, while it related immediately to the Bay of Fundy, had the most important possible bearing upon the general question of the interpretation of this clause of the treaty, and just for that reason every word, I may say every letter, of that long diplomatic correspondence was scrutinized with the utmost care, was presented before the tribunal and was discussed over and over again on both sides of the question by the various counsel who were concerned in the case.

So, as a matter of fact, we had all the handicap in regard to the Bay of Fundy that we could possibly have had under any circumstances, and we had not the advantage of obtaining an award with regard to that very important body of water. The injury to Canada to-day is in not having the question decided one way or the other. Hon. members opposite have spoken of the importance of having this question settled. Well, is it settled to-day? Have they given up our rights in the Bay of Fundy? Do they stand in the position in which they seem to have stood in these negotiations, that we have absolutely relinquished all our territorial rights in the Bay of Fundy, though under the terms of the tribunal, we have absolute rights in these territorial waters? Has the government of this country given up the Bay of Fundy, with its marvellous fisheries, in which more than five thousand men are engaged, in which more than $2,000,000 of capital is invested, and whose annual production is nearly $3,000,000? Have they given up our claims with respect to that? If so, why has the claim of this country been abnegated in regard to the Bay of Fundy when it has been asserted before this tribunal in regard to other territorial waters? The injury is in not having the question of jurisdiction settled. That has two aspects. In the first place, it is in the interest of friendship between the two countries, that the question should be settled. I offered my congratulations to the government in the early days of the session, that many questions had been settled. It had not then dawned upon me that the Bay of Fundy had been excluded in the way it has been. It is in the interest of good relations between the countries that it should be settled; and I should have thought that, unless the government propose to absolutely abandon all our claims in regard to that bay, they would have persisted for that very reason even if they thought we had not a good case, upon having the Bay of Fundy included in that arbitration, in order that we might have a definite and clear decision in regard to the rights of the fishermen of both countries in these waters. What does the government propose to do about it? The Minister of Justice said, in one part of his speech, that he was glad the Bay of Fundy had not been included, and in another part, he said that we stand in a better position in regard to it than before. If it be true, as he stated, then the tribunal has confirmed in the most complete manner and to the fullest possible extent our contention with respect to these bays, including the Bay of Fundy, what does the government propose to do about

it? Are they going to open up the matter again with the United States? Or have they estopped themselves from doing this, by neglecting to have this bay included in this reference? I do not know the exact character of the negotiations in that regard. They have not been brought down in the form of written documents, other than the memoranda which have been read. But I do most sincerely trust that no steps taken by this government in that respect, will have precluded this country from asserting its rights in this connection.

One other question only I would like to allude to. Having regard to the decision of this tribunal upon the second question, the position of Canada and Newfoundland acting jointly seems to me to be a very strong one. Question 2 was as follows:

> Have the inhabitants of the United States, while exercising the liberties referred to in said article, a right to employ as members of the fishing crews of their vessels persons not inhabitants of the United States?

I understand perfectly that this is a question which touches Newfoundland more than it touches Canada, but, I take it that the answer to that question, coupled with the control of the bait supply, made Great Britain—that is, Canada and Newfoundland—complete masters of the situation. The control of the bait supply is a very important thing indeed. My hon. friend expresses surprise and disappointment because the tribunal did not proceed to deal with the reasonableness of certain regulations made by Canada and the United States.

I touched upon the main question in connection with that, and I pointed out that the tribunal made a certain disposition by which it would be determined whether any regulation was or was not reasonable. I am inclined to think if the Minister of Justice had taken the trouble to make himself a little better acquainted with the situation than he seems to have been, he might not have expressed so much surprise nor so much disappointment with the tribunal at the course it did take in that regard. I will not say anything more than that. As a matter of fact, I think that after the government had given away our case to some extent, as it seems to me they did, by the shape in which they put the question touching the reasonableness of regulation, it was exceedingly fortunate for us that the tribunal took the course it did take. As a result of that, Newfoundland has still the right to control its bait supply; and the tribunal has decided that Canada and Newfoundland have the right of control over their own citizens being employed upon United States fishing vessels. If my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and other members of the government will put these two things together and see what they amount to, I think eventually they might come to the conclusion that so far as these fisheries are concerned we have the situation in our own hands, and that the fish of the maritime provinces would at no distant day have entered the markets of the United States free of duty, even if no reciprocity treaty had been made. That is the conclusion I have come to after considerable study of this award, and of what it means to the people of this country and the people of Newfoundland.

Now I am glad that these matters were submitted to this tribunal. I regret the form in which some of them were submitted. I regret that the government did not follow the example of the United States, and put its contentions in every respect at the highest point at which they could have been maintained. They failed to do that, and the result has not been helpful to the cause of Canada. However, it is a desirable thing that these disputes should be settled, I rejoice that some at least have been settled. I hope the government will take the opportunity at no distant date of announcing to the House what its policy will be with regard to the Bay of Fundy, in view of the fact that the waters of that bay are territorially the waters of Great Britain, under the reasons advanced by this tribunal, and under the award based upon those reasons.

THE TYPHOID EPIDEMIC IN OTTAWA.

Mr. BLACK. Having failed at a previous stage of this sitting to say a few words on this subject, I will ask the House to listen to me now, and I do so the more readily because I seldom take up the time of this House. I would not have returned to the subject were it not that I consider the editorial criticism in the Ottawa 'Citizen' of my remarks as unfair and unjust, and that I should reply to them. There seems to be a feeling in the city that nobody outside has a right to discuss this question at all. The Ottawa 'Citizen' insinuates that I made remarks unfair to Ottawa. A gentleman speaking at a meeting on Friday evening, I think it was, and who I believe is a reporter in this House, said that I put it over Ottawa too strong. Now if my language was too strong, what must we say of the language of the gentleman who addressed a meeting n the Young Mens' Christian Association on Saturday to which I listened. My remarks were as the moonlight to the sunlight, or as water to wine compared with theirs, or as water to hot Scotch compared to what was given out there. I think that I, as well as every other member of this House of Commons, has a perfect right to take part in a discussion of the water we are compelled to drink. If it is a family

row in the city of Ottawa, I represent here a family of 225 persons who are obliged to drink the water of the Ottawa. So far as I am concerned personally, I do not drink it, and never have since I first came here. I tried it twice, and I was so sick each time that I have abstained from it ever since. I have lived in this city during the last six years as much of the time as I have lived in Nova Scotia, and I claim the right to criticise the nature of the water we are given to drink. Coming back to this editorial, the editor says that I have made an unfortunate attack, and given much publicity, 'unfair publicity,' I believe he says, to the conditions of the Ottawa water supply. Why, Sir, before I had ever said a word, the 'Citizen' itself had been spreading the news from Vancouver to Halifax. There was hardly a paper but that has published news in regard to the typhoid epidemic at Ottawa. Then the 'Citizen,' after helping along this publicity, turns around and blames me for the few gentle remarks I made here. It says:

Dr. Black asserts that it is known where the present outbreak has originated. If it is not a matter of common knowledge, and Dr. Black is not using the city fairly by withholding such information particularly at this time. We may be getting poisoned, as Dr. Black intimates, but we can still conscientiously plead that we don't know how any more than at the beginning of the present outbreak.

Well, I regret very much the ignorance of the editor of the 'Citizen.' The report published in Toronto of the health officer who has examined the Ottawa water, says that the typhoid epidemic comes from that water. Dr. Bryce at a meeting on Friday says:

It is a water epidemic pure and simple. He placed the responsibility entirely on the water.

Dr. McCullough says :

The chief cause of the typhoid in Ottawa is the water.

Now I think these are pretty good proofs that somebody besides Dr. Black knows the location. I was going to say, when I was stopped as trespassing on the orders of the day, that there were four and possibly five modes of carrying typhoid. First, there is the water, which is the great carrier. Typhoid is a water-borne disease. Every man who has studied public health knows that typhoid is essentially a water-borne disease. Secondly, it is carried by milk, and it gets into the milk only by being carried there, by washing the milk cans or milk pitchers in polluted water that has not been boiled.

It might be introduced into the milk by a fly dropping into it and carrying the poison with it. That is No. 2, and No. 3 is, the fly which carries the bacillus from the excrement to our food dropping it into the milk pitcher, the sugar bowl, candy or anything else. The fourth is contagion where an individual comes in contact with a person affected with typhoid. Possibly the fifth, and probably the fifth, is wind-carried bacilli. This can be excluded because the earth is covered with snow at the present time. Flies can be excluded because there are not many around Ottawa at the present time. I am afraid there are some on the man who wrote that editorial. Milk is certified in Ottawa as pure. Now, by the laws of exclusion, we come back to one cause and one only. We must take the analysis of the water, and, taking the opinion of Dr. Bryce and of Dr. McCullough—not mine—we must come to the conclusion that the source of this disease is in the river. If it is not, in heaven's name, why is everybody crying out to have the water purified? Ottawa is trying to do the impossible. You cannot run two trains in opposite directions on one track without meeting disaster and death. You cannot soil and pollute the water of the river with the by-products of the human body and drink the same water without disaster and death. There may be let-ups, there may be periods when nobody is being killed, but every once in a while there will be an outbreak such as we have now. Let us see what is the history of Ottawa in regard to this very thing; this attempting to pollute the water and to drink it also. I have not had a great deal of time to look up the public health reports but I have looked at some of them. In 1895 there were 195 cases of typhoid in Ottawa, and in 1889—22 years agao—there were 2,000 cases. Have there been any since those years? What has there been between those years? Here is a sentence in the official report of the medical health officer for Ottawa. He sadly says 'typhoid fever is a yearly visitor to swell our death-roll.' That is the health offcer's report. I think that with the statement that we have had typhoid every year and with the records of the other years, it is about time that Ottawa had decided that it is doing the impossible, that it is trying to drink water that is being polluted. It is further giving to all the communities down below the poison from here. The result is that typhoid has broken out at Rockland. I think I have shown my justification for the remarks I have made, that the poison is properly located, that the river has been polluted for years and that somebody else started the publicity before I did. I have no advice to give to Ottawa, but there are only two things for Ottawa to do—stop having this river polluted or take the water from somewhere else. London, England, has a river flowing through it but it never thinks of drinking the water. It goes away back to the principality of Wales for its

supply. New York has the Hudson river flowing past it, but it never attempts to tap that source of supply; it goes fifty miles away for water. Vancouver does the same. Yet, we adopt the slip-shod trick of our forefathers, who took their water wherever they could get it handiest without knowledge. That has been tried by different cities all over the continent of America. The result has been thousands and thousands of cases of typhoid fever, and the cities all along the great rivers, such as the Ohio, Mississippi and the Missouri, have wakened up to the fact that it is impossible to pollute their water and drink it too. They have gone elsewhere for pure water or they have gone to enormous expense in counteracting the pollution that has been going on in the rivers.

We are not half as wise in these things as the ancients were. I might quote from Dr. Montizambert's speech on Saturday in saying that 2,500 years ago the Romans would not drink the water from the Tiber but they built that magnificent aqueduct that still has water flowing through it. Jerusalem, he also stated, went away where it could get pure water and brought it at great expense through an aqueduct. You cannot pollute the water and drink it without disaster, and Ottawa must either purify the water above the city or she must go somewhere else to get pure water. If the pollution above the town is stopped the pollution at the town must be stopped in fairness to those below. I am very sorry to have had this much to say but I thought it was only right that I should say this in justice to myself considering the way in which my remarks had been received by the ' Citizen.'

Mr. JAMESON. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I think that the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Black) has been discharging a great and important public duty. I think that he deserves the gratitude, not only of the members of this House, but of the citizens of Ottawa. We are all proud of the national capital and we want it to have a good name. I do not think, however, that attempting to conceal the unfortunate conditions which exist is going to do any good. The only thing to do is to correct them if possible. To-day the typhoid outbreak has actually reached such a state that the question is asked by people throughout the whole city: Who will be next? If the discussions in the House and the discussions in the press can do anything I think that the movement which has been set on foot and which has been so much stimulated by the action of the hon. member for Hants will work for that end, and I think he deserves, as I have said before, the thanks of the House and the citizens of Ottawa for the action which he has taken in that regard.

Mr. BLACK.

FLYING OF FLAGS IN CANADA.

Mr. DANIEL. I was in hopes that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) would be in the House, but I see that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) is here. I was going to refer to the fact that a few days ago we had a debate with reference to a resolution moved by my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie), in which the hon. Minister of Public Works stated that he was going to have the Union Jack flown, among other places, at all the seaports in Canada. He gave a list of the special days when the flag would be flown. I think the Minister of Public Works said that the flag was also to be flown every day at the seaports. I read from the St. John ' Globe ' of a recent issue the following:—

Sir, I notice that during the debate in parliament on the subject of flying flags the Minister of Public Works stated that hereafter flags would be flown daily on all public buildings at seaports, and also that St. David's day shall be a special day for the display of flags. The latter regulation was not carried out yesterday (St. David's day) and so far the only public building to fly the flag daily is the customs house. Why is the Union Jack not seen on the post office, railway buildings, etc?

(Signed) WELSHMAN.

I may add that the flag is not displayed on the militia buildings, and I understand it is only flown at Fort Dufferin when there is an inspection or something of that kind. The Minister of Public Works when he made his statement gave rise to anticipations which have not materialized. What is the explanation?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I endeavoured to convey that the flag should be flown daily on all public buildings under the control of my department in border cities and towns, and at the principal seaports, and also, upon all public buildings on special days. I do not know that it has ever been the custom to fly a flag upon the Intercolonial Railway buildings on special days, and the Militia Department has certain rules which govern the display of flags on the buildings under its control. I issued instructions that the flag should be flown upon all the post offices and custom houses on St. David's day as well as upon other special days, and that in border cities and towns the flag should be flown every day in the year on these buildings. Some of the officials did not apparently understand the order with reference to St. David's day, which would account for the flag not being raised on the post office in St. John on that day, although it was displayed on the custom house. I have had a peremptory order sent out by the chief architect, and I do not think it will

be misunderstood in future. I was sorry that on St. David's day the flag was not hoisted on the Ottawa post office, but there was some misunderstanding on the part of the official whose duty it was to attend to the matter. As soon as my attention was called to the fact that it was not flying on the parliament building on St. David's day I gave orders which were at once attended to. I trust that in future the orders will be well understood.

Mr. DANIEL. I am glad to hear the statement of the minister in regard to the buildings over which he has control. What is the rule in regard to the militia buildings?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am under the impression that the flying of the flag on forts and military buildings has some special significance. I do not think that either in England or in Canada it is customary to fly the flag from forts or military buildings as on other public buildings. However, I will get the information and let my hon. friend know at some later date.

Mr. DANIEL. I think the flag flies from forts every day they are occupied or garrisoned, and of course Fort Dufferin is only occasionally garrisoned. On military stores buildings and such, I should think the flag ought to be displayed as on other public buildings.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There are certain regulations governing such matters and I do not think there is any intention of changing them.

SUPPLY.

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

Civil government, Department of Indian Affairs, salaries, $118,225.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). There is no increase of numbers, and the increased amount of $2,825 is entirely accounted for by the statutory increases, being 12 at $100, 44 at $50, 2 at $25 and one at $12.50. The deductions for different reasons make the net increase $2,825. The number of employees is 78.

Mr. DANIEL. There appears to be 77, or one less, for 1911-12.

Mr. OLIVER. That is an error in the printed copy, due to the allowance for the private secretary having been shown in the current year as a vote for a separate official, while for 1911-12 it is properly shown as an allowance to an official.

Department of Indian Affairs, contingencies, $13,050.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What does the item of sundries cover?

Mr. OLIVER. Chiefly travelling expenses.

Mr. CAMPBELL. For whom?

Mr. OLIVER. For officials of the department, such as inspectors of timber and inspectors of agencies.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is any part of this to be charged to the travelling expenses of a man called Leach?

Mr. OLIVER. No, Mr. Leach is employed in the Interior Department.

Department of Interior, salaries, $919,798.77.

Mr. OLIVER. There is an increase of 21 clerkships over last year, of which 17 are new appointments and 4 promotions. The increases are as follows: Statutory increases, $22,825; 36 promotions, $9,625; readjustment of clerkships in the second and third divisions, $2,300; 17 new appointments, $15,700; miscellaneous increases, due to changes occasioned by death, resignations, promotions, &c., $4,950; total, $55,400; decreases due to changes occasioned by deaths, resignations, promotions, &c., $14,487.50, making a net increase over last year of $40,912.50.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the reason for increasing the clerical staff?

Mr. OLIVER. The increased business of the department. I might read, for the information of the committee, a memorandum which was placed in my hands to-day by some of the officers of the department, as it bears on this point. First, there is a memorandum to the commissioner from the deputy commissioner, which says:

I again desire to bring to your attention the necessity for additional assistance and accommodation for the staff of this branch of the department. The work has increased during the past ten years from 471 per cent under one heading to as high as 734 per cent under another; and there is every prospect of it becoming heavier, as settlers begin to apply for patent for the homestead and other entries made since immigration assumed its present large proportions.

It is of course impossible to provide more staff without somewhere to put them. At the present moment we are crowded to a degree which is not only embarrassing and detrimental to the work but absolutely dangerous to the health of the clerks. Our sick list during the past year has been very large, and no doubt is attributable to some degree to the lack of space and defective ventilation of the offices occupied by our staff. I attach hereto a schedule showing the increase of work, and also a description of the rooms which we occupy. You will see that the average floor space allowed to each is only 56 square feet.

The Commissioner of Dominion Lands, Mr. Greenway reported to me that he fully endorsed this statement, and that the correspondence was bound to increase very

largely when applications for patents under the new Act would come in. In 1900 the number of files handled in the Dominion Lands branch, the Assistant Commissioner's branch, was 29,263, and in 1910, 227,538. In 1900 the letters were 20,869 and in 1910 167,960.

Mr. DANIEL. Are these applications for homesteads?

Mr. OLIVER. No, they are letters with regard to homesteads. In 1900 the applications for patents were 5,601 and in 1910, 32,012. New patents recorded, 1900, 3,320; 1910, 19,352. Notifications of approval issued, in 1900, 2,746; in 1910, 19,247. The committee will thus see the enormous increase that has taken place in the past 10 years; and according to the commissioner, that increase will be much greater during the next two years, because of the very large immigration of the last two or three years, the work arising out of which has not yet reached the department.

Mr. DANIEL. I suppose all these new appointments are made after examination by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, we are asking the House to provide the money to make them, and we have no authority to make them, except through the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the hon. minister find any difficulty in getting suitable young men to take these positions? The Postmaster General told us the other night that he had a good deal of difficulty in getting suitable men for the position of railway mail clerk.

Mr. OLIVER. The appointments we have received from the Civil Service Commission are, generally speaking, satisfactory, and we have no serious reason to complain.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I find an allowance of $600 for private secretary. Is that his salary?

Mr. OLIVER. Each department has its own private secretary, and because of the confidential position he holds, and the special work he does he receives an allowance of $600, over and above his ordinary salary.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the salary of the man who acts in this case and who is he?

Mr. OLIVER. His salary is $2,300 and he gets $600 in addition, and his name is J. B. Harkin.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is he the same gentleman who appears in the different departments of civil government, Indian Affairs, and Interior?

Mr. OLIVER. The Indian Department has its own private secretary and there is another for the Interior Department, and there is an allowance in each case of $600 for the private secretary, and each department has its own private secretary.

Mr. ROCHE. Are there any employees who do not get the statutory increase this year?

Mr. OLIVER. We are asking for a statutory increase for all the employees which are not at the limit of their class.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the department make any attempt whatever, to get immigrants into the eastern part of Canada. In the maritime provinces we have been suffering from loss of population, and we want immigration there just as much as in any part of Canada. I know that some time ago complaints were made, that people could not obtain any information whatever in the immigration office in London, with regard to the advantages open to settlers in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. There was not a paper or a word of any kind about these provinces and no inducement held out to immigrants to settle there, and there are immigrants who would prefer to settle in the east, rather than in the west. I would like the hon. minister to give us some idea as to whether he has been doing anything in that respect lately, and what he has been doing.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sorry that I am not in a position to give any details at the moment. I am only now asking for the votes for civil government and I have not the assistance here which would enable me to reply to my hon. friend's question. But I may say that we have been paying some attention to the maritime provinces during the past two or three years. We have two publications in regard to Nova Scotia, two in regard to Prince Edward Island, and one in regard to New Brunswick, publications that, I think, are fairly creditable, both to the Dominion and to the provinces concerned,—at least, I have never heard of any fault being found with them. I do not think we have any delegate now working in Great Britain from the province of New Brunswick. We have one from Nova Scotia and one from Prince Edward Island, and my information is that the results of their work have been reasonably satisfactory. Of course, the work is very different from that which is done for the rest of the Dominion. While there is the room for population in the maritime province, it is not the same kind of room as is available

in the prairie provinces,—it is probably easier to attract immigrants to the prairie provinces than to the maritime provinces. But we realize the desirability of increasing the population of the maritime provinces in a desirable manner, and we are paying some degree of attention to it in the way I have stated. Of course, I can give my hon. friend more detailed information on another occasion.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it the intention of the minister to appoint one official from New Brunswick?

Mr. OLIVER. That is our intention. We had made arrangements for the appointment, but, if my memory serves me well, the gentleman we had chosen would not accept. We have not made arrangements for a delegate from New Brunswick yet, but our desire is to have one or more delegates from each of the maritime provinces.

Mr. DANIEL. When some other of the minister's estimates come up, perhaps he will be in a position to give more detailed information in regard to the efforts to obtain immigration for the maritime provinces.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I understand that the province of New Brunswick have an immigration agent of their own in the old country, that province and Ontario being the only ones that have such agents. It was stated before the committee that they were working in harmony with the Dominion officials. Does the minister's department lend its assistance to these agents?

Mr. OLIVER. Any literature we publish is at the service of the provincial agent, and I am under the impression that the New Brunswick agent does use the literature we publish.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Do they get any other, any financial, assistance from the department?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the minister give the names of the new officials?

Mr. OLIVER. No, we are asking for a vote which will enable us to appoint seventeen.

Mr. BLAIN. Have they been selected?

Mr. OLIVER. No, we are not able to select them. We apply to the commission and they send us the candidates they approve of. Of course, we can reject these candidates after trial if we see fit. But, as I have said, we have found them generally satisfactory.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is not seventeen, as I understand it; the minister is asking salaries for twenty-one new clerks. But in the vote for contingencies there is an item 'Clerical assistance $15,000.' Last year, this was $10,000.

Mr. OLIVER. The amount voted for clerical assistance under contingencies is for the employment of clerks temporarily engaged during the session or in other times of rush. This is provided for under the Civil Service Act. The seventeen clerks—

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is it not twenty-one?

Mr. OLIVER. There are seventeen new appointments, and four promotions. Provision is made under contingencies for the appointment of extra clerks to take care of the increase of business when it is not considered desirable to make permanent increases in the staff to that extent.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As I understand these appointments, four of them are creations of new clerkships to be filled by men now in the service, leaving their present positions vacant for new appointments. It means twenty-one new appointments, and four of the clerkships are to be filled by men who are now in the service.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I assume from what the minister stated that he is in favour of the extension of the Civil Service Act. He expressed his satisfaction with the results of that Act in the inside service, and I assume that he is in favour of extending it to the outside service. May I ask what progress he has made in persuading his colleagues to adopt the provisions of the Civil Service Act in the outside service. One reason why I urge this is that there appears to be a great disparity between the salaries obtaining in the inside service and those of the outside service. I have not the figures to enable me to speak authoritatively of the salaries in the outside service, but I know from instances in my own city that they are not at all in accordance with what they are in Ottawa. In going through this list I find there is a lot of 16 clerks who are receiving an average salary of $3,400. I question very much if that is fair; I think it is unfair relatively to the salaries obtaining particularly in the outside service in the western country. The criticism I make would apply in both ways; first, that these salaries are too large, and secondly, that in some cases in the smaller towns they are too small. Then, going on to the next item, there are 43 clerks with an average salary of $2,500 each; next, 81 clerks with an average salary of almost $2,000. Now, taking into consideration the very large number, it is impossible to come to the conclusion that so many high priced officials are necessary in the department. I am not criticising the staff the minister has under his control. It is

no more than justice to say, as one who has considerable to do with that staff, that I have found them exceedingly courteous and exceedingly fair. But it does appear that there is a tendency here in the city of Ottawa, in this department, and, perhaps, more so in other departments, to run the salaries beyond what would be proportionate to those obtaining throughout the length and breadth of Canada, both in the outside service and in commercial life generally. I fancy that if the minister will look this country over, even in those parts, where living is higher than it is here, he will find that men doing the class of work that is done in his department do not receive salaries at all proportionate to these figures. It seems to me that the government has run wild, and are not considering the financial standing of the average man in Canada when they fix the salaries at such disproportionate figures. I am appealing to one of the members of the government who has had some struggles in life, perhaps, himself, the best one I can appeal to along this line, and I would ask him, first, what progress he is making in convincing his colleagues of the advisability of extending the operation of the Civil Service Act to the outside service, and, secondly, whether he does not think that, all things considered, the salaries obtaining in his department are away out of proportion, not only to those obtaining in the outside service in his own department, but to those allowed among the commercial interests of Canada to men who do the same class of work.

Mr. OLIVER. I regret that, as has so often happened before, it is my misfortune in life to be a disappointment to my friends. I regret to have to say that I have not exerted myself to any serious extent to secure the application of the Civil Service Act to the outside service. It has not appealed to me as likely to be a satisfactory working proposition. As to the respective salaries of the inside and outside service, I am not able from my own knowledge to make comparisons between them, or to compare them with salaries paid in other lines of life. But I would remind my hon. friend that in the Department of the Interior we are transacting the land business of, I might say, half a continent. That business is all concentrated and handled right here in Ottawa. I do not think it can be expected that business of that character and of such volume can be handled satisfactorily except by high priced men. It may be that we are paying higher salaries to some of our officials than their merits or their duties would warrant. But I will say with all candour to the committee that it is, in my poor judgment, by all odds in the best interest of Canada that where we are handling so much and so important business we should pay salaries high enough to get men competent to handle that business. I think that is true economy and that to keep up the standard of efficiency is more important than to keep down the standard of the salaries we pay. As to salaries in the outside service, it may be that they do not compare favourably with those of the inside service in merely setting one column of figures opposite the other. I would not say that the outside service is not in many cases entitled to increase of remuneration. But there is all the difference in the world between the responsible man who is collecting the business and the man who is handling the business after it is collected. It is the difference in responsibility that is being paid for, as I understand it. I know that the salaries paid to the heads of branches here are certainly higher than the salaries paid to men on the outside, but these heads of branches have the responsibility not only for their own work, but for the work that is done by the large staff under them, and also the responsibility for the work that is done by the men in the outside service. We may be paying some of these men more than they are worth, but as an administrator of the public business I would say that the country is pursuing the line of true economy in paying sufficiently well to secure competent service.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Will the minister tell me what progress is being made towards settling the claims of applicants for homesteads in the New Westminster districts?

Mr. OLIVER. There are several different classes of applicants for homesteads in that district. As my hon. friend knows, the matter is one that is complicated with timber matters. He has already brought to the attention of the House one of these cases and there are others. In so far as the applications which are located within timber berths are concerned, we are not in a position to deal with them at the present time. As I have already informed my hon. friend we have had this matter under consideration for a considerable time. We find that there is a very great difference of opinion between the different interests concerned, and we have recently had representations from a deputation from one of the important interests—the lumbermen. They expressed very strong objection to the action that we had taken, and they pressed their views so strongly that we felt it was only right that we should give the matter reconsideration. Until it has become possible to give that reconsideration I cannot say how we will be able to deal with those applications.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would like to call the minister's attention to the serious position in which he places these settlers. Their case is a very extraordinary one because nearly all of these settlers were placed on the lands by the minister's own agent at New Westminster. They went on these lands with his full knowledge and consent, and in the cases to which I refer particularly the settlers had no reason to suppose that if they fulfilled their homestead duties they would not get their patents. I have had a ream of correspondence from these settlers, and the minister has on his files a ream of correspondence setting forth the position in which they are placed. A sample case that I will relate to him is that of George Bellrose which was the subject of inquiry during this session. This man went on his land in 1896, speaking from recollection. The land was open for settlement. It was not part of a timber berth, but he was told when he made his application that there was reason to suppose that correct surveys would show that an adjoining timber berth overlapped the land upon which he desired to settle. He knew that at the time but he did not know the extent of the overlapping which he had reason to suppose would be very small. It has now been determined that it extends over ten acres of the 160 which he attempted to take up. As to the other 150 acres there is no obstacle whatever to giving that man his patent or dealing with him in some way. The man has built a house, has brought up a family, has made an orchard, has performed all the duties that any settler could be expected to perform, he is one of the best settlers in Chilliwack, he is one of the most respectable men there, and yet in all that time he has not been able to get a title to his land. Worse than that, recently the British Columbia Electric Railway Company had occasion to cross his land. They destroyed his improvements to a large extent, they were perfectly willing to pay for the improvements as they paid all other settlers upon whose land they entered, but they found that they could not deal with Mr. Bellrose because he had no title to the land whatever. He could not be represented, as I understand it, in any negotiations respecting the amount they were to pay for the improvements that they had destroyed, but by some process they arrived at a value of $260. That value which he had created by his labour has been taken from him. The company have paid the money into the Dominion Lands office in New Westminster or elsewhere to the credit of the government. It is not the government's money, it is Mr. Bellrose's money, but he cannot get any satisfaction as to whether or not this money will be paid to him or, if it will be paid, when it will be paid. Worse than that still, Mr. Bellrose is in this position with scores of others that if the minister's new regulations go into effect at any time before he is dealt with he will be deprived of three-quarters of his holding and, as the minister stated in this House a short time ago, under the new regulations the minister will have no power to deal with an applicant for a patent whose application has not been finally disposed of at the time the new regulations go into effect. The minister has been a pioneer himself and he can picture to himself the position in which these scores of applicants are placed through no fault of their own. It may be that the agent at New Westminster acted beyond his authority when he allowed these men to go there. I would not like to urge that upon the minister, however, because I know his agent at New Westminster is a very faithful servant of the department, and has spent the greater part of a lifetime in the service. I know him to be a thoroughly conscientious man, and I am quite sure that he felt that he was doing the right thing by these settlers when he placed them in the position they are now in. I am quite sure that these men were justified in relying upon verbal promises and irregular notes which they had from this agent assuring them from time to time that they were all right and that no person could turn them off their land. If the minister desires to see some of these communications I have in my possession here quite a sufficient number of them to convince him of the nature of the correspondence passing between the agent at New Westminster, and the settlers on the lands. They run something like this. The agent would write to a man who inquired why he could not get his patent: I cannot give you that patent because there is a new survey being made; Mr. So and so, of the department has been up here running lines; those lines are not yet quite completed; his report has gone to Ottawa, and since it has gone there, I have not heard anything about it; I can assure you that just as soon as I get the lines from Ottawa I will attend to your case and we will issue your patent. In several cases, he has gone further and assured the man who was anxious about his holding: You can rely upon it that no person can come between you and your claim. I have correspondence like that in this very Bellrose case, but when they write to the department they are met with an answer to which the signature of high officials of the department is attached, telling them they are mere squatters. Man after man, whose case I have brought to the attention of the department, has received a letter from the office here, that he is a mere squatter on the land, and that the department does not recognize that he

has any claim at all. I feel quite sure that the minister has no desire to leave settlers in that position. These men have committed no offence against the Dominion of Canada when they came to the province of British Columbia in answer to the minister's invitation, published in all the newspapers, to come and get land and settle upon it. They come here and they go to the office advertised, they ask the agent where they shall go, that agent puts them on a plot of land and says in the course of time, if you stay there, I will give you your patent. They have been there as long as 15 years in the Bellrose case, and nearly as long in other cases, and these men cannot get their patents. I appeal to the Minister of the Interior that he will give some assurance that these cases will be dealt with. I am not speaking now of men settled on timber lands, where there are large quantities of timber remaining, although I think these men should have some information as to what their rights are. But, there are a number of men settled on lands not covered by timber berths and they simply have been delayed by the unravelling of the red tape of the department, and they have nothing to blame for their lack of patents, except the dilatoriness of the department based upon reasons which I cannot fathom. I would appeal to the Minister of the Interior to make some promise that whatever rights these men have, will not be jeopardized by any new regulations, and that they will remain in their present standing. That is the point of most importance to my mind, namely, to assure these men that the minister will do the square thing by them, and that if they were entitled to 160 acres under the old regulations, they will be dealt with just as effectively for them as if these old regulations had not been altered. It seems to me that is a simple thing for the minister to do, and I believe the minister has authority to do it. If the minister would only make a statement like that, it would bring comfort to a great many deserving settlers in the New Westminster district.

Mr. OLIVER. It would be very unwise for me to make a general statement that might be mistranslated. I wish to deal with all these settlers on a fair basis, but of course there may be a great difference of opinion as to what a fair basis is. With regard to this particular case, that my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) mentions, I cannot understand how, if the railway company damaged Mr. Bellrose's property, the damage should be paid into the department, instead of being paid to Mr. Bellrose.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). That is where it is.

Mr. OLIVER. If that is where the money is now, I can assure the hon. gentleman that Mr. Bellrose will get it without any delay, because I think it is entirely unwarranted that the money should be paid to the department at all, it being, as my hon. friend says, Mr. Bellrose's property that was destroyed.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Subsequent to the questions recently answered by the minister about Mr. Bellrose, I sent him a copy of these answers and he acknowledged their receipt and then mentioned to me for the first time, this $260. He said: I wish you would find out if there is any prospect of my getting the $260 that the electric railway paid into the department for the damage to my property.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not see that the department has any claim on the money in any way, shape or manner, and certainly if Mr. Bellrose is entitled to it, he will get it. As to going beyond that and giving a general statement that would be assumed to be a settlement of this very complicated case, I would not like to do that, and I think my hon. friend would hardly be fair in urging it too strongly.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I ask the minister to say that these cases shall not be prejudiced by the change in the regulations, because these men have done everything in their power to have their cases settled before the regulations were changed. For instance, the present regulations were virtually suspended last July and these men have been pushing their claims actively from July to the present, which would seem to be long enough to secure settlement one way or the other, but nothing has been done.

Mr. OLIVER. I have only apologies to offer for the fact that these matters are not settled. I do not often apologize, but I apologize in this case. There are many divergent interests to be considered and I would not wish to be tied up to a general statement, but any specific case, I would be glad to discuss. Mr. Bellrose apparently, was a squatter before the survey, and owing to the fact that part of the land he claims, is included within the timber berth, he has not so far, obtained entry for that kind, and, therefore, is not in a position to apply for a patent. I do not know what improvements he has, but there is no doubt that whatever improvements he has, he will certainly be maintained in these improvements. There will be no question about his right to that, whatever else there may be, I myself am a pioneer and my sympathies are entirely with the pioneers, but I have to be guided in administration by all the rights and interests that are concerned, and therefore, I do not wish to go too far in making a promise.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Would it be too far for the minister to go, to say that these claims, whatever they are worth, would not be prejudiced by the changes made in the regulations, and that if these men had any rights before the regulations were changed, these rights would remain?

Mr. OLIVER. There has been no change in the regulations. We proposed to make a change, but the change has not been made and I am not able to say just whether the change that we propose, will be made. So far as that is concerned, all the rights that were at any time existing still exist without being affected in any way by the proposed regulations which were expected to go into effect last July, but which never did go into effect.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). May I go further with the minister, and ask him if he will remove the inhibition he has placed on his agent at Westminster from dealing in any way with these applications under the old regulations, because while it is technically correct that the new regulations have not gone into effect, in another sense it is not accurate to say that, because they have been advertised as something that may go into effect at any moment, and are only temporarily suspended. As I understand it, the agent has explicit instructions not to do anything at all under the old regulations. I know that is the way he understands it—whether he has got those instructions or not—because he tells every person who goes in there, that he cannot give them any information; he cannot dot an I or cross a T or do anything that may be required to perfect any case before him. That is what these men are concerned about. If they had no rights before, they would have none now. But they see it advertised that while they have settled on 160 acres, cleared, improved and fenced it, they are likely to get patents for only 40 acres. I am sure the minister does not want to bring a man to this country on the expectation of getting 160 acres, and then pay him off with 40 acres.

Mr OLIVER. If a man has settled inside a timber berth or partly inside a timber berth, I do not know how far we would be warranted in recognizing him as a legitimate squatter. If he settled entirely outside of the timber berth. I presume we would be entitled to recognize any rights he might be presumed to have; but I do not give any assurance on that point. The assurance I am quite willing to give is that any settler outside of a timber berth, that is a man who has not trespassed on the rights of another, will get consideration for all the improvements he has made. I may say that our agent at New Westminster, although he is an old servant of the department, and I believe with the best intentions, does not perhaps fully appreciate the intricacies of the situation, and we are at present taking measures to clean up the matter and to see that people get their rights. I do not think I would be warranted in going further than that.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). It seems to me that the minister might say that he would implement the promises of his agent at New Westminster, which is all that I am aiming to get. In a great many of these cases the settler has the specific assurance of the agent at New Westminster, the only man on whom the settlers can rely, and who, so far as they are concerned, is the government of Canada. They have letters from him assuring them that they will be all right. Now the minister says they will be all wrong, because his agent placed them on timber berths. The settlers did not know that he had no authority to do that; all they know is that they cannot get the papers until the timber lease is disposed of. They are quite content to wait a long time if they think they will eventually get their land; but when told that they will only get one-fourth, and that somebody else will get three-fourths of the land when divided, they feel that that is not a fair position to be placed in. It savours of repudiation of contracts which they have made with the government agent at New Westminster. The only fault that can be found with the agent is that he has been too long in the service. He has aged rapidly in late years, and is now very feeble, and the task of settling these cases is at present beyond him, because he is not physically fit to go out and make the inspections.

Mr. OLIVER. I am quite aware that the physical infirmities of the agent have been growing upon him recently, and he is not physically able to deal with these intricate and difficult questions, and we are taking measures to have them dealt with. The clerk of the department who is in charge of that work has gone to New Westminster to try to straighten them out. As to the word of the agent binding the department, the position taken by my hon. friend is to a great extent correct; but where the agent has seen fit to locate a settler within a timber limit, we cannot guarantee to the settler that we will step in and take from the berth holder the right for which we have taken his money. If the agent made such a promise to any settler, he stepped outside not only of his authority, but of his right, and however willing we might be, I do not think we would be able to implement a promise of that kind to the full. All I can assure my hon. friend is that we will take into consideration the promises made by our agent to the settlers, and will implement every promise so far as it seems reasonable.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is this $7,000 for sundries to be expended in sending some one out in behalf of these settlers?

Mr. OLIVER. No. That amount relates only to the travelling expenses, telegrams, postage stamps and other sundries required at the head office. It has nothing to do with the service in the west.

Contingencies, $67,000.

Mr. OLIVER. This amount is made up of clerical assistance, $15,000; printing and stationery, $45,000; sundries, $7,000. The clerical assistance is required for the service of thirty temporary clerks whom it will likely be necessary to employ during the fiscal year 1911-12. These temporary clerks, in accordance with an amendment to the Civil Service Act passed last session, can be employed for a period of six months instead of four months as heretofore. We get them from the Civil Service Commission, just as we do permanent clerks. We are asking for provision for that many, but we may not require them. If not, the money will not be used. We expect, however, a very large increase in our work during the coming year.

Immigration, $1,066,250.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox and Addington). I think it is the duty of the hon. minister to make a general statement such as the Minister of Railways gives us before his estimates are passed. This is a very large expenditure, and it is now too late to discuss it properly.

Mr. OLIVER. I would be very glad to make a general statement to-night but of course I have no desire to force the House to go on.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox and Addington). If my hon. friend would fix a day for the discussion, that would be a considerable convenience.

Mr. OLIVER. Unless something unforseen should occur, we will say Friday next.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PERLEY. The leader of the opposition has requested me to give the following notice on his behalf: As the pending reciprocity proposals have not been carried into effect by the Congress of the United States at the session which has just terminated, he intends to move on Wednesday next for the postponement of the further consideration of these proposals in the parliament of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.23 p.m.

Mr. OLIVER.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 7, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 133) to incorporate the Alberta Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Ruttan.

Bill (No. 134) to incorporate the Canadian Inter-Mountain Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 135) respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill (No. 136) to correct a clerical error in the title of the French version of Chapter 142 of the statutes of 1910.—Mr. Brodeur.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. MONK. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to inquire from the government if the contract for the reconstruction of the Quebec bridge has been granted, and upon whose recommendation. I understand there has been a division among the board of advisers?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contract for the Quebec bridge has not been signed. When it is concluded, it will be on the recommendation of the board of engineers as established under order in council, and approved by this House.

Mr. MONK. Do I understand that the contract has been awarded for the reconstruction, irrespective of signatures?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are details in connection with that contract that it would not be in the interest of the public to mention at the present time. The only reply I can give to my hon. friend is the one I have given, that the contract is not yet signed.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the government, because we understand that there has been a disagreement among the members of the board, whether the chairman of the board has been furnished with a copy of the recommendation made by his colleagues, and if he has been asked to have a report upon that?

Mr. GRAHAM. The report of the board, the majority of the board, became part of the record of that board, and so long as the chairman was chairman he had full access to the minutes of that board, as full as any other member. Any report that has been made since he was chairman has not of course been submitted to him.

Mr. MONK. I beg leave to ask a further question in connection with the same matter. Was not the tender of the Imperial Bridge Company, the English Company, the lowest tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. In a very short time I expect to have this matter closed up so far as the signing of the contract is concerned, when all papers in connection with it will be laid on the table.

THE FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has not understood my request. What I wanted was a transcript of the whole minutes of the Treasury Board of November 30, not simply the extract referring to the matter of the Farmers' Bank, also, all the component members of the Treasury Board, not simply those who were present at that meeting.

Mr. FIELDING. If there were other minutes of the same date, I will be happy to bring down a supplementary return; and also to indicate therein the other members composing the board at that time.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS COMMISSION.

Mr. MONK. I have been requested to ask the government if it is true that Sir George C. Gibbons has been offered and has accepted the chairmanship of the International Waterways Commission; and also, if there have been any other appointments?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is in rather an inquisitive mood to-day. I can inform him with regard to the question he has just put that Sir George Gibbons has not been appointed to the chairmanship of the Waterways Commission, and cannot be appointed, nor can any one else, until the Bill which is before the House has been passed into law.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House again in Committee of Ways and Means.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Chairman, it is now a full month and more since my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) laid upon the table of the House the agreement which he and my hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) had concluded with the President of the United States, for the improvement of the commercial relations which have long existed between us and our neighbours. From that date to this that agreement has been reviewed, discussed and canvassed, in the press of the country, in meetings of public bodies, and in parliament; and unless I greatly misapprehend the trend of public opinion, unless I fail to read aright the signs of the times, I think I can venture the assertion that the policy which is therein involved has met with the approbation, nay, with the enthusiastic approbation, of a majority of the Canadian people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Against this statement of mine I understand that I hear some protest. I shall not stop, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the merits of the respective opinions on that point which we on this side and our friends on the other side of the House entertain. No word of mine, I am sure, would change their views, and I know full well that they will persevere in their views until the evening of the next polling day. I am perfectly aware that the policy has not been universally accepted, that it has met in some quarters, and I may say rather unexpected quarters, rather stubborn opposition. It is a well known fact that at present an organization has been created in the cities of Montreal and Toronto for the purpose of fighting this agreement. To this I have no exception to take, those who do this are perfectly within their rights. Neither will I underestimate the importance of such a movement, and still less the importance of the men who have placed themselves at the head of it. But even whilst fully recognizing the importance of that movement, I do not think there is any serious cause for alarm. General Grant in his Memoirs narrates that during the Mexican war he was in the army of the United States as a young lieutenant. He was riding towards the front in company with a friend. when all of a sudden they heard in front of them a most unearthly howling of wolves. His friend asked him how many he thought there were in the pack, and not wishing to exaggerate he said he thought there must be at least 20. His friend smiled and said nothing. In a few minutes they came in sight of the wolves and there were just two, which had made all that noise. General Grant observes that he thought of this incident in after life when he heard the noise made by some disappointed men, and he adds they were always more numerous before they were counted. I believe that what is true of the United States is also true of this country. Of the objections that we have heard to this agreement some there are which seem to me to lack singularly in force or appositeness; others on the contrary are worthy of consideration, not from any inherent strength, but from the circumstance that they are inspired by a strange misconception as to what would be the result and the consequences of the

agreement which is now before us. The wonder to me is that there should be any objections at all. Who can deny that we have now reached a stage in our relations with our neighbours which all parties in this House have been seeking for the last 40 years? Who can deny that if, 40 years ago, in the early days of this confederation, if 30 years ago, or 20 years ago, or even 14 years ago, when we took office, it had been possible to obtain such an abatement in the American tariff as is embodied in this agreement, there would have been universal rejoicing in this country. The fact, Sir, cannot, be denied, the evidence of it is to be found in this that the two parties into which the people of this country are divided, apart on all other questions, were always agreed in the opinion that the relations which existed between us and our neighbours, were a blot on our common civilization. There is further proof in this that these two parties in succession, wore a good deal of shoe leather travelling from Ottawa to Washington in order to obtain, if possible, an improvement in these relations. Still better evidence is to be found in this that when Sir John Macdonald introduced the National Policy in 1878 in this House he did it as a means to an end, with a view of obtaining ultimately reciprocity of trade with our neighbours. The other day I listened with pleasure to my hon. friend the member for Peel (Mr. Blain) narrating the manner in which the National Policy had been brought into the world. He dilated upon everything, he stated everything except this thing, the last of all, that this was, in the mind of Sir John Macdonald, to be a means to the end of obtaining reciprocity of trade which up to that time had been denied to us. My hon. friend's memory was short upon this, the memory of his friends is also short and perhaps it would not be amiss if I read him and his friends the motion of Sir John A. Macdonald, if only to show him the immensity of the distance which now separates him and his party and its leaders, from that party and its leaders of that day. This was Sir John Macdonald's motion:

That this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a national policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen now obliged to expatriate themseleves in search of the employment denied them at home; that it will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so badly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade and moving—as it ought to do—in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade.

Here was the policy laid down by the party in 1878 and carried into effect the following year, in 1879, when the Conservative party had been placed in office upon that very identical policy. In the Act bringing that policy into effect, section 6, of the Tariff Act, 1879, was embodied the following permanent offer of reciprocity:

Any or all of the following articles, that is to say: animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal, and flour of meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted or smoked), and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty.

That was in 1879, and we are now in 1911. And what was sought for in 1879 we may now have, and yet men there are who doubt and hesitate and falter and who would erase thirty years of our past history from the book. Pages after pages could be quoted from speeches delivered by members of the Conservative party in which the American tariff was denounced as unjust, as unfair, as hostile, and now that it is in our power to remove the injustice, the unfairness, and the hostility, men there are who rise against us and tell us: Stop, proceed no further, let the injustice remain, let the hostility remain because upon injustice and hostility the Canadian confederation depends for its existence.

It may be asked: What is the cause of this change of attitude, and how is it that men who all their lives have been in favour of the policy which we now propose to parliament are all of a sudden found to be against it? The other day my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), in his address to this House said: that the Conservative party had in 1891 said good-bye to reciprocity. I must confess that I was staggered at that statement coming from the hon. gentleman, because my reading of history is that the Conservative government of which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was a member, and an important member, when they went out of office in 1896, were just as much in favour of reciprocity as they had been at any period of their lives. I must say that the memory of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is not always uniformly good—it is good sometimes, but not so good at other times—and I hope my hon. friend

will not be offended if I tell him that his memory on this point is singularly treacherous. Shall I review with him the history of his past career upon this point, but before I do so it would be better if I should give to the House the very language he made use of a few days ago:

In 1891 the Liberal-Conservative party made its last endeavour for reciprocity with the United States of America, and after the negotiations were ended and we returned home to Canada, the Liberal-Conservative party declared itself as done with reciprocity from the United States of America, and that henceforth its duty was to develop Canada on the lines of its own self-dependence, and to look to the British market as the great, steady, stable market for our products. The old heresy had not yet been quite purged from the Liberal party, which pursued the quest until 1897. They went to Washington; they tried their efforts; they failed. They came back, and they made declaration in this House of Commons and elsewhere, that as far as they, as a party, were concerned, they were done with reciprocity negotiations with the United States of America.

Now, Sir, let us review the history of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) upon this question. He is aware, as everybody is aware, and no doubt he remembers it very well, that in 1891 parliament was dissolved by the government of the day, of which my hon. friend was a member, for the purpose of placing before the Canadian people the doctrine of reciprocity—not unrestricted reciprocity, as was contended by the Liberal party, but a limited reciprocity, a renewal of the treaty of 1854. The Conservatives carried the elections upon that policy, and as soon as the elections were over my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) and his government made a bee-line for Washington to interview Mr. James G. Blaine, who was then Secretary of State for the United States. But, the excursion of my hon. friend on that occasion was not a happy one. Julius Caesar said: I came, I saw, I conquered; but my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) might have said after his trip to Washington: I went, I was seen, I came back; he was ushered in and shown out. But the following year—not abashed at all, not at all discouraged by the cool reception of the previous year, the following year, in 1892, the hon. gentleman made another trip to Washington, and though he was more cordially received on that occasion, still the results were no better. Then, I suppose it is that my hon. friend would have us believe that the Conservative party and the Conservative government, after this last trip to Washington, abandoned for ever the doctrine of reciprocity. On that I take issue with the hon. member (Mr. Foster), and I will show him how treacherous his memory is. In 1894 Sir John Thompson, then Prime Minister, made this statement on the floor of the House, speaking from the very place I now occupy:

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that communications were indirectly made with the United States government to the effect that Canada would be glad to know of any desire or willingness on the part of the United States government to take measures towards the extension of trade between the two countries, and that Canada would be willing to reciprocate with due regard to the interests and industries of Canada, and with due regard to the revenue which would be necessary to Canada. At a subsequent stage an officer of this government went to Washington for the purpose of seeing whether it was the desire of the United States government or of the committee then having charge of the subject in the House of Representatives, to enter into communication with the government of Canada on the subject of tariff concessions on either side of the line.

Remember, that was in 1894. And, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) also spoke in that debate. I may say that the occasion of the debate was a charge against the Conservative party by Mr. Charlton, then a prominent member of the Liberal party, that the Conservative government was insincere in its efforts to obtain reciprocity. And, the hon. member (Mr. Foster) spoke for about an hour to convince the House that the charge of Mr. Charlton was unjust to him, that he was perfectly sincere in wishing for reciprocity with our neighbours, and, though I cannot quote the whole speech, I may with propriety cite a few sentences of his peroration:

When they, the people of the United States, look over the items in our tariff as it shall have passed this House, they will find that line after line, article after article, grade after grade, we have given them a better chance to get into our market than they have given us to get into their market; consequently legislative reciprocity so far as trade is concerned, shines out from the propositions that the government put before the House to-day in a far greater degree than it does out of the legislation which they have proposed, and which is in progress through their Congress.

Now, Mr Chairman, you will see at once how treacherous is the memory of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). He told us the other day that the Conservative party had said good-bye to reciprocity in 1891, but in 1894 he was proposing to this House resolutions from which, to quote his own words: reciprocity shines out brightly before the eyes of the American public. Then, in 1894, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) introduced a revision of the tariff, and I have here the Act entitled 'The Customs Tariff of 1894.' It is quite true, and I must give my hon. friend this credit, that in that last Tariff Act which he submitted to this House he removed from it the old standing offer of reciprocity which had been introduced in 1879, but that old section of the Act which I have read to

the House and which was introduced in 1879 if put aside was immediately reproduced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) in another form, Section 7 of the Act which my hon. friend's government passed in 1894 contains this disposition:

> The whole or part of the duties hereby imposed upon fish and other products of the fisheries may be remitted as respects either the United States or Newfoundland, or both, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that the governments of the United States and Newfoundland, or of either of them, have made changes in their tariffs of duties imposed upon articles imported from Canada, in reduction or repeal of the duties in force in the said countries respectively.

Here, then, in the tariff of 1894, is an offer to the United States of reciprocity in fish and fish products. Here are other offers in the same Act: Section 8—eggs to be free, when free in the United States; section 10—shingles and pulp wood to be free in Canada when free in the United States; section 11—green or ripe apples, beans, buckwheat, pease, potatoes, rye, rye flour, hay and other vegetables to be free in Canada when free in the United States; section 12—barley and Indian corn to be free in Canada when free in the United States. Sir, this is the way my hon. friend turned his back upon reciprocity in 1894. This is the statute of 1894; and in 1896, when my hon. friend's government went out of office, that was the policy of himself and his party.

My hon. friend was also good enough to review our career, and he stated that in 1897, when we came into office, the old heresy of reciprocity had not been rubbed out of ourselves. It had not been rubbed out of his own composition either. But when he said that we abandoned the policy of reciprocity in 1897, I take issue with him altogether. We did not abandon our policy of reciprocity in 1897. We made application to the United States, but when we found that we had been rebuked, that our advances had not been received as favourably as we thought they should have been, then we thought it was consistent with our dignity not to make any further efforts to obtain reciprocity; and I stated then, speaking for the government, not that we had changed our views on this subject, not that we had ceased to believe that it would be in the interest of the country to have reciprocity, but that we would make no more advances to our neighbours to gain that boon, but that if it came, it would come from them, and not from us. This is the explanation of the change we have had—no change of principle or policy, but simply a position which we thought to be more consistent with our own dignity.

Why, Sir, do I state these facts? Is it simply for the purpose of showing my hon. friend that his memory is at fault? No, Sir. I state these facts to show that the position taken by my hon. friend, that we have no mandate to negotiate with our neighbours, has no foundation whatever. My hon. friend tried to show, from certain words of mine, at the last Imperial conference in 1907, that we had abandoned our position on reciprocity. The words which he quoted were as follows:

> There was at one time wanted reciprocity with them (the United States) but our efforts and our offers were negatived and put aside, and we have said good-bye to that trade, and we have put all our hopes upon the British trade now.

My hon. friend concluded from these words that there was an abandonment of our policy; but my hon. friend did not do me justice in quoting simply part of a sentence. No one knows better than my hon. friend that it is hardly fair to a man to extract a sentence from a whole passage and quote simply that. I will quote the whole passage, and then the House can draw its own conclusion. This is what I said at the conference:

> Between the preferential tariff and the general tariff we have now an intermediate tariff. The object of this intermediate tariff is to enter into negotiations with other communities to have trade arrangements with them. It has been supposed that this was to hit our American neighbours. With our American neighbours we should be only too glad to trade on a better footing than at the present time. We are next door neighbours and in many things we can be their best market, as in many things they can be our best market. We should be glad to trade with them, but it never was intended, nor thought at the time, that this intermediate tariff could apply to the United States. There was at one time wanted reciprocity with them, but our efforts and our offers were negatived and put aside, and we have said good-bye to that trade, and we have put all our hopes upon the British trade now.

Sir, there is a different meaning in the words which I uttered at the conference from the meaning sought to be conveyed by my hon. friend. I was not surprised, however, at the attitude taken by my hon. friend on that occasion. He and I have sat opposite one another for a long time; he knows me and I know him. But I must say that I was more than astonished when I heard my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) the other day take exactly the same position. My hon. friend from Brandon, in the course of an able speech, for which everybody will give him his due, said that he had long ago had his doubts about reciprocity, that he had begun to doubt about it as far back as the campaign of 1891. I believe that my hon. friend's conversion has not been so gradual. It has been more sudden than he thinks himself, because

my hon. friend was at the Liberal convention of 1893, and he agreed to this resolution which was adopted as part of the policy of the party to which he then belonged:

That a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty would develop the great natural resources of Canada, would enormously increase the trade and commerce between the two countries, would tend to encourage friendly relations between the two peoples, would remove many causes which have in the past provoked irritation and trouble to the governments of both countries, and would promote those kindly relations between the empire and the republic which afford the best guarantee for peace and prosperity;

That the Liberal party is prepared to enter into negotiations with a view to obtaining such a treaty, including a well considered list of manufactured articles, and we are satisfied that any treaty so arranged will receive the assent of Her Majesty's government, without whose approval no treaty can be made.

My hon. friend from Brandon, like my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), has asserted that we have abandoned that policy. I am not conscious of it. It has been dormant, I admit, because we had taken the ground that we would make no more efforts to obtain from our neighbours what had been refused to us. But I deny altogether that there was ever any change by the Liberal party of the policy they laid down in 1893. My hon. friend from Brandon also took the ground, as my hon. friend from North Toronto had done before him, that we had no mandate on this subject from the people, in the last general election. It is true that in 1900, 1904 and 1908 the question of reciprocity was not an issue at all because at that time there was no difference of opinion between the Liberal party and the Conservative party upon that question. There was none so far as I knew, and so far as everybody knew.

I take issue with my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) when they tell us that the parliament of Canada is debarred from dealing with any question which has not been discussed at the previous general election. That is not in accord with the constitutional history of Great Britain or of Canada either, as I have read it. Let me ask my hon. friends what mandate had the government of Lord Elgin in 1853 when it went to Washington to obtain reciprocity? Had that question ever been put before the people? Had it been an issue the last time the people's representatives had gone before them? Not at all. Let me ask, further, what mandate had the government of 1864 to put through parliament the resolution which proposed confederation? Had the question of confederation ever been put before the people of united Canada? No, not a word about it had ever been heard. The only question then raised was that of representation by population. Yet the government of Sir John Macdonald and the Hon. Geo. Brown —because the two men were united on that occasion—brought in a resolution which was nothing more nor less than a complete transformation of our then condition. When Canada assented, in 1871, to the fishery stipulations in the Washington treaty of that year, had that question ever been put before the people? No, it was unknown to them. It never had been debated before. In the face, therefore, of these precedents, it is childish for any man to challenge the right of this government to follow the course it is doing.

But, again, I ask what is the cause of the change of attitude which we see on the other side of the House? That cause cannot but be flattering to this government. The only reason given is that Canada today is prosperous as she never was before. If Canada were still in the position in which we found it when we took office in 1896, with its vast fertile lands still unoccupied and untilled, with its natural resources dormant as they had been since the early days of creation, with its transportation facilities still in the most rudimentary stage, with industry stagnant, with agriculture unremunerative—were Canada still in that position, I have no doubt that to-day the policy we are proposing would be received with favour and the air would resound with pæans of exultation. But instead of being in that condition the country is prosperous, extraordinarily prosperous, and we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite: Do not go any further, fold your arms and let well enough alone. Well, what is this country? What are we? Is this Canada, or is this China?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Chinese have left well enough alone for 4,000 years. 4,000 years ago they were probably the first nation on earth, and so satisfied were they that they refused to move. They let well enough alone for 4,000 years. If a reformer showed his head among them he was ruthlessly put down and told to let well enough alone. It is said—and I believe it is historically true—that gunpowder was invented by an ingenious Chinaman, but the people of China never used gunpowder for the defence of their territory, though often exposed to invasion. They depended on the great dragon to sweep off their enemies from the face of the earth by the fire from his eyes. They let well enough alone. It was an ingenious Chinaman who invented the compass, but they never used it for navigation, and for 4,000 years their little junks circulated around their shores, never getting away from the sight of land. They let well enough alone.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And we are asked to adopt this Chinese policy. But, Sir, this is Canada, and we shall have to go on whether hon. gentlemen opposite will follow or not. We will drag them on, even against their will.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is our policy. We must go on. Some years ago a young lady showed me her album, which, as a young girl, she had shown to Sir John Macdonald, and asked him to write in it the motto of his life. And he wrote on it this motto: Hope on, hope ever. How far the Conservative party is from that motto to-day!

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But we shall go on with our policy. Our policy is 'advance,' and if it be wrong we shall submit willingly to the judgment of the Canadian people, and to the punishment which ought to be given every man who brings in a wrong policy. But this is our policy. Our policy has been, is, and will be, so long as the Canadian people continue to place in us the confidence they have shown us during 15 years—and that policy is to seek markets wherever markets are to be found. We are above all an agricultural people, our chief wealth is the growth of those products of the temperate zone, fruits, cereals and vegetables, and it is our boast—not an idle boast, but a boast founded on actual experience—that in cereals, vegetables and fruits we can, without exaggeration, beat the world.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At the northern extremity of the temperate zone, our cereals have more strength, our fruit has better flavour, our vegetables have more delicacy than similar productions from other parts of the world, and under free competition, not barred in any way by tariff legislation, they will displace all other products on the tables of the wealthy. Our object to-day is to open the door of the American market, to open the door of a nation of 90,000,000, which has been closed to us for the last 50 years, and when we are now on the eve of reaching that long sought goal, we are met by objection after objection, we are deluged by a plethora of sophistry, we are told that if such an arrangement is to go into effect and Canadian vegetables, cereals, and fruits can cross the boundary line and be eaten free of duty by the American people it will be all over with the Canadian confederation, and even the British Empire will reel and rock upon its foundations.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Sir, let us discard these freaks of unreasoning panic, let us approach this question from the point of view of common sense, from the basis of first principles.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let us, I say, approach the question from the point of view of common sense—and I am glad that my remarks on that point evoke some response from the other side; we will see how far they will go. If, Sir, I were to state to my hon. friends on the other side that amongst civilized mankind, all those who work, work with the object of disposing of the product of their labour, I should be told, this is a truism that is running in the street. If I were to add that the man who works has the legitimate ambition of getting the greatest possible remuneration for his labour, I should be told, this is a mere truism. If I were to say that the man who works, will be better remunerated the more clients he has, seeking the products of his labour, I should be told, this is a truism. And yet, this is the very thing, this very truism, which is embodied in the proposition now before you. All that we ask under these resolutions is to obtain for the man who works in the fields, the best possible remuneration for his labour. And does that proposition require any defence? Is it not simply on the line of common sense? Is it not the first of all principles? How, then, is it that it is not accepted at once? I will give the reasons. I will try to be fair in giving these reasons. But, before I proceed further, I must say that it seems to me that the House of Commons and the Canadian people at large, owe a debt of gratitude to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) for having obtained from our neighbours, such an advantageous arrangement, and having obtained it without the sacrifice of any Canadian interest. Mr. Chairman, here perhaps I may be permitted to say that, in my opinion, the discussion which has taken place up to this time, has been carried on upon a high level. Of course, I do not agree with my hon. friends on the other side who have taken part in this discussion, but I pay them the tribute, one and all, of having carried on the discussion in a fair manner, in a manner which, I think, deserves acknowledgment on our parts, and reflects credit upon themselves. I am sorry that to this I have to make an exception in the person of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). My hon. friend from North Toronto was not satisfied to criticise the

arrangement, in which, indeed, he would have been within his right, but he was unduly unfair in trying to depreciate not only the agreement, but those who had made it. He spoke of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, as being very ordinary men. He repeated this two or three times, speaking pointedly of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. Well, if my hon. friend from North Toronto has not learned it yet, he may learn it now, that if he had to his credit one-half the achievements of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, he would have reason to be more proud of his career than he can be. Then, he went over the members of the cabinet, this one and that one, and at last he came to my poor humble self; and of my poor humble self he spoke as follows:

> Men of such fine financial mind and business acumen as the right hon. gentleman who leads the government and the party.

I have never posed as a man of fine financial mind or of business acumen; but when I see the pretensions put up by some men who dabble in finance and business, I am surprised at my modesty. If I had dabbled in finance and business, I am prepared to admit, I should have perhaps made a sad mess of it. But I could not have been worse than my hon. friend. If, after having posed as a business man and financier, I had nothing to show but a record of failures, I would go and hide myself for very shame, and be very chary to throw stone into other people's gardens, for fear they should be returned to me with compound interest.

I stated a moment ago that the agreement we made, is simply to get better prices for the product of the Canadian farmers. This is a proposition so obvious that I am surprised it should have received the treatment it has received on the part of our friends opposite. But the objections made to this agreement are not to be found within the four corners of the same; they are all based upon extraneous grounds. The opposition, the Conservative party, are against this agreement because, as they tell us, it will produce consequences which will be deplorable for this country,—I have listened with some care to nearly all the speeches that have been delivered in this House on this question, and those which I had not the opportunity to hear, I have read with equal care; and I think I am fair in stating that the objections made to this arrangement are fourfold. The first objection is that the effect will be to deflect the carrying trade from Canadian channels to American channels. The second is that it will destroy our natural resources. The third is that it will imperil our industries. And the fourth—and certainly not the least—is that it will dissolve our autonomy and land us ultimately in the American Republic. I think I have there fairly stated what are the objections of hon. gentlemen on the other side; and the House will perhaps permit me to discuss them. Let us take the first—the objection that this arrangement is going to deflect trade from Canadian channels ino American channels. This question is to be discussed from two points of view; from the point of view of goods going from Canada into the United States for the purpose of being carried over to Great Britain, and goods going from Canada to the United States for consumption therein. Now, regarding the first, those goods sent from Canada to the United States, to be carried to Great Britain, in what way does this arrangement undo the system now in existence? It does not affect it one iota. At the present time, goods go from Canada to be shipped from Boston, New York or any American port without paying duty. In the same way, American goods come to Canada to be shipped out by Montreal, Halifax, or St. John without paying duty. A cargo of wheat can leave Winnipeg for New York, and there be discharged and put on board ship without duty being demanded. A cargo of grain can leave Minneapolis to be taken to Montreal and shipped thence without paying duty. This is by virtue of the bondage privilege which has been given by each government to the other, for the purposes of transportation. It has been in existence for something like sixty years, and I have never heard a complaint that it was unfair to one party or to the other. There was a time when I felt nervous on reflecting that the bonding privilege was simply an act of good will on the part of the United States towards us. That was the time when we had no communication of our own to the sea. But now that we have a continuous communication on Canadian soil from sea to sea, we feel that the United States can remove the bonding privilege at any time they please, and if they do so, they will suffer more than we shall. But Sir, our condition in that respect is absolutely safe, whether this treaty passes or not.

Now, Sir, it does not follow that for my part I am opposed to the policy of retaining in our own channels Canadian trade; on the contrary, I am very solicitous in that respect, and I think I can show by the records of this government that we have favoured the building of lines through Canadian territory from east to west with the intent of keeping trade in our own channels. But I may say this to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), and to the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) especially, that if they expect to keep trade within Canadian channels by legislative

enactment, by trade impediments, they make the greatest of all mistakes, a mistake which was tried once and had to be abandoned. Sir, when the Canadian Pacific railway was created in 1881 it was with the avowed policy of creating a channel of communication between east and west; the policy was to keep, so far as legislation could do it, Canadian trade in Canadian channels. Now my hon. friend from North Toronto commented upon the aspect of our policy rather severely, and with great force of language as to the results upon the credit of Canada, as to those who had invested their money in these enterprises, when they learn that by this legislation the lines east and west could be diverted from channels running east and west to channels running north and south. This is the language which the hon. member for North Toronto made use of on that occasion, and I quote it in view of what I shall say a few minutes later:

> Take the capital invested in your east and west lines of communication: Was it ever dreamed in Britain, Sir, that the time would come when a change of policy would be inaugurated by the men who petitioned for the money, who pled for the investment of capital and got it at long last? Was it ever dreamed that when this capital was severely fixed and invested, the long lateral lines of railway should be tapped every few miles by communication to draw off the trade intended for them to southern routes and do away with the long haul of the east and west lines?

My hon. friend should have had in his mind when he spoke that way the circumstance that in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company precautions had been taken to keep the trade flowing east and west. In that contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the following clause was inserted as clause 15:

> For twenty years from the date hereof no line of railway shall be authorized by the Dominion parliament to be constructed south of the Canadian Pacific railway from any point at or near the Canadian Pacific railway, except such line as shall run southwest or to the westward of southward, not to within fifteen miles of latitude 49.

Mark the words. The men who invested their money in that enterprise had this inducement, that the Canadian government would not for twenty years permit any railway to be built south of the line of the Canadian Pacific railway, and that for fifteen miles south of the boundary line there should be absolutely no railway at all. Therefore, under those circumstances, trade could not be diverted from Canadian to American channels, there could be no possible communication. That was the extreme precaution which was taken by the government of that day, that was a restriction upon the energy, upon the enterprise of the people of the west which was to last for twenty years. Under that restriction the capitalists of the world were invited to put their money into the enterprise, and they did it, upon the faith of the Canadian government. How long did this restriction last? Did it last twenty years? Sir, it lasted just six years, and at last, after six years, the Canadian government had to recall that legislation. And how did it occur? This is one of the most dramatic pages of the history of our country, and no one knows it better than my hon. friend from Brandon. I do not know if he was then in the legislature, but I know he was a young politician, and he could not have been indifferent to what was taking place. There was a restriction put upon the energy, upon the enterprise of the people of the west, and of the province of Manitoba in particular. The people of Manitoba wanted power to trade north and south, they wanted to trade with their neighbours, the American people, they wanted to have railway communication with them. But there was a statute, there was an Act of parliament, there was the authority of the Canadian government which prevented them from trading with their neighbours to the south, and the Canadian government attempted for six years to keep that legislation in force. The legislature of Manitoba passed Acts chartering railways, allowing them to cross that zone of territory which the government was attempting to reserve from civilization and from the benefits thereof. The legislature of Manitoba wanted railways to communicate north and south, they chartered railways to that effect, and these charters were disallowed one after another, disallowed in 1881, disallowed in 1882, disallowed in 1883, disallowed in 1884, disallowed in 1885, disallowed in 1886, disallowed in 1887. Year after year the legislature of Manitoba petitioned this government, petitioned parliament, to do away with this restriction, and year after year that prayer was denied. At last in 1887, after this restriction put upon their energy, the government of Manitoba, with the assent of the whole people of Manitoba, passed another Act authorizing a railway to run from Winnipeg to the boundary line where it could reach the American system of railways, and this Act was disallowed. The province passed beyond that disallowance, and proceeded to build the railway, though there was no legislation empowering them to do so. It was practically an act of rebellion. My hon. friends from Manitoba, my hon. friend from Brandon, remembers that on a certain day in the month of October, 1887, when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company challenged the right of the province to cross their line towards the south, 200 citizens from the city of Winnipeg, mem-

bers of the government, members of the legislature, financial men, professional men, merchants, bankers, went in a body to the point of crossing determined to repel force by force, to allow the crossing of the Canadian Pacific railway by the provincial line. Then, Sir, the Canadian government came down, and at the following session the privilege was repealed, a privilege that had to be bought back by the Canadian government from the Canadian Pacific railway. Now I ask the hon. member for North Toronto, what became then of those investors who had put their money into the Canadian Pacific railway upon the faith of the Canadian government. Were they ruined by it? What became of this turgid rhetoric of my hon. friend which I read a moment ago:

Take the capital invested in your east and west lines of communication: Was it ever dreamed in England, Sir, that the time would come when a change of policy would be inaugurated by the men who petitioned for the money, who pled for the investment of capital and got it at long last?

No, they did not dream of it, but it was done all the same, and the result was that their stock, which was worth at that time 30, has now reached 213. I repeat, if you attempt to prevent the people from trading in natural channels, no amount of legislation will accomplish that object, but let nature alone, and then the trade will be carried on on Canadian lines. Why? Because we have the interior and the shorter and the better lines. Take the condition of things to-day; Winnipeg can trade with Europe by way of the United States, it can trade with Europe by way of Canada. The line of railway from Winnipeg to Montreal is 1,414 miles, and from Montreal to Liverpool 2,760 miles, a total of 4,174 miles. From Winnipeg to New York by way of Minneapolis, Chicago and the American lines, the distance is 1,790 miles, and from New York to Montreal 3,026 miles, a total distance of 4,826 miles. The American line is 4,826 miles, the Canadian line 4,174 miles, a difference in favour of the Canadian line of 652 miles. Do you require any legislation, I want to know, to compel trade to choose the Canadian channel? Is it not obvious that for very self-interest trade will always take the Canadian line, because it is the shorter one? Well, Sir, that is not all. We have had experience as to what has happened, and our experience has been that our trade over the Canadian channels has increased by leaps and bounds as against the trade by the American channels. In 1900 the total amount of Canadian wheat exported from Montreal was 4,000,000 bushels; in 1910 it had increased from four million bushels to 14,140,000 bushels. Of American wheat the total number of bushels exported from Montreal in 1900 was 5,000,000 bushels, and in 1911 that had increased to 10,000,000 bushels. So, therefore, there is no doubt on this point, the Canadian line must have the preference, because the Canadian line is the best and the shortest. But, Sir, the question now has to be examined from the point of view of goods which are exported from Canada to the United States with a view to consumption in that country. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), when he spoke upon this subject, stated that our policy ought to be to favour interprovincial trade. To this, Sir, everybody agrees; we all favour interprovincial trade in preference to trade with other nations, and I am prepared to admit with my hon. friend that the home market is the best for all kinds of products. But I have to observe to my hon. friend that this whole amount of our natural products, and my hon. friend will not contend that the Canadian people can consume the whole production of our natural products. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) the other day stated that the home market would require about 80 per cent of our products. It is difficult to secure reliable statistics upon this point, so as to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion how much of meat, of eggs and of fruit is consumed by a population. This depends much on the means and wealth of the population, but it is possible to obtain not only satisfactory, but conclusive evidence and statistics as to the amount of wheat which is consumed by a population, and it is far less than 80 per cent of our production. Thirty years ago, or thereabouts, the opinion was held that the consumption of wheat was about five bushelsl per head, and to-day I am satisfied it is much larger. I discussed the matter some few weeks ago with a prominent miller, and his opinion is that at the present time the consumption of wheat is between 6 bushels and 7 bushels per head. If that be the case, the Canadian consumption of wheat, assuming a population of 8,000,000, would be about 50,000,000 bushels. If that be the proportion of the consumption to the production of Canada, then Canada consumes only 50 per cent of her production of wheat. Where is the balance to go? My hon. friend will tell me we have the English market. So we have, the English market is quite ample enough to take the surplus production of wheat in this country for many years to come, although we are sure the production will increase tenfold by and by.

But, Sir, there are other products than wheat, which the British market cannot absorb, or cannot absorb with the same convenience as the American market can. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) spoke of hay in Quebec, and rather hinted, although he did not say so, that the sending abroad of hay is bad business for the

farmer. I can tell my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) that no hay will be exported from the hillsides of the eastern townships of the province of Quebec, but as the Minister of Agriculture reminded my hon. friend from Brandon, we have in the province of Quebec natural meadows, which require no tillage, and upon which the best of timothy has been grown, not for 50 years, but for 100 years. Along the two shores of Lake St. Peter there are natural meadows a few inches only above the level of the water, which are yearly flooded, and which, to the knowledge of every one in the province, have been for a hundred years or more growing hay and nothing else. The counties of Berthier, Montmagny and St. Maurice, on the north shore, and the counties of Nicolet, Yamaska and Richelieu on the south, are so situated that they have a population of, perhaps, 1,000, who are growers of hay and for whom this treaty, if it becomes law, will be the most positive boon. To-day they cannot sell any hay in the United States because there is a duty of $4 a ton. Let the duty be removed and immediately there will be an immense trade in that section of the community, as there was some 30 years ago. The same thing applies in the case of eggs, poultry and mining products. For this reason it is to our advantage that we should have not only the British market, but the American market also. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) made the argument that if you were to adopt this arrangement our present facilities for transportation to Great Britain would become useless. I differ from him altogether. The trade will go on just the same, but we will raise more of those commodities than we raised before.

Then there is the cattle trade. Years ago we had a cattle trade with Great Britain. We have some yet, but it is not as large as it ought to be, because everybody knows that it has been constantly retarded by the embargo put on it some 20 years ago or so, and, therefore, if we are not able to sell all the cattle we can raise in Great Britain there is a ready market in the United States.

Now, I come to a very important point. It has been stated in this discussion, and repeated in the press; indeed, the statement has been alluded to in Great Britain, that by this arrangement we were putting an end to every possibility of mutual preferential trade with Great Britain. My hon. friend from Brandon made that argument, and I have heard it from the other side of the House. I take positive issue with that statement, and I say more: that statement does not bear criticism; it has only to be analysed for its falseness to be shown. Sir, we on this side of the House have never taken part, we have refused to take part, in the controversy which has been long going on in England on the question of mutual preferential trade. We would not take any part in the contest between the tariff reformers and the free traders. We thought it would not be dignified, we thougnt it would not be any part of our business, we thought it would be an act of impudence for us to take part in this controversy, whether on the one side of the question or the other, and we preferred to remain silent upon that point, having laid our policy before the English people. And what was our policy? Our policy was set forth by the Canadian ministers in Great Britain at the conference of 1902, and it was in these words:

> The Canadian ministers stated that if they could be assured that the imperial government would accept the principle of preferential trade generally, and particularly grant to the food products of Canada in the United Kingdom exemption from duties now levied or hereafter imposed, they (the Canadian ministers) would be prepared to go further into the subject and endeavour to give to the British manufacturer some increased advantage over his foreign competitors in the markets of Canada.

This was our policy laid down at the Imperial Conference of 1902. This is our policy in this year 1911 at the conference which is soon to take place. We have been told by the other side of the House that the action we have taken with regard to this agreement has made it impossible to implement the policy thus laid down. How can that be argued seriously? The Canadian ministers at the conference in 1902 stated that they were prepared to give to Great Britain a preference on manufactured goods in our market if Great Britain would give us preference on our natural products in her market. Great Britain does not export many natural products; on the contrary she is a large importer of natural products. We are exporters not of manufactured products, but of natural products, and we are large importers of manufactured products, and we have given to the Americans a free entrance to our markets only for their natural products as they have given us a free entrance to their market for our natural products and how can that affect the British Islands? Surely in no way at all can it affect our trade with Britain. The United States can enter our market with their natural products, but it is certain that England will never send a bushel of any kind of grain to Canada. However, England can give us a preference in her market for our natural products if she chooses to change her policy, and then we are prepared to give her upon her manufactured products a corresponding advantage. Sir, the policy of Canada is just the same as it was three months ago when this arrangement was made; nay, it is the same to-day as it has been for the last 12 years

and it will be the policy of the Canadian government at the next Imperial Conference which will open in May next. What then of all the shrieks and lamentations and imprecations we have heard from all sides upon this point? Surely the question has not been properly thought out for if it were it would have answered itself. Perhaps it is just as well now, since I am reviewing all the objections to this agreement, that I should take up another point which has been made against it and which has drawn many a tear from the eyes of some gentlemen sitting on the other side. I refer to the consequences of the agreement on what are known as the Most Favoured Nations. There are in existence certain old treaties between England and other countries in which it is provided that if England or any of her colonies should give a preference to any country in the world the same treatment shall be given to those nations with which England has these old treaties. These treaties were in the past of so little consequence that we never troubled about them. When in 1896 we found in our way the treaty with Germany and the treaty with Belgium we asked for the renunciation of these treaties. Similar treaties with other countries were not in our way, and, therefore, we did not trouble about them. However, all of a sudden these treaties have assumed enormous magnitude in the eyes of some, and a few days ago we heard a gentleman on the other side of the House say that we were practically opening our doors to the whole world. Well, the whole world is a big phrase, but let us examine in detail what it is composed of in this sense. The whole world in detail, so far as these treaties are concerned comprises, Venezuela, Switzerland, Sweden, Spain, Russia, Japan, Denmark, Colombia Bolivia (and who ever heard of any trade with Bolivia) Austria-Hungary, and the Argentine Republic. Let us see what our trade is with these nations. All told last year we exported to Venezuela $14,000 worth and we actually imported from Venezuela $53,000 worth, a trade which would probably supply the next corner grocery. And, in this $53,000 worth of trade of Venezuela there is not included any of the natural products we mention in our agreement with the United States. Then from Switzerland we imported $2,633,000 worth and we exported to Switzerland $10,000, worth, and our imports from Switzerland were chiefly silks and cottons and manufactures of silks and cottons. Sweden our exports last year were $111,000, and our imports $207,000, and there was not a dollar's worth of anything included in the agreement. We exported to Spain last year $51,000 worth and imported from Spain $1,040,000 worth, and our imports included fruits, but they were oranges and tropical fruits of that character such as are not provided for in the agreement at all. With Russia, our exports were $59,000 last year and our imports $138,000 and I cannot find among them a single article which would come within the scope of the agreement. To Norway and Sweden our exports were $487,000 and our imports $168,000, and amongst these there are some fish, and Norway would have the benefit of free fish under this agreement and that is the first item we find which is at all affected. Then, we have some trade with Japan, but does any one imagine that Japan will send us wheat or butter or cereals? With Denmark we had some trade, but not very extensive, our exports being $425,000 and our imports $86,000, and while Denmark is a butter exporting country not a pound of butter came to Canada from Denmark. Then, with the State of Columbia our exports were $42,000 and our imports $28,000, but they included nothing mentioned in the arrangement. Bolivia—we have not any trade with it; we do not import anything from it or export anything to it. Austria-Hungary—our imports are $1,410,000 and our exports $60,000; the imports are chiefly laces and things of that kind. Then I come to the last—the Argentine Republic; our total exports are $2,869,000, and our total imports $2,181,000; but I find that we have not imported from the Argentine a single article that is included in this agreement. The Argentine, however, is a wheat-growing country, and it exports wheat; but if ever the Argentine Republic sends wheat to Canada, there is no reason why Canada should not send wheat to the Argentine. so that objection is wholly exploded and may be dismissed without further reference.

Another objection which has been taken to this agreement is that it will destroy our natural resources. My hon. friend frim North Toronto was particularly indignant on this point. He grew eloquent and asked us what we meant by establishing a Conservation Commission for the preservation of our natural resources and then proceeding with ruthless hands to destroy their work. I have to say to my hon. friend that the Commission for the preservation of our natural resources was intended to deal not at all with questions of political economy, but with questions of physical science. My hon. friend told us that we should preserve our natural resources for our children and for our children's children; but I ask my hon. friend, what is the object of these natural resources? Soil, water, forests, minerals, have been given to man by the Creator for the use of man, and all civilized nations have acted accordingly. Why did our ancestors leave their respective lands and come to this country and take it from the Indians if it was not for the purpose of taking hold of the natural resources of the

country and using them for their benefit? The Indians were men after the heart of my hon. friend from North Toronto—they were great preservers of natural resources. They kept them not for themselves, but for their children and the children of their children. They never used them to any great extent. The territory they inhabited contained many minerals; but when our ancestors came here, they found the Indians using implements made of bone and stone. They never cultivated the soil; they lived on fish and game. They were in the midst of immense forests, but they never felled a tree to build a house. They lived beside the most noble streams in the world, but they did not use them to turn a wheel; they never even used water to wash. They were people after the heart of my hon. friend from North Toronto. Our ancestors who came here, came to enjoy the natural resources of the land. Unfortunately, they not only used, but also abused them. It is the reproach of the white settler that if he has used these natural resources, he has been imprudent, and has destroyed them much more wantonly than he has consumed them for his own benefit. It is charged to-day against the Canadian farmer that he is not cultivating the soil, but mining it, and taking all the fertility out of it. It is charged against the Canadian lumberman that he is not only cropping the lumber, as he should, but in his operations, is destroying much more than he uses. I think it is admitted that in this valley of the Ottawa, where timber has been cut for the last one hundred years, the lumbermen have destroyed more timber than they have ever carried away. Sir, the object of the Conservation Commission is simply to instruct the farmers the lumbermen, and others, how to use the natural resources of the country. But if that be the case, the Commission, which is ably presided over by my hon. friend from Brandon, will do an immense service in showing all our people how to use these resources with prudence, so that they will be preserved for our children and our children's children.

But, Sir, what has this to do with this agreement? My hon. friend says that our resources will be taken by the Americans. Well, the Americans will take them if they pay for them; but whether they take them or not, whether this agreement goes into force or not, the natural resources of the country will be made use of, and I hope in a more prudent manner than they are at the present time. My hon. friend from North Toronto need have no more apprehension on that point.

I pass to a more important objection, really the only objection of any consequence that I know of. That objection is that this agreement will imperil our industries. How will it imperil our industries? This agreement is concerned chiefly with natural products. There are no manufactured products dealt with in it, except agricultural implements. In negotiating this agreement we have adhered strictly to the terms of the resolution which was adopted at the Liberal Convention of 1893, in which the Liberal party declared for a treaty of reciprocity in natural products and a carefully-considered list of manufactured products. Why did we put this restriction in our resolution? Why did we state in so many words that the reciprocity which we would negotiate, if it ever became our lot to do so, would be general for natural products, and would be confined to a carefully prepared list of manufactured products? Because, Sir, there is a vast difference between reciprocity in natural products and reciprocity in manufactured goods. This is the reason we have acted with this prudence. I was not present at the Conference which took place between my two friends beside me and Mr. Knox; but it is not a great effort of imagination to suppose that the Americans were far more concerned about obtaining reciprocity in manufactured products than in natural products; but our negotiators would not consent to any reciprocity in manufactured products, but insisted on limiting the agreement simply to such manufactured products as agricultural implements.

Well, we limited our negotiations to that; and in doing this, I know that we have not gone as far as certain sections of the community wanted us to go. A certain section wanted free implements altogether, but we did not think it prudent or advisable to go that far. And why? The reason is that the men on the treasury benches, who are responsible, recognize in tariff matters the wide difference between manufactured and natural products. It is easy enough to put up a customs duty or enact a protective duty, but it is always a difficult task to decrease or remove such a duty. The reason is well known. It is obvious that if you raise the customs duty or impose a protective duty you create at once a fictitious economical atmosphere; and if the industries established under that tariff and under that temperature and condition, have to face suddenly a removal of the duty, you might annihilate in the course of one night millions of capital and reduce to non-employment thousands of operatives. That is why we have acted as we have done. We have gone very cautiously, with great care into this agreement. When we came into office in 1896, we had the same problem before us, the same consideration weighed upon us, and we took the utmost possible precaution—whilst giving, as we were bound

to do, to the consuming public an abatement of the tariff—we took every precaution in so doing not to injure any existing industry, and I think we have been successful.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Although it was part of our policy to obtain reciprocity with the United States, we have acted carefully in so doing and have not injured any industry. The only industry affected is that of agricultural implements, on some of which the duty has been reduced from 17½ per cent to 15 and on others from 20 per cent to 15 per cent. It would have been pleasing for myself at all events to have gone beyond that, but we considered that if we did, we would perhaps not do justice to the large number who have invested money in these establishments.

This government does not exist for the farmers alone or the manufacturers alone or for any one class, but for the manufacturers and farmers and for all the classes which compose our nation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not admit that there should be any antagonism between class and class. I do not admit that there should be any antagonism between the manufacturer and the farmer. The manufacturer is the best friend of the farmer, and the farmer is the best friend of the manufacturer. Let them walk hand in hand, let each profit by the trade of the other; but so far as we are concerned, for 14 years we have administered the government of this country on these lines, trying to do away with collisions between class and class, trying to keep all abreast of one another keeping always in mind the motto: Freedom for all and privileges for none. That has been our policy and that policy we shall continue. There are men who believe that we are going to recklessly ruin industry and capital. Capital is timid under all circumstances and the man who is at the head of affairs and the ministers who assist him, would not be worthy of the public confidence if they were not always careful to see that capital will be safe, whenever it is invested in any industry in this country.

Mr. BURRELL. Would my right hon. friend permit me one question ? Does not the very argument he has put up on behalf of the manufacturers apply with crushing force to the fruit industry?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not in the least. My hon. friend will observe that we have not obtained for the manufacturers a free market on the other side of the line, but we have obtained a free market for the fruit growers.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask a question?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. One is enough, I think.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think so, too.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not object to interruptions, but when a man has been on his feet for some time and is anxious to get through, he does not care to enter into a controversy which would force him to more exertion. But I may say to my hon. friend that when in committee, I shall be very happy to answer all these questions.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I understand that under the rules, when a matter is being discussed in committee, a minister of the Crown, if he is asked a question, is bound to answer, and has not the right to dispute the right of any member to ask a question. I have never heard of such a thing; it is an innovation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no such rule. The hon. member who has the floor is the only one who has the right to speak to the question. No other member has the right to interrupt either with a remark or a question. Such interruptions are permitted frequently, and parliamentarians have said that they are the spice of debate, but they are entirely limited to such interruptions or questions as the speaker who has the floor at the moment will allow. There is no distinction in that respect between a minister and an ordinary member.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I am quite willing, Mr. Chairman, to bow to your ruling, but I say that it is an innovation in parliamentary practice.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman does not accept the ruling of the chair, he is at liberty to appeal to the House but not to discuss the ruling.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say to my hon. friend that it is not an innovation and that of course a minister is bound to answer questions, but there is a time to answer them and when that time comes, I shall be happy to reply. Before I depart from this subject, let me say that to carry out this agreement, everything has been done, we were careful of all interests and followed in the line established in 1896, namely, that stability of tariff is one of the elements of success in all enterprises.

I now come to the last of the objections raised against us. If it is difficult to find within the four corners of this agreement the latent, the insipient destruction of our industries it is still more difficult to find therein the fatal germ which

is to dissolve our autonomy finally landing it into the American Republic. Autonomy ! They speak of autonomy. Why, it was only last year we heard the same men rebuke us because we paid too much attention to autonomy.

But, whether they approve of autonomy, or whether they combat it, they show clearly, in one instance as in the other, that they never understood or appreciated the true meaning of the word. This new-born zeal for autonomy, when reduced to actual exposition, is generally expressed somewhat in this way: There may be, perhaps, no danger to our autonomy in this agreement itself; but this is only a first step that will be followed by others. This, they tell us, is a trade agreement confined to natural products; another time the agreement will be extended to manufactured products; this will be followed by commercial union and lastly by political union. Such logic, Sir, will carry you any distance, in any direction, to any conclusion which hope, fear or any other passion may suggest. With such logic the world has long been familiar. Was there ever, in any land, at any time, a reform proposed which was not immediately denounced as revolution by all the forces of reaction? With this logic we have been particularly familiar in this country ever since the first days of responsible government. Open the records of our own old discussions, and you will find that when the reformers of that day were asking for responsible government, all the Tories denounced the idea as being the first step towards annexation. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that, if, upon this occasion, the whole Conservative party have been moved by the old instincts of Toryism. But the manner in which this reform which we now bring forward is opposed, will be seen by anybody who examines the question, to be an insult to the intelligence and character of the Canadian people. What are the arguments we hear against this agreement to justify the position which is taken that this is a first step towards the dissolution of our autonomy? We are told that this agreement may, perhaps, lead to certain satisfactory results for some time, but that later it may be removed, and if removed, may be followed by a high protectionist tariff, and under such circumstances the Canadian people would not have the stamina to resist the dislocation of trade but would be forced to seek refuge in the American union. This is the argument which we have heard from the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax); this is the argument of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Nay, this is even the argument we have heard from my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton), who, on this occasion of all occasions, has deserted the principles of Liberalism to join the principles of Conservatism. Let me refer to the resolutions of the Board of Trade of Toronto,—I take these because they contain in condensed form all the arguments with which we have been deluged in this House. The third resolution says:

3. That any present benefit to any section of Canada or to any interest therein which might accrue from said agreement would be more than offset by the loss and injury to other sections and interests.

There is an admission that in this agreement there will be a benefit at least to some sections of the community. It may be qualified, but it is there all the same. And the fourth and fifth resolutions read:

4. That the proposed agreement would weaken the ties which bind Canada to the empire.

5 That to avoid the disruption of trade which after some years under said agreement would result were said agreement terminated and a protective tariff against Canada established by the United States, Canada would be forced to closer trade relations with them, which would still further weaken those ties and make it more difficult to avert political union with the United States.

Mark those words—'Canada would be forced to closer trade relations.' Well, Sir, if Canada would be forced, what would force it? Nations there have been which, in the face of a great emergency, a great national calamity, would rise to the occasion, and even the women throw their jewels and ornaments into the common fund for the protection of the country. But we are told here by Canadian Tories that if a crisis, an economic crisis, were to arise in which their pockets would be liable to suffer, they would hesitate between their pockets and their loyalty.

Sir, the Tories of fifty years ago were made of sterner stuff. In 1854, the treaty which was negotiated by Lord Elgin, with Francis Hincks as his Prime Minister, resulted in immediate prosperity. Ten years afterwards the treaty was repealed, and a high protective tariff substituted for it. At that time, did Canadians falter? Did they hesitate? Were they forced into closer relations with the United States? Did they seek a refuge in political union? No, in the face of that action they conceived and organized the Canadian confederation.

The treaty of 1854 was negotiated by Lord Elgin, when, as I have said, he had as his First Minister Francis Hincks. It was ratified in 1854 by the first Liberal-Conservative administration that we had. That administration was presided over by that staunch, stalwart Tory, Sir Allan Macnab, and one of its members was the young man, John A. Macdonald. Did Sir Allan

Macnab, or did John A. Macdonald falter? Did they say to Lord Elgin that they would not advise the ratification of the treaty for fear that, if it were afterwards abolished, the Canadian people would be forced into closer relations with the United States? On the contrary, their advice to Lord Elgin was to ratify the treaty. It never occurred to them that, even if the treaty could be repealed, as it was repealed ten years later, there would be a single Canadian who would be led by the dislocation of trade to seek to change his country's allegiance. But imagine what would have been the colloquy between Lord Elgin and his advisers, if, instead of being advised by such men as Sir Allan Macnab and John A. Macdonald, he had been advised by the present leaders of the opposition, my hon. friend Mr. Borden and my hon. friend George Eulas Foster. 'Sir,' they would have said, 'do not ratify this treaty.' Lord Elgin would ask them, 'Why; will not the treaty be a cause of satisfaction to the people?' 'It would,' they would answer; 'but that is the very thing we dread. It may bring us prosperity. But, after prosperity comes, the treaty may be repealed and replaced by a high tariff: and we are not sure that our knees would be firm enough and our spines strong enough to resist the aggression of the Americans.'

Away with this timorous advice of faint-hearted men, we stand by the example of the stout-hearted men of fifty years ago. Reviewing the situation as it is placed before us, far from sharing the forebodings, the lugubrious forebordings, uttered concerning what is to follow the application, not of a new principle but of an old policy, it seems to me there are evidences not a few that we are now entering upon a new era in our relations with our neighbours, that we can see already whitening on the horizon the dawn of a brighter day. One thing is certain, one thing cannot be denied, that the relations which have existed between the two countries for the last fifty years, especially for the last twenty years, still more for the last twelve years, and which almost came to a crisis a year ago—those relations have been a blot upon the civilization of the two countries. They have amounted practically to a proclamation of noncommercial intercourse between the two countries, so far as legislation could bring that about. Another thing cannot be denied, that the man who raised the Conservative party to the highest pitch of power and influence, the man whose name is still revered, though his example is not followed, Sir John A. Macdonald, deprecated and dreaded that situation. He did all that man could do to change it and improve it. To that end he made many sacrifices, and to that end he made his last appeal to the Canadian people.

One other thing cannot be denied, that at this moment, amongst the thoughtful men of the American union, the feeling is growing up that the policy which they have pursued towards us for the last fifty years has been wrong, that it has been injurious to themselves as well as to us, that it is selfish and narrow; and they are prepared to retrace their steps and to enter with us into a mutually profitable commercial intercourse. Now, when we reach that stage, it is inconceivable that we in Canada should be told that this retrograde policy, long followed by the United States and which they are now on the eve of abandoning, should become the Canadian policy, and that we should follow a policy of non-commercial intercourse with them. It is incredible, and yet we have heard that idea proclaimed again and again in this House. We are told that unless this retrograde policy is maintained Canada is exposed to danger, and we are threatened that unless this policy of non-intercourse is maintained we are doomed to annexation. Annexation! Annexation! Once upon a time there was a very strong annexationist movement in this country, and it received its first check when Lord Elgin brought back from Washington the reciprocity treaty of 1856. From that day to this the desire for annexation has dwindled and dwindled, until there is not a vestige of it left in any part of this country.

Once upon a time—this is also a matter of history—the conviction of every American citizen was that the Canadian confederation should become a part of the American union. Recent events have shown that there are still men in the United States who harbour that hope. But there are also men who are beginning to perceive that the republic, though its career has been glorious, has yet many questions to solve and many dangers to face; and many of them are beginning to recognize that the solution of their difficult problems would be seriously complicated, perhaps fatally impaired, if, in the territory of the republic, was to be included another territory as large as their own, with a people not yet as numerous, but destined to be as numerous as their own, with problems of their own also to solve, and whose union with the United States would only add to the complications which the American people have to meet. If my poor voice could be heard throughout the length and breadth of this country, and if, without any presumption, it could be heard also beyond the frontier, I would say to our American neighbours: flattering as may be to your pride, the idea that the territory of the republic should extend over the whole continent from the waters of the Gulf of Mexico to the waters of the Arctic ocean, remember that we Canadians were born under the flag of your ancestors, a flag under which perhaps you may have suffered some oppression, but

which to us has been, and is more than ever, the emblem of freedom. Remember that if you have founded a nation upon separation from the motherland, we Canadians have set our hearts upon building up a nation without separation; remember that in this task we are alreay far advanced, that with our institutions, with our national entity as a people, and with everything that constitutes our national home we are just as devoted as you are to yours. Remember that the blood which flows in our veins is just as good as your own, and that if you are a proud people, though we have not your numbers, we are just as proud as you are, and that, rather than part with our national existence, we would part with our lives. If my voice could be heard that far, I would presume to say to our American friends: There may be a spectacle perhaps nobler yet than the spectacle of a united continent, a spectacle which would astound the world by its novelty and grandeur, the spectacle of two peoples living side by side along a frontier nearly 4,000 miles long, with not a cannon, with not a gun frowning across it, with not a fortress on either side, with no armament one against the other, but living in harmony, in mutual confidence, and with no other rivalry than a generous emulation in commerce and the arts of peace. To the Canadian people I would say that if it is possible for us to obtain such relations between this young and growing nation, and the powerful American republic, Canada will have rendered to old England, the mother of nations, nay, to the whole British Empire, a service unequalled in its present effects, and still more in its far-reaching consequences.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe). Sir, it would be well if, upon a question of this kind, which touches the heart-strings of the nation, each one of us here in this House spoke his mind freely without partiality or prejudice. Some have done so, and have broken with their party. But, Sir, the great majority of us are swayed largely by personal interests, and perhaps more so by party prejudice. It will, therefore, remain for the electors of this country when they calmly enter the polling booth on next election day, to pass a sane and sound judgment on this question. Now a reference has been made by the right hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat to the defection among the members of his party; that reference was such as to classify those gentlemen who left his party as wolves.

I think that analogy was pretty far drawn, because it is a well established principle of parliamentary government that on all questions of a domestic character or relating to home affairs a member of parliament is in duty bound to follow his leader, and his party, but it is as well established a

principle in the mother of parliaments to which the right hon. gentleman has appealed, that when a great question arises involving international or constitutional matters, a member of parliament is entitled to, and should of necessity pay his first allegiance to his country, and follow the dictates of his conscience. If I desired to delay the House I could give many examples of great men who have bulked large in the history of the mother land who have found occasions on which they have had to leave their party and turn their allegiance to another party. I could mention the names of Gladstone, and Chamberlain, and should I seek to enter into the Red Chamber, and into the very cabinet councils of the right hon. gentleman, I could also find a great name, and a great man who, on a certain occasion, left his party because he could not see eye to eye with that party on a great question. Sir, what happens when a man leaves his party on what is a national question, a question that touches the heart strings of the country? There is a duty on the other party in that case, it is their duty to support him, it is their duty to admit him, if he so desires, into their councils. I have read the history of the mother land very conscientiously, and consistently, and I have never seen anything but the highest respect paid by members on both sides to those men who have seen fit to leave their party on a matter of conscience, and national sentiment. It very ill became the right hon. gentleman to cast the reflections he did on those followers of his who cannot see eye to eye with him on this occasion. I think, Sir, this is one of the greatest questions that has ever come before this House or the country. The right hon. gentleman quotes ancient history. The situation to-day is entirely different. The men of the past are not the men of to-day, business is carried on in an entirely different way, and any man who reads and seeks to apply to present conditions rules derived entirely from the past, is bound to be mistaken. This question is one which involves principally the young men of the country, it is a question which involves a change of the entire trade relations of Canada; it is a question which endangers the national spirit and life, and every man is entitled to look on it in a new and original way. There is bound to be a great shifting of political views. I have no doubt in the world that there will be Conservatives in the country who will support the right hon. gentleman, prompted by a selfish interest thinking that they are going to make a dollar to-morrow. But there are others in his party, as he can see if he reads the press to-day, and they are the leading men of this country, who are leaving his party and who tell him

they do not want any more of this reciprocity question. We read in the government newspapers immediately after defections of this kind that these men did not amount to anything after all. I like to take a cool, level-headed view of political questions, and I will give the party of the right hon. gentleman this credit that it must have had some very good men in it or it would not have lived as long as it has. These men who are leaving his party are the leading men of the country, and if the defection continues, there will not be many prominent men left in it, except those who represent it in parliament.

I have pointed out, I think clearly, that it is the duty of every man in this country on any question of this kind, not to be governed entirely by his ancient party allegiance. The question is a vital question, it is a national question and not a domestic question, and any man is entitled to take any position he desires on it. In so doing, he is following what has been known from time immemorial as the proper parliamentary practice.

The right hon. gentleman quoted history to point out that the treaty of 1854 was a very good thing and also that there was a very strong sentiment in favour of annexation previous to the enactment of that treaty. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) referred to that famous despatch of Lord Elgin, in which Lord Elgin pointed out that unless free navigation and reciprocal trade with the United States were granted, the people of Canada would rebel and annex themselves to the United States. I have taken the trouble to examine carefully the history of that period. Any one who knows the contemporary events and conditions of that day will understand the great difficulties under which Canada laboured. How were these difficulties brought about? For many years previous to that the Canadians had enjoyed the privilege of a preference in the British market for everything they produced. Their goods were carried to Great Britain in British ships, and in addition to that, there was a bounty on a number of articles that they produced such as spars and potash and the alkalis which were large products of this country at that time, amounting to $4,000,000 or $5,000,000. In 1847 the Corn Laws were abrogated in England, which gave to the United States free access to the English market. It was not until 1849 that the Navigation Laws were abrogated, and during those two years the people of Canada had to compete with the Americans in price for their produce in the old country, and in addition, they had to pay excessively high freight rates to the old country for the stuff they shipped there, owing to the Navigation Law much higher rates were paid by the Americans, who had free trade with Great Britain. Consequently this country was under a tremendous handicap and the statement of Lord Elgin was absolutely true at that time.

Let us follow another little bit of history. I like to correct my right hon. friend's history, because I know he is a good historian, but sometimes he overlooks some aspect of the matter under discussion. During the course of his speech he asked the House what demand there was for a reciprocity treaty in 1854, what mandate had the Governor General of that day to go to Washington and carry on the negotiations? The right hon. gentleman must have known, certainly he should have known, that the then parliament of Canada, before the question was taken up at Washington at all, had passed an address to Her Majesty to permit negotiations to be opened. Would it not have been fair to the House to call attention to that fact? That was some eight years before the treaty was finally carried through. So during the eight years the matter had been amply discussed by the people of this country, considered on every side and everybody looked forward to the passing of that treaty with a great deal of hope.

From that he drew the lesson that all his government had to do was to ask to have a reciprocity treaty put through immediately because, he said that reciprocity had always been the policy of his party. To-day the right hon. gentleman gave us many selections from his former speeches, and good speeches they were, much better than those made by him since he formulated these proposals, because after all I think he has a soft spot in his heart in favour of his country, and possibly there may be some slight doubt in his mind—slight doubt mind you—that after all this treaty is not as good as it ought to be. The right hon. gentleman argued that the views of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on the subject of reciprocity were the same as his own, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has had fifteen years experience in opposition in this House to enable him to change his mind on the subject of reciprocity while the right hon. gentleman has evidently not studied out the question to enable him to come to a proper view of it yet. We all remember the occasion when Professor Bryce was sent to Washington as ambassador. Mr. Bryce is a well known free trader, a great friend of the United States; his principal income is derived from the sale in the United States of his book on the American constitution, and there is an American saying, that if you earn a dollar in America you ought to be an American. I do not say

that Mr. Bryce follows that example to any great extent, but there was a feeling of uncertainty in this country when he was appointed British ambassador, and a fear that as soon as he got to Washington, being a pronounced free trader, being a believer in the annexation of this country to the United States, and being in favour of continentalism, that he would seek to carry out the same old plan that is embodied in this agreement. So strong was this feeling, and so loudly was it expressed in the newspapers that the Prime Minister of Canada thought fit, at a public dinner given to Mr. Bryce on April the 1st, 1907, to warn that gentleman. The right hon. the leader of the government spoke as a good Canadian then, and he told Mr. Bryce where he should expect to get off at, and these are his words:

We are turning our hopes towards the mother land; we have introduced the doctrine and policy of preference to Great Britain and towards all the British Empire and this is the policy by which we stand at the present time; not, for my part, that I do not value American trade——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). That's nice, keep on 'hear, hearing,' until I get through.

—not for my part that I do not value all that we would have to gain if our relations were on a better footing,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Now, be careful, dont hear, hear too much.

—but this is a matter on which we shall have no more pilgrimages to Washington.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe)—continuing quotation:

This is the simple message I have to convey to our guest at the present moment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Now, I remembered that phrase vividly when the Minister of Finance rose in this House to tell us he had been on a pilgrimage to Washington, and that Mr. Bryce had helped him to get the treaty. Does it strike anybody in this House as strange that there should be a total reversal of the view of the leader of the government on this question.

An hon. MEMBER. Not a bit.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Of course not. The right hon. gentleman cannot blame this House or the country if he is accused of not following out the principles of the Liberal party, and with not pursuing the path that was blazed by Sir John Macdonald, and Sir George Brown when they formed confederation. One point in this treaty which has been emphasized by the Minister of Finance is that this is concurrent legislation, and that it can be wiped out at any moment. That we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite, is one of the chief points in favour of this arrangement; it is the only thing they can bolster it up with, namely, that if it is no use we can wipe it out at a moment's notice. Well, there was something of this kind before. It is all wrong to say that the treaty of 1854 was a great success, but nevertheless when that treaty was abrogated the best elements in both parties formed a great coalition to bring about confederation as the antithesis of reciprocity. And, Sir, there is another great coalition on this occasion, and the evidence of it is that the leading Liberals of Canada are joining with the Conservatives in opposition to this policy. On the occasion to which I refer the leading men of both parties united and in 1864 George Brown formed a coalition government with Sir John Macdonald and they accomplished confederation. A strange thing happened immediately after confederation, for George Brown the founder of the 'Globe' newspaper resigned his office in the coalition government. And, Sir, the reason that great man left his party was because the government of the day had sent delegates to Washington to negotiate a treaty by concurrent legislation good only for a short period, as this treaty is said to be. It may be well to put a few expressions of the founders of the Liberal party on 'Hansard' so that Liberal members may cogitate over them. Mr. Mackenzie who later became the leader of the Liberal party, and Prime Minister of Canada, wrote a life of George Brown, and at page 103 I find this:

On the 19th December, 1865, the Hon. George Brown resigned from the coalition ministry of George E. Cartier on account of the reciprocity negotiations that had been carried on at Washington the previous summer by Howland and Galt.

In discussing this incident Mr. Mackenzie says:

It was, therefore, with a sense of relief that he felt bound, a few weeks after the confederate council adjourned, to adopt such decided views on the question of reciprocity with the United States, against the views of his colleagues, as to render his resignation necessary. This was the immediate cause of his resignation. During Mr. Brown's absence from Ottawa on public business, Messrs. Galt and Howland were sent to Washington, and were negotiating there with the Committee of Ways and Means. The ministers subsequently agreed to accept the scheme of concurrent legislation for the interchange of commodities instead of a treaty. Commercial intercourse by reciprocal legislation would inevitably disarrange our trade relations with the United States. Stability is an element that cannot be dispensed with in commerce, and so Mr. Brown considered.

These were the views of the two great chiefs of the Liberal party at that time, the founders of the party led by the right hon. gentleman. I hope we shall hear not much more about concurrent legislation in reciprocity after I get through. The right hon. gentleman did not read his history, or he would not have gone on with this measure, for the whole sentiment of the Reform party, from the time George Brown resigned his seat in the cabinet until the right hon. gentleman took the seals of office, was contrary to concurrent legislation in this matter. Let us see what Mr. Brown himself said. Here is a letter which he wrote to George E. Cartier on December 19, 1865, which is to be found on page 104 of 'Mackenzie's Life of Brown':

'The interests involved are too great. I think a very great blunder has been committed in a matter involving the most important interest of the country and that the order in council you have passed endorses that blunder, and authorizes persistence in it. I confess I was much annoyed at the personal affront offered me, but that feeling has passed away in view of the serious character of the matters at issue, which casts all personal feeling aside.

'I desire to leave you in perfect harmony. I shall, of course, place in writing my grounds of resignation, but seeing the prejudicial effect their present publication might have on the negotiations, I propose that no reason be given for my resignation until the reciprocity question is settled one way or the other. I propose to state in to-morrow's 'Globe' that my resignation has occurred from a grave difference in the cabinet in which I stand alone on an important question; that the explanation will be given in parliament in due time, and that it would be inexpedient for the public interests that they should be given sooner. I make this suggestion, believing it the best thing for the public interest, and on that ground alone; but any other proper course of procedure I am ready to adopt at the wish of my late colleagues.'

The next quotation which I desire to place on record is from George Brown's speech, delivered in the Senate in 1875, on the subject of reciprocity with the United States. In 1874 George Brown was sent to the United States to negotiate a treaty of this kind. He succeeded in negotiating a treaty, which was for a period of 21 years. The reason for that period being fixed was that he realized that such a treaty must not be subject to the will of the American Congress to change it at a moment's notice. Mr. Brown, in his speech before the Senate, which can be found in the records of that House, said:

In the negotiations of 1865-6 for a renewal of the treaty, offers were made to the American government by our then Finance Minister, Sir A. T. Galt, which in my opinion ought not to have been made. The government then existing in Canada was the coalition government formed in 1864 for the special purpose of carrying confederation of the whole British North American provinces. I was a member of that government, and, as is well known, it was in consequence of the policy adopted by my colleagues and the conduct of the reciprocity negotiations that I felt compelled to resign my position as president of the Executive Council. I resigned because I felt very strongly that, though we in Canada derived great advantage from the treaty of 1854, the American people derived still greater advantage from it. I had no objection to that and was quite ready to renew the old treaty or even to extend it largely on fair terms of reciprocity, but I was not willing to ask for renewal as a favour to Canada; I was not willing to offer special inducements for renewal without fair concessions in return; I was not willing that the canals and inland waters of Canada could be made the joint property of the United States and Canada and be maintained at their joint expense; I was not willing that the customs and excise duties of Canada should be assimilated to the prohibitory rates of the United States; and very specially was I unwilling that any such arrangement should be entered into with the United States, dependent on the frail tenure of reciprocal legislation, repealable at any moment at the caprice of either party. I firmly believe that good as a reciprocity treaty had been for Canada, in the event of repeal, we had a commercial policy of our own open to us for adoption not greatly inferior to that we should be deprived of; and unless we got a treaty for a definite term of years and conditions of fair reciprocity, without such embarrassing entanglements as were proposed, I was willing that the treaty of 1854 should be repealed, and each country left to follow its own course. My colleagues, determined to proceed in a matter I deprecated, I could not be responsible for such a policy, and to avoid responsibility for it I resigned office. The government sent deputies to Washington to obtain, if possible, legislative reciprocity—they did all they could to obtain it, but without success, and the treaty of 1854 came to an end on the 17th March, 1866. I have not changed my opinions from what they were in December, 1865. I still believe that Canada largely profited by the treaty of 1854, but that the Americans profited by it still more, and we all know—for we have tested it—that Canada has a commercial policy of her own but little if at all inferior to that you were deprived of in 1866.

Does not that cover the whole argument of the Conservative party in regard to the present agreement? That was the policy of George Brown, and the policy of the great Liberal party for many years. I am free to admit that there were a few Conservatives who desired reciprocity at that time, just as there are, perhaps, to-day a few Conservatives who desire reciprocity; but this country has advanced very greatly since that time. Were it not that a great deal of stress has been put upon the history of this movement, I would not trouble the House with so much about it Now,

the treaty of 1854, which it took eight years to negotiate, unlike this treaty, which took eight days, or, perhaps, eight minutes, did not bring about that great amount of prosperity for this country which it was expected to bring. In the very first year of the treaty the carrying trade of Canada from Sarnia to the sea was taken over by the United States. I have to ask the House again to bear with me while I place on record some figures, because this is a subject on which a great many beautiful arguments have been framed upon a merely hypothetical basis. I have here a memorandum which gives the total trade of the St. Lawrence route in the year previous to the adoption of the treaty of 1854:

In 1849 the British navigation laws were repealed. Then this country had free trade and free navigation with Great Britain, and Canadian goods were carried by American vessels in competition with English vessels over the St. Lawrence route to Great Britain. There were no navigation laws to prevent that. Trade on the St. Lawrence grew enormously. In 1854 it amounted to $42,000,000. The first year of reciprocity—the Canadians gave the United States one-half the carryinig trade from Sarnia to the sea, and in all likelihood history will repeat itself. Here are the figures:

TOTAL TRADE, ST. LAWRENCE, QUEBEC.

	1854.	1855.
Trade..	$ 33,633,128	$ 15,208,600
Ships..	1,416	742
Tons..	618,926	348,800
Sailors..	20,301	11,902
Exports and imports, Montreal and Quebec..	$ 42,000,000	$ 28,000,000

The total exports from Montreal and Quebec for 1854 were $42,000,000 in rough figures and in 1855 they had declined to $28,000,000. It is quite safe to say that the same result which occured in 1854 will occur once this treaty comes into force. Those figures were compiled, and recently published in the Canadian 'Century' in an article by Mr. G. D. Griffin, a well known journalist of that period. So that the treaty did not in that way benefit Canada to any extent. If I desired to do so, I could show in 1857 there was great distress throughout Canada. You can turn up the files of the 'Globe' and read about soup kitchens, about the people being in a starving condition, and about suggested legislation to relieve distress; but the great year of Canada was the last year of the treaty. It is true there were good prices in 1861 because the war in the United States had caused a great demand for cattle, hogs, sheep and other products raised in Canada. The last year of the treaty was the year of reconstruction in the United States. The war was then over. The fields which had been left untilled during the war were being again brought under cultivation, and the abandoned farms were being restored to their former condition. The great waste in cattle, hogs, sheep and poultry and other farming stock which occurred during the war had to be replaced, and in addition there was the speculative element which arose at that time and increased the trade with this country, so that in that year the balance in our favour rose to very large proportions.

When we read the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite delivered in this House and those spoken outside this House and many of the newspaper comments, which were made throughout the green and salad days of commercial union, we find that the great argument advanced was that the trade balance in favour of this country, while the reciprocity treaty was in force, was so great that we would be very foolish if we did not secure another treaty of the kind. Well, in my investigations of the records of this House, and of the United States Congress, I discovered what I consider one of the strangest things in connection with this matter which has ever occurred in connection with an international question outside of that red line map which we are told Mr. Webster used when he stole from us the northern part of the state of Maine. I find that throughout the discussion a certain statistical table was used. That table was first published in Canada and most of the figures were supplied by Mr. Paterson, of the Montreal Board of Trade. That table showed a very large trade balance in favour of Canada and it has been republished by a gentleman in the United States for the benefit of the United States government, a Mr. Larned. He published that statement in a report he made to the United States Congress on the question of reciprocity. The Hon. George Brown had a vague idea in his mind—as anybody who reads his speeches will see—that the figures they were using were all false, but he could not apparently get at the true figures because I have not been able to find in the journals of this House, or the Senate, that the true figures of the trade were ever placed on the records of either House. But a strange thing occurred. About 1880 there was some talk of reciprocity, and for the first time the actual figures were published in the journals of Congress. They were given by Mr. Nimmo, who was then secretary of the Bureau of Statistics of the United States Treasury. The Americans have means for obtaining absolutely accurate statistics of their trade which we lack. If you ship anything out of the United States you have to make a sworn declaration and manifest as to its value just as if you were entering it at an American customs house, so that their figures of export and import must be correct. In this country we are supposed to give export value, but anybody who knows

anything about the business will not for one moment imagine that the figures in our blue-book of the exports of Canada are at all accurate. Take the figures of exports of the items mentioned in this schedule and compare them with the actual sworn fact. Suppose you take the Canadian figures of exports from Canada to the United States and compare them with the American figures and you will find a discrepancy. The United States have the exact figures and it is my intention to place on record in a few minutes both tables, I shall give the facts to show that the leaders of the Liberal party were entirely opposed to concurrent legislation such as we are now asked to enact, and now I am going to show that the figures of the trade from Canadian sources are all wrong. Let me now give the false statistical table of trade with the United States, 1854-1866 accompanying the report of J. U. Larned to the Secretary of the United States Treasury, July 3, 1871. These are the Canadian statistics used in the reciprocity controversy. Canadian figures were prepared by W. J. Patterson, secretary of the Montreal Board of Trade:

	From Canada to United States.	To Canada from United States.	Balance.
1854...	$ 6,721,539	$15,533,090	-$ 8,811,551
1855...	12,182,314	20,828,676	- 8,646,362
1856...	17,488,197	22,704,508	- 5,216,311
1857...	18,291,834	20,224,648	- 1,932,814
1858...	11,581,570	15,635,565	- 4,053,995
1859... .. .	14,208,717	17,592,916	- 3,384,199
1860...	18,853,033	17,273,029	+ 1,580,004
1861...	18,645,457	20,206,080	- 1,560,623
1862...	15,257,812	22,642,860	- 7,385,048
1863...	18,670,773	18,457,683	+ 213,090
1864...	32,422,015	7,952,401	+ 24,469,614
1865...	30,547,267	14,820,577	+ 15,726,690
1866...	46,199,470	15,242,834	+ 30,956,636

That is the false table. Now I intend to put the actual figures on record. It will take only a few moments, and I hope that before the House resumes at eight o'clock hon. members will think these figures over. The table is as follows:

Statistical table of trade between Canada and the United States, prepared by Joseph Nimmo, junior, chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the United States Treasury, May 25, 1880, presented 2nd session, 46th Congress, accompanying report 1127, part 2, House of Representatives.

	To Canada.	To United States.	Balance.
1854..	$24,157,612	$ 8,784,412	-$15,373,200
1855...	27,741,808	15,118,289	- 12,623,519
1856...	29,025,349	21,276,614	- 7,748,735
1857...	24,138,482	22,108,916	- 2,029,566
1858...	23,604,526	15,784,836	- 7,819,690
1859...	28,109,494	19,287,565	- 8,821,929
1860...	22,695,928	23,582,796	+ 876,868
1861...	22,676,513	22,724,489	+ 47,976
1862...	20,573,070	18,511,025	- 2,062,045
1863...	27,619,814	17,484,786	- 10,135,028
1864...	26,574,624	29,608,736	+ 3,034,112
1865...	28,829,402	33,264,403	+ 4,435,001
1866...	24,828,880	48,528,628	+ 23,699,748
1867...	21,020,302	25,044,005	+ 4,023,703
1868...	24,080,777	26,261,379	+ 2,180,602
1869...	23,381,471	29,293,766	+ 5,912,295
1870...	25,339,254	36,265,328	+ 10,926,074
1871...	32,276,176	32,542,137	+ 265,961
1872...	29,411,554	36,346,930	+ 6,935,476
1873...	34,565,113	37,649,532	+ 3,084,419
1874...	43,473,174	34,365,961	- 9,107,213
1875...	36,225,735	28,271,926	- 7,953,809
1876...	35,004,131	29,010,251	- 5,993,880
1877...	39,374,180	24,277,378	- 15,096,802
1878...	38,284,421	25,357,802	- 12,926,619
1879...	30,843,702	26,133,554	- 4,710,148

SUMMARY.

1854-1866, 13 years—

Total balances, United States..	$66,613,712
" " Canada..	32,093,705
General balance. United States.	$34,520,007

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CURRIE. When the House rose at six o'clock, I had had the pleasure of placing upon the records two tables of statistics, giving the trade of this country with the United States during the period of the old treaty. I stated that one of those tables was absolutely false, and that was the table which had always been used in the discussion upon the question of trade relations with the United States from the time the old reciprocity treaty was abrogated. Now, the figures of that table, which table I would call the greatest statistical lie of the nineteenth century, showed that there was a balance of trade in favour of this country for that period of $31,955,131. On the face of it, that would appear to be a good thing for Canada, because in those days we did not have that heresy proclaimed that it is a good thing for a country to have a balance of trade against it. In fact, the doctrine used to be preached by those high priests of the Liberal party, by those great financial lights of the Liberal party, that if a country did not have a trade balance in its favour sooner or later that country would go to ruin; in other words, that commodity must pay for commodity, which is a doctrine of free traders from time immemorial. I find that that false statement was the statement upon which commercial union and reciprocity were fought, and which I may say was sanctioned by the United States, which published it in its records, showing that they deliberately intended to falsify the facts, I find that according to the true statement, the actual American figures showed, during the period of the treaty, a balance in favour of the United States of $34,520,007. So the treaty was not quite so good for Canada as it appeared on the face of it.

The right hon. leader of the House took

issue with the members on this side of the House, who declared that this government and this parliament had received no mandate from the people to negotiate this treaty. The Prime Minister took exception to that statement, and said that neither was there any mandate for the old treaty, that there was no mandate for confederation, in fact, that there was no mandate for any great piece of legislation that had been passed in this country. I pointed out in the earlier portion of my speech that before the old treaty of 1854 was arranged an address was passed by the parliament of Canada on May 12, 1846, which address was forwarded to Great Britain. Negotiations followed, with the result that a treaty was concluded in June, 1854, ratification was exchanged at Washington on September 9, 1854, it was proclaimed September 11, 1854, and took effect March 16, 1855. Now, throughout the whole period of that treaty after it was consummated by the United States, the arguments were that it would only be a very short time until Canada became a portion of the United States. Did I wish to do so, I could take an hour in placing on the 'Hansard' extracts to show that the leading American newspapers and writers took that view of the question. The prevalent view was expressed by the 'North American Review,' which was at that time the leading exponent of public opinion in the United States. The chief writer in the review laid down the doctrine that the treaty had been given to Canada in order that Canada might be led gently into annexation.

Now, Sir, we have had some experience of attempts to force us into annexation. Four times, by force of arms, attempts were made to bring about the annexation of Canada to the United States. Those who visit Quebec can see a bronze plate beneath the ramparts of the city showing where Montgomery fell in the first great invasion. If you go to Niagara you will find a monument erected to Sir Isaac Brock, which commemorates our deliverance from the second invasion. You will find there was an invasion in 1837, at least an indirect invasion, backed up by the United States, to bring about the independence and ultimately the annexation of this country. I am not speaking my own words in recounting these facts, because any one who reads the chief authors on Canadian history will find these facts for himself. Read McMullen, or any other historian that is recognized as an authority, and you will ascertain the facts I mention. In 1866 there was a direct invasion; that followed the abrogation of the treaty. Now, what occurred during the existence of that treaty? The American Congress was constantly threatening to abrogate it. Early during the existence of the treaty we had to place a tariff on the manufactures of other countries in order to raise a revenue. Mr. Galt, who was then Finance Minister, framed that tariff, and he had a very hard time of it. He had to meet the opposition of the free trade element in Canada, who were largely pro-annexationists at that time. He had to meet the opposition of the English merchants, and if you will read the history of that epoch you will find that he went over to England and expostulated with the clothing merchants of Manchester, and excused Canada, and said it was impossible for this country to get a revenue unless they put a tariff on British goods as well as goods from other countries. He had also to meet with great opposition in the United States. The American papers discussed this question, and I find in the columns of the Toronto 'Globe,' which at that period was a very good journal, extracts time after time from the American papers. The Chicago 'Journal' was one of them; it stated that unless Canada changed her ways and took the duties off American manufactured goods coming into Canada the treaty would be abrogated. I do not wish to burden 'Hansard' with all these details, but I merely state what took place.

Now, I find that as the time approached for the abrogation of that treaty, which broke up the commercial relations existing between the two countries, it was found necessary, owing to the fact that there was a small number in the Conservative party and a small number in the Liberal party who were very noisy, and continually crying out for a reciprocity treaty, and even for annexation, it was found absolutely necessary, I say, for the great chiefs of both parties to form a coalition to bring about confederation. I find, also, that it was the party to which I have the honour now to belong, and which then called itself the coalition or Liberal-Conservative party, that was chiefly instrumental in bringing about confederation. That party, Sir, bore the brunt of the struggle in favour of the confederation of Canada. It fought another great battle in 1878, and it fought a battle in 1891.

Whatever fault there may be with our leaders, and we are all weak men and liable to make errors, the dominant note in the life and history of the Liberal-Conservative party from that date has been Canadianism. Not going too far pro-British—why, Sir, Sir John Macdonald, on one occasion had to say that if a certain Act of his in the way of duties on British goods was going to hurt British connection, it was so much the worse for British connection. Again, that policy has been constantly to prevent any shifting of the position towards the United States, constantly leading along the middle path that was blazed out by

George Brown and Sir John A. Macdonald. That is the path we are treading to-day, and that is the path you will find the young men of this country are going to follow. They are not going to follow any by-roads towards reciprocity of tariff or anything else, they stand first for Canadianism and they intend to remain Canadian. As one of the younger element it shocks me to think that gentlemen will get up in this House and plead that 50 years ago this desire was so and so, that it still remains strong, and that it is hoped to accomplish it now. I heard the Finance Minister and his colleague, the Minister of Customs speak. What was the burden of their speeches? That a duty had been laid on the Liberal party many years ago and also on the Liberal Conservative party to bring about reciprocity of trade between the United States and Canada and the Minister of Finance says: I am pleased to say I can now come into this House and say that my labours are done, I have paid my debt. It reminded me very much of the story so eloquently told by Balzac, the great French novelist, of the young couple who were married. The young man had received an appointment under the government, and they were invited to a ball. The bride was anxious to appear as handsome as possible at this official ball, and borrowed from a friend of hers a diamond necklace. Terrible to relate, at the ball, or on the way home the necklace was lost. The young couple discussed the matter and decided not to say anything about it to the friend who had lent the necklace, but to go to a jeweller's purchase a similar necklace and mortgage their whole life's work to pay off the debt. They carried out that programme. Throughout their whole lives, they starved and slaved and saved every dollar. They did not have sufficient food or clothing, and finally when they were both old and decrepit, the day came when at last they had paid their debt. And then the lady thought she would go and tell her friend the whole story. She told the whole story and her friend after hearing the story of her life work and sacrifice, informed her that the diamonds she had lent her were paste, an imitation, and that the necklace was worth only 35 francs. We have here a tragedy of a similar character. Here are two honourable gentlemen who all their lives have been slaving, struggling, labouring, saving up every copper, waiting every moment patiently for a call to come to Washington to accomplish a treaty of this kind. They come back to this House and the Minister of Finance says: The debt is paid, I have finished my work for the right hon. gentleman as he also wanted to finish his work. These hon. gentlemen are no doubt staggered and shocked to find that the country does not appreciate that sacrifice, that this House does not appreciate that tragedy, and that everybody is really laughing at them for being such fools as to go over to the United States and bring back what is in reality a pinchbeck, an imitation treaty. From the time that the first treaty was negotiated until the negotiation of this treaty there was not a moment when the United States would not have given concurrent legislation in this matter of trade. Why? Because they have failed four times to annex this country by force of arms. The people of this country having suffered the torch, the destruction of their homes, the death of their nearest friends and relatives, and failed to accede to the demand for annexation. The Americans had decided to adopt other methods. I am not waving any old flags, but I will try to place before the House the reason why thinking men say that this treaty will ultimately lead to annexation. I acknowledge the fact that on the face of it a person will be very much inclined to say: What harm is there to trade between these two countries; there can be no question, but it will be a benefit to both of them. That is a sensible question to me. But I find that on every occasion when an attempt was made to bring about a crisis in the commercial affairs of this country, the Americans had in view to coerce us commercially which is the method adopted by the United States so successfully to coerce other countries to come into the union. They succeeded in the case of the Sandwich islands. There is one man in the United States Congress, in the House of Representatives, Mr. Champ Clarke, who, whilst he may have the reputation from the hon. gentlemen opposite of being a humorist, has the reputation of being the best posted man in history in the whole United States. Without exception there is no man who knows the history of the operation of congressional and state government in his country better than Mr. Champ Clarke. When this matter was under discussion in the Senate of the United States, Mr. Clarke let fall one simple remark which the newspapers of this country published but which very few people recognized, as being of importance. This is what he said, speaking of this treaty:

> The agricultural schedule is largely a humbug, a delusion and a snare. We had a reciprocity treaty with the Sandwich Islands, because from the first, we intended to swallow them.

Now, Sir, what are the facts of the case. I am going to tell you the facts, to recite them to this House, in order to show you that there is a very strong analogy. A reciprocity treaty was made with the Sandwich islands in 1875. Sugar is one of the principal products of the Sandwich islands, and one of the principal products of the United States. There was no necessity for reciprocity in that case any more than there is

necessity for reciprocity in wheat, but a reciprocity treaty was established. The treaty was for seven years, to be abrogated on twelve months' notice. In 1887, after a great deal of grumbling, President Cleveland said he would not grant a new treaty because he was opposed to a reciprocity treaty on principle. But he had a sudden change of mind, and granted a new treaty without any reason being given. But here was a reason of the treaty of 1887. The United States was given a harbour on the Sandwich islands known as Pearl River harbour in perpetuity. In that way they got the first small portion of land from the Sandwich islands. The treaty expired in 1891. Its abrogation was subject to one year's notice. I wish to tell the House that during all the time that that treaty was in force there was not a session of Congress in which some blustering Senator or representative did not threaten to dissolve the treaty between the United States and the Sandwich islands.

There was a continuous panic all the time in the Sandwich Islands; sugar lands declined in value, and property generally was depressed, because they could not tell what moment their chief market would be destroyed. Talk of analogy, is not that analogy enough. Before the McKinley Bill was passed we had a trade with the United States in barley, but when the duty was raised our farmers suffered, and there was a tremendous dislocation in trade and hard times. Well, in the Sandwich Islands reciprocity organizations were formed but the United States would not annex the Sandwich Islands off the bat because they would not honourably accept the bonded indebtedness. Their plan was to let the trouble go on, and there was a revolution, and a protectorate government was formed which disavowed largely the debt of the island, and, after the process had continued long enough to tire out the bondholders the United States quietly annexed the Sandwich Islands. We are told by writers on the subject that with the single exception of Spreckles, the Americans came over to the Sandwich Islands without a shinplaster and they were no sooner there than they married natives, grabbed all the lands and property, seized all the banks, and when the protectorate came they were in possession of the whole situation. We see in that instance a short term treaty; we see constant threats of abrogation; we see commercial coercion more successful in the Sandwich Islands than a straight war would have been. Now, let us see what about Cuba. At one time Cuba and Porto Rico belonged to Spain, and I do not now refer to the Philippine Islands because they were conquered by force of arms. In 1891 there was an agitation in Cuba for the enlargement of the sugar market; something similar, only stronger to the agitation we have had for this treaty. The sugar planters and the tobacco planters had a splendid market in Britain, and all the better grades of tobacco were purchased in Europe, as they are purchased to-day, only second grades reaching the United States and Canada. The planters had a market in Great Britain but they wanted a wider market, just as our farmers in the Northwest seem to want two markets where now they have one. At last in 1891 a reciprocity treaty was consummated between the United States and Spain, but it was not long in force before there were threats in the American Senate to abrogate it. The sugar interests in the United States were all the time looming up on the horizon, and as soon as the trade had been established by American traders and Hebrew dealers in tobacco, the question arose among the Cuban planters: are we going to lose the American market? But, agitation did not go swift enough; arms were sent from the United States to the half black natives; blacks there sent from San Domingo as workmen and were no sooner landed than they were prepared to fight, and a revolution was fomented. And what for? To bring about annexation to the United States in order, as they said, that Cuba should have a free market in the United States. The Spanish American war followed. Spain ceded Cuba to the United States, and the United States turned Cuba over to the tender mercies of a native government. Why was this done? It was because if the United States remained in possession of Cuba the foreign bondholders might have come on the scene to ask that their bonds be paid, but by turning the country over to a provisional government the debt of the country was discharged by that very act, and when the foreign bondholders are all dead and forgotten, inside of possibly ten years, Cuba will have the same destiny as the Sandwich Islands. A writer on this question, Mr. Lawrence Laughlin, of Chicago, pointing out the ultimate end of the Sandwich Islands, states that what had been foretold from the first, viz., that the reciprocity treaty would bring about annexation, had come true. Here we have two outstanding examples; we have a reciprocity treaty, connection is formed between the two countries of a commercial character, commercial coercion from the United States follows, and the national entity of the other country is wiped out. Now, in our own country, why did they seek confederation in 1866. I will place upon the records of the House an extract from the speech of a great Liberal of those days, and it is an argument against this treaty more eloquent and potent than anything I could say. I quoted from the same authority this afternoon, I quote

him again, so that his remarks may sink deep into the heart of my free trade friend from Nova Scotia. And, that reminds me of the great convention of the boards of trade of Canada and the United States held in Detroit in 1866, and at that convention speeches were made by prominent Americans in which they invited Canada to join the United States and partake of the pleasures of annexation and the free markets they could afford. There was at that convention a great Nova Scotian, Joseph Howe, and when he rose to speak on that occasion he told the Americans present how his son had gone to the United States when the civil war broke out, and how he had fought for the union, and how he had come home with an honourable discharge, and Joseph Howe said: I tell you gentlemen that if I should do anything to bring about the annexation of my country, and to haul down the British flag that floats over Canada, the very first man to blow out my brains would be my beloved son who fought so gallantly for your union. Well, Sir, we have not such Nova Scotians to-day.

Mr. McKENZIE. Why not?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I cannot understand why; they are largely free traders. Let me tell you something about the Nova Scotians we have to-day. Nova Scotia came into the confederation in good faith, but unfortunately for that province there has always been a free trade element among its people; a free trade element that believes in the doctrine that what money is made by one industry must be lost by somebody else, because they cannot understand that there may be a profit at both ends of the bargain. The hon. gentleman who went to Washington to negotiate this treaty is one of these men, and I say without any hesitation whatever, that Nova Scotia with her splendid harbours, and her wealth of coal and iron, and her intelligent population, had she the proper men to lead her in her legislative halls, would be to-day greater than any state in the union, for not only would she be manufacturing goods for Canada and Canadians but she would be manufacturing goods in competition with Germany and every country in the world. But, that narrow spirit which keeps constantly agitating against the condition of things that exist, that narrow spirit has dominated Nova Scotia and its politics and it is only within recent years that successful industries have been established in Nova Scotia, and which to-day I am happy to say are so prosperous.

Now, let us see what confederation has done for Nova Scotia. We men in the middle west are not narrow or provincial; we are willing at all times to hold up our end of the log, and when it comes to paying the piper, we are willing to pay our share fairly and justly. The workingmen of the province of Ontario, whose children eat the bread that is baked with soft coal, have been paying three and a quarter millions of dollars a year in coal duties—why? In order that their brethern in the coal mines of Nova Scotia might have protection and labour. They have paid three-quarters of a million dollars a year in bounties on iron and steel in order that the men who work in the iron mills of Nova Scotia might have protection and labour. Is that selfish? Have hon. members ever read a word in the newspapers of my province against that proposition? But Nova Scotia continues to send to this House, free traders, men who are constantly attacking the best interests of this country, and seeking to destroy its industries and to prevent our workingmen in the Central West from having employment, men who believe that what is good for one part of the country must be injurious to the other. If Nova Scotia continues to send such men to this House—and there is no doubt, from the signs of the times, that there will be a change in the next parliament—I for one, staunch protectionist as I am, will have to consider whether it will be worth while for the rest of the country to grant a duty of 50 cents a ton to Nova Scotia on soft coal, and a bounty on her steel in order that she may send free traders to the parliament of Canada. I think that is a fair proposition, and, I say it unreservedly, that if such a state of affairs occurs after the next election, and I belong to the dominant party, I shall be one of the men to stand up in this House, and say: No, Nova Scotia does not want protection; take the duty off her coal—she sends free traders here; Nova Scotia does not want protection on her steel—she sent here a man, a free trader, who threw the markets of Canada open to American farm products. Let Nova Scotia play fair in this matter and send men here who are more in touch with the true interests of Nova Scotia, not men who come and talk free trade and practice protection at the expense of the rest of the country. I hope the hon. gentleman has now heard enough about Nova Scotia. He can take that and find out if he can get elected on it in Nova Scotia after this; because he is elected by the coal workers of that province.

There is one thing which I very much deprecate in discussions of this kind, and that is, that the tone of the discussion should be lowered to any personal note. I was deeply grieved this afternoon to hear the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, and who happens not to be here at the present moment, state that the members of his government were great financiers,

and that the hon. member for North Toronto, when he was in office, and since then, had not to become a great financier that he could pose as a millionaire. Now, Sir, that is going a long way from the proper and legitimate sphere of discussion—and I always find that those people who live in glass houses are the people who throw stones. When the hon. member for North Toronto was Finance Minister of this country and sat on the treasury benches, the discovery had not been made of how ministers could get rich quick with purses of $150,000 from their friends. They did not know how to take houses and automobiles from their friends. Now, I think we are even on that question. If I desired to go further, I could entertain the House for a long time along these lines. I trust there will be no more sneers of that kind from the right hon. gentleman who leads this House.

Now, let us see how this treaty was made. We have all heard the ministers of the day discuss the question of treaties and treaty making. It must have occurred to hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House that the outstanding feature of the speeches of the members of this government is that the making of a treaty involves the granting of a favour. No sooner did they come into power than they granted a big favour to Great Britain by which they foreswore three and a half millions of revenue ever since for the sake of a preference. Whether that is good policy or not, I am not at this moment going to say. I am going to say this, however, that the favour granted has never brought a single favour from the British government in return, because in that country they conduct their business on the principle that the making of a treaty is a bargain in which there is no such thing as the granting of a favour. When our ministers went to Washington to negotiate this treaty, they went with the idea that they were going to give a lot of favours and get some in return. I want to point out to you that from the very beginning the principle of American diplomacy has been that in the making of treaties there should be no such thing as the granting of any favours. George Washington laid down a very sound principle in his farewell speech. He was laying down a policy which his country should observe for all time; and I want to say that the study of the life of that man will leave any one amazed at the shrewdness of his policy and his prophetic vision. He laid down certain rules for the government of his country, and the Americans have followed those rules unhesitatingly. Anything that George Washington has said is almost as sacred to any American as a decree of the highest court of the land. Now, George Washington, the first president of the United States, recognized this very danger which our kindergarten legislators, negotiators and ambassadors have never yet discovered, the danger from regarding anything done in a treaty as a favour and not a bargain. In his farewell speech he said that the negotiators of treaties should keep constantly in view that it is folly for one nation to look for favours from another.

And they went to negotiate with the other nation with that standing in front of them. President Washington recognized the danger of sentiment in treaty making and warned his countrymen against it. In his farewell address occurs the following passage:

> . . . constantly keeping in view, that 'tis folly in one nation to look for disinterested favours from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favours, and yet being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favours from nation to nation. 'Tis all illusion which experience must cure—which a just pride ought to discard.

Let me ask what insane idea possessed our ministers of the Crown when, in every treaty they have made, they saw fit to insert that foolish favoured nation clause in general terms, which opens the markets of this country to other countries as is done by this proposed agreement. Any one who knows anything about treaty making, knows that there are two forms of drawing the favoured nation clause. There is one which says that this favour being freely granted, will be freely granted to every country. There is another form known as the reciprocal, which is always adopted by the Americans. That form states that this favour will be granted to every country which grants similar favours to us. Is not that the proper form which should have been inserted in all our treaties. But in what situation are we now placed? We find a great many countries that are manufacturers and shippers of goods such as we have, on the free list. Denmark is a large producer of butter and eggs, and so is France, and the Argentine Republic is a heavy producer of wheat. Now what have we? We have made no treaty with those countries, but this very foolish kindergarten favoured nation clause, in the form in which it has been swallowed by the Minister of Finance —the great Grotius of this government, this high authority in international law and treaty making—what does it lead to? This is the logical result. A Canadian farmer can send his wheat into the United States free of duty and American wheat can come

into Canada free. But under this favoured nation clause, so also can the wheat of the Argentine Republic. You would naturally suppose that this clause must be reciprocal and that the Argentine Republic must reciprocate in kind. Nothing of the sort. If a Canadian wants to send any wheat, except seed wheat, to the Argentine Republic, what happens? A duty of 20 per cent ad valorem meets him at the door. The same is true of France. France is a large producer of wheat, and ships millions of bushels occasionally to Great Britain. If France desires to ship wheat to Canada, she could do so free of duty, also butter and cheese which she produces to a large extent. She is also a large producer of eggs. All those articles find, as a rule, a ready market in Britain, but sometimes that market is glutted, and there is a good market in Canada. France can ship those products into Canada free of duty, but if a Canadian farmer wants to ship anything into France, he is confronted with a very heavy duty. How extremely one-sided is not this arrangement. Not only is that true of France, but also of other nations. And yet but three or four words added to the favoured nation clause would have avoided all that difficulty. And this mighty mind, this genius of finance who has brought this reciprocity treaty into this House and disturbed the whole of this country, did not know there was such a form as a reciprocal form of the favoured nation clause.

An hon. MEMBER. Ask him.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I do not think he did. He could not tell us of any treaty in which there was one. I would like to hear from him so that we might test his knowledge of this treaty making clause. When a man sets about making treaties, he ought to be acquainted with the treaties of other countries. Can the hon. minister tell us off-hand of one or two in which this reciprocal form is used?

Mr. FIELDING. I much prefer to let my hon. friend keep on with his argument. He is doing remarkably well.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Yes, I have evidently floored the hon. gentleman on the simple question of treaty making.

Mr. FIELDING. He shall see

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). If the hon. gentleman had his deputy here, he might find out from him. I shall now pass from that form of treaty making and discuss what this particular arrangement is going to do for this country. Coming down to the Atlantic, I find that this proposed treaty deals with the fisheries there. Now Canada possesses the last great fishery on the Atlantic. There is no other great fishery left. The north sea fisheries have been destroyed by trawlers. Everybody knows how these trawlers kill the fish and the spawn by dragging their nets over the bed of the sea. In like manner the Norwegian fisheries have been destroyed, and the only great fisheries left are the Canadian. The American fisheries have been ruined, and the Americans have none, except the artificial lobster and oyster, which are grown just as we grow chickens. The Atlantic fisheries are then the most valuable asset of this country. If this country were to take possession of them in a truly national sense and organize them in a national manner, instead of our poor fisherman down east getting only 1 cent a pound off his hook, he would get 4 cents or 5 cents per pound. Mr. MacGrath of St. John, Newfoundland, who is one of the best authorities on the fisheries to-day on the Atlantic sea-board, who is a public man, and a journalist of well known repute, has stated that the Atlantic fisheries are worth $12,000,000 per annum. He has stated also that there are 50,000 people employed in that industry and he points out that when you divide the value of those fisheries by the number of men employed in them, the fishermen of to-day only earn $240 a year. Will any workingman say that that is a fair wage for these men who toil in this arduous and dangerous work. They should be earning each at the least an average of $1,000 a year. And they could easily do that if the government had only sufficient courage to take hold of our fisheries in the proper manner.

We can remember when every man employed in the lumber business in Ontario was paid a dollar a day and board himself. That was all he could get. The Americans controlled our forests, and they were ripping out the trees and shipping the logs over to their own side, where they were manufactured and where the high-priced labour was employed, but we had courage enough in Ontario to stop that, and compel the logs to be manufactured at home. But that is what they are doing with the fisheries on the east coast. The Americans go there with their vessels and their gear. They employ our men to do the fishing, and they take the fish over the side. They have a close corporation, which is not above carrying on its business in this respect on a fraudulent construction of the laws of the United States. Yes, Sir, they actually perjure themselves by that false construction in the treasury board of the United States. If that fish is brought into the vessel they can carry it into American ports duty free. Why is it that there is only $3,000,000 worth of fish shipped out of the maritime provinces into the United States that pay duty? Everybody knows that the quantity that goes is nearer $10,000,000 worth. We have

had a similar experience with the fisheries in Ontario and in Manitoba. And this government stands supine, and by its supineness enables the Americans, by their regulations, to come in, throttle our fishermen and squeeze the last drop of blood out of them. They come in and virtually take possession of our fisheries as if in fee simple, and compel our men to slave for them, paying them the price that goes to the mere hewers of wood and drawers of water, and as middle men they make enormous profits. They are the master's and we are the peon's. This is the condition that exists in our Atlantic fisheries. All this would be remedied if the government would form co-operative societies amongst our fishermen, organize our fisheries in the proper manner, put in freezers and give these men a chance to get their fish to market; and, above all, put an export duty on every pound of fish that went off the banks or out of the country except in a Canadian bottom. The application of the good old navigation law—that is what would build up this industry. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) laughs. He would not raise a hand, as did the knight in the other chamber, Sir George Ross, who, when Prime Minister of Ontario, declared to the Americans that they were not to take our logs out of our forests unless they manufactured them in this country. These men do not understand the principle of a great national policy developing industries of size and consequence.

I pass on now to other industries. I have pointed out that the strength of the nation lies in iron and steel. And all honour to the men, I say, who have established great iron and steel works in Nova Scotia—mostly western men, it is true, but also including eastern men, who have made money out of it, as we are glad to know. So we have the example not only of the Nova Scotia iron and steel works, but of the car works, of the stove works and many others. And yet these men of the east send men to represent them in this House, a majority of them rank free traders, as I regard them.

The hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell) told us that it was too bad the duty should remain on shingles, and said that he was interested in a shingle mill and a lath mill.

An hon. MEMBER. And in pretty nearly everything else.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Yes, I suppose in nearly everything in the province he is interested in some way. He told us that they could get so much more for their stuff if they had the stuff on the American side. Why, let him follow the natural course of the policy of this government that he supports—move his shingle mill across the line and then ship the logs over and cut them there. There is no string on the logs, and this exportation of logs in an unmanufactured state is the very thing that this policy is intended to bring about from start to finish.

There are other articles on the free list, such as talc, asbestos and gypsum. There are vast deposits of gypsum in New Brunswick and around the Bras d'Or lakes in Nova Scotia—the best, possibly, in America—and some in Ontario also. Now, a strange thing about this gypsum situation is that we shipped $221,000 worth of gypsum last year out of this country in the raw state, and we brought back $75,000 worth of—not gypsum—but of plaster of Paris, which is gypsum under another name. That tells you the whole story. Then, if you read the 'Mineral Industry,' published in the United States—if the House requires I will send to the library and get a copy—you will find that they have great hopes of the gypsum industry in the United States, because the Payne tariff had reduced the duty, and they hoped to get gypsum from Canada. And they expected to be able to mine it cheap, because they could employ labour in these mining operations at $1.20 and $1.35 a day—that is what they wanted to pay our men for mining. I give these figures in the hope that the miners and labourers in Cobalt will read them.

Now, we come to asbestos, another item we are going to be given the privilege of sending free into the United States—a most marvellous thing, that the United States will allow our asbestos to go in free. As a matter of fact, statistics show that 85 per cent—80 per cent at the very least—of all the asbestos of the whole world is produced in Canada. The figures also show that 95 per cent of the asbestos consumed in the United States is brought into that country from Canada. The Minister of Mines (Mr. Templeman) is in his seat, and I will ask him to correct me if it is not so.

An hon. MEMBER. He does not know.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Then, again, I have to fall back on myself as an authority.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. What would you do with it?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). We have an absolute monopoly of asbestos—and the great thing has been accomplished of getting asbestos into the United States free. And the minister asks me: 'What would you do with it?' What would I do with it? I would try to manufacture it. Let me tell the minister exactly all about that: If you look through this treaty you will find that a long, lean, dark, hairy hand has manipulated every part of it. I wonder whose it is. Let me put the House onto it. You find its work in the pulp schedule, but not in that schedule alone. Sixty per cent of the asbestos that goes into the United

States goes to be manufactured into paper. The Minister of Mines asks me what I would do. I would say to the Americans: Gentlemen, there is going to be an export duty on asbestos, and if people want asbestos paper to line their walls, or put under their floors to make their houses fireproof so that they can save one-half of one per cent on their insurance, they will have to come to Canada to get it, and if they want to tax themselves 50 per cent on the import, why, they will add just that much more to the cost; that would be the effect under the economic law which everybody knows and which even Adam Smith himself, strange to say, acknowledges.

And then there is the talc industry. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is not in his place. He was asked what talcum was used for. He sits at the receipt of custom, he knows what goes in and what goes out, what everything is used for and what duty it ought to pay. He said that he understood that talcum was used for 'dressing for the person.' I do not need to turn up 'Hansard' to verify that—fortunately my memory is pretty good; I do not think the minister would deny what I have said, even if he were here. I find that they have talcum mines in the United States. They have very large mines of this material in the state of New York, one in Michigan and Texas, and others in other states of the Union. And the funniest thing about these talcum mines in the United States is that they are all controlled by one corporation. What corporation? The American Paper Company. What do they use talc for? The Minister of Customs evidently did not know, for the talcum used to make what he sees advertised on the blind walls—'Jones's Borated Talcum Powder'—is all imported from Italy; there is nothing on this continent that is fine enough and white enough for this purpose. That talcum is worth $60 a ton, ours $3.50.

The American Paper Company makes asbestos roofing paper. That great American paper trust figures there again. So in respect to all these minerals that are going to make us all happy, all these great industries in which our workingmen are allowed to make $1 a day and board themselves in mining, they are all really controlled by one great trust on the other side of the line. How much do you think Canada is going to get out of it? I agree with the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), that this policy, in spite of anything that is said by the Prime Minister, is going to be a disastrous one. He tried to teach the chairman of the Conservation Commission his duty, and what a foolish and silly way he used in trying to teach him. He said his business of Chairman of the Committee on Conservation was political science, but that the things we discussed in this House pertained to political economy. Now I have a recollection of reading in books that nobody has yet decided whether political economy is a science or not, and I would like the right hon. gentleman to explain, if he were present, the difference between political science and political economy.

Well, we all know that the true policy of this country is not to allow anything to go out of the country that is not manufactured, when it can be manufactured in this country, more especially those articles of which we possess an absolute monopoly. We have virtually a monopoly in fish, and still this government invites all the nations of the earth to come in here and fish, to deplete our fishing waters, and destroy this great article of commerce in order that we may worship at the altar of some free trade fetish. We have a monopoly of all the asbestos in the world, but it is going to be sent out of this country, and none of our young men are to be trained to grind that stuff up and manufacture it into paper. The same with gypsum, that also is to be taken away from us; so with our salt mines, they are to be closed down although we had hopes of a great industry from the by-products of salt, and all that will be left for us are the by-products of the salt. We are to be allowed to send away the raw materials for the benefit of the foreigner. The right hon. gentleman said that his ancestors came to this country and dispossessed the Indians of their lands, that the Indians were the true conservators of the land, and the settlers were those who wished to use them. He drew the analogy to represent our conservation idea, as opposed to his pro-American idea. Now let us follow the analogy out. We are to be the Indians, and we are to be treated as savages and barbarians, and allow those gentlemen to the south to come in here and take away our raw materials, to take them over to the United States and manufacture them. If that is the policy, then I say what is the use of encouraging our young men to study engineering science in order that they may oversee the development of our industries? What is the use of McGill? Why is there a technical school in Nova Scotia? Why is there a technical school in New Brunswick? What is the use of Laval and McGill, with their hundreds and thousands of young men studying technical science in order to become engineers? Yes, and what is the use of our Toronto university, which has the greatest number of young men attending scientific classes of any school in the world, except one, that is the scientific institute in Glasgow? What is the ambition of these young men? They live in hope of achieving the scientific knowledge which will make them leaders in the industries of this country, enable them to superintend the

poor foreigners who come here to use the pick and shovel, building our railroads and developing our natural resources. I say if this policy is to be carried out, then shut the doors of all these scientific schools, throw the keys into the sea, and let all these young men go back to the woods and prepare to handle the pick and the shovel themselves. That is the way this policy impresses itself on my mind. There is nothing in it for this country, either for the present or for the future.

Now let us come to the province of Quebec. Great stress has been laid on the fact that the people of Quebec can export their hay. Well, now, in regard to hay, I have a distinct recollection of reading in some musty text book of English law that in the old country for many years no leases were made unless they contained a clause forbidding the tenant to take a pound of hay or a pound of straw off the land. Hon. gentlemen here who are members of the legal profession will tell you that the same thing obtains in the province of Ontario, where the tenant is not allowed to take a pound of straw or a pound of hay off the farm. Quebec has a great future before it as a farming country, it has a tremendous future before it as a manufacturing country. It has resources of cheap power much greater even than that of the great province of Ontario from which I come. It has a skilful class of people; no people in the world are so deft with their fingers, or so skilful in handling machinery, so quick to learn, so studious and faithful, as the men of Quebec. The forest from which they used to get their livelihood is retreating farther and farther back, and little villages are deserted for six months in the year while the fathers and sons leave their homes in order to work in the forest. Would it not be the proper policy to encourage industries for these villages so the people would not have to leave their homes for employment.

And let me point out that another question arises here. I have shown that the men who organized confederation did it with a set purpose, which purpose is the very antithesis of the policy which underlies this reciprocity treaty. I say that so far as I am concerned, I have not lost faith yet in confederation. Men who have lived in Canada for forty years find that the constitution under which they are living is becoming more and more dear to them. There seems to be something in it which touches our hearts. It meets every varying condition of our life, it deals fairly and squarely with all classes. Whilst we may grumble once in a while, I do not think there is anybody who could draw up a better constitution than that which was drafted by the fathers of confederation. Under that constitution certain privileges were justly granted to the French Canadians, their language and their religion, the same as certain other privileges were granted to the people in my province, and to other provinces. Now, Sir, I assert that confederation is directly challenged by this reciprocity agreement, it is the first great challenge confederation has received since it was consummated.

I would ask these men from Quebec if there is analogy, if there is anything to show them what would happen to them if confederation is set aside. I say yes there is. At one time the state of Louisiana belonged to France. It was sold by Napoleon to the United States. It contained a population exactly of the same race and of the same people as the French Canadians. They spoke the same language, they observed the same doctrine and had the same rights and the same social customs, and they bore about the same proportion relatively to the population of the United States as the present population of Quebec would bear to the population of the United States if Canada were annexed. What has happened to Louisiana? Why, Sir, you can go on the streets of English Toronto and you will hear more French spoken than you will hear on the streets of New Orleans. What has happened to those parish churches built by the fathers? The Yankees in the south used those old churches for what purpose? To search their registers so that if a man with French Canadian blood attempts to rise in politics or otherwise, if they can find from the register that there is a drop of black blood in an ancestor, ten or twelve generations back, the man is put into a Jim Crow car. Many of these French Canadians came from Demerara, Martinique and Dominica, and to-day every one with a French name who cannot show a clean bill of health is under suspicion as to his colour and we all know how strong the colour feeling is in the south. It would be the same here. If a French Canadian who voted for this agreement, bartering away the rights of confederation for a bale of hay, asked me to vote for him and I were a French Canadian, I would say, if you think that I would vote for you after you have done that, you must think I am only fit to don a pair of long ears and eat a bale of hay.

Now we come to the great province of Ontario. That province can pretty nearly take care of itself so far as any Americans are concerned. We are not afraid of them, we will welcome them, we will take them in on any deal from a game of poker up. Some of our best men from the province of Ontario are building their great railways. Jim Hill, who is from Ontario, taught them how to build railways, and he was the first man who taught the United States

managers how to manage railways, the first to teach them railway statistics. I could point to other eminent men in the United States from my province. This arrangement touches my province closely. The one thing about the treaty is that there is not a single word from end to end as regards the working men. That is a serious thing. We will take one class, the truck gardeners. Possibly there may be other gentlemen in the House who can deal with that better than I can, but having lived in the south of the United States for a while, and knowing the conditions, perhaps I may be pardoned if I enlarge a trifle on it. Many people have asked why the Ontario intensive farmers or truck gardeners are opposed to this arrangement. They say that our truck gardeners can grow stuff as cheaply as in the United States. On its face that seems a plausible argument, but let us examine it. The man in the south, in Florida, starts growing his truck in January. He does not have to pay any big money for a house for himself and family. I have ridden along in the Southern States and counted the pickaninnies through the chinks in the logs. He has not to buy expensive clothing, he has not to sit in the house for six months while the soil is covered with snow, and he has not to buy coal. He starts things growing on his truck farm early in January and he can get coloured help, men, women and children at fifty cents a day or less. They grow their truck in every month in the year, they get three or four crops a year, because there is no snow, and the conditions for growth are ideal. You ask me, can a man in Ontario do that. The grower in the south does not have to pay for glass or hotbeds or steam, but the man in Ontario has, and the only profit which the Ontario man makes is the little profit off the first three or four weeks of the early crop; the rest of the time he is simply turning his crop over and perhaps paying expenses. You take away his little profit, his means of livelihood. I have had to make my livelihood and I know what touches the heart of every worker; and the man who has worked for hire, when he sees one of his fellows injured, says: That injury is to me also—and that is why Ontario is against this agreement. If it hurt only that one class of man, every worker in my province in his heart feels sore. He would say: Why should we injure these men and deprive them of their livelihood? It may be my turn next. We have not heard any promise here to-day that it would not be our turn next. We were told by the right hon. gentleman who leads this government that these ambassadors had not gone as far in the way of taking duties off manufactured goods as he might have gone. That, I take it, is a plain intimation of what he may do if he had another chance at it. We have heard a great deal about transportation systems. We have two roads that can take care of themselves. Who is going to be hurt? Not the two big railway companies, because the two chief men have said that they will take care of themselves and no doubt they can, they have the money and resources, they are building lines to Duluth to-day, endeavouring to meet this crisis. It is the thousands of men employed on the railways of Canada who are now deriving a living from this traffic who will be hurt; they will be deprived of their labour, they will have to sell their houses for nothing and leave the country and go to the United States if this traffic goes to the United States, as it will, because, as I have shown, the moment a treaty of this kind comes into effect, 50 per cent of our traffic will go south of the St. Lawrence. It was so before, it will be so again. As I said, there is nothing in this for the working man, who sees his fellow touched all along; he is told this is going to make the prices higher for the farmer, but that means that living will cost more to him. He will not get more wages, because his wages are dependent not on protection or free trade to any large extent, but largely upon the situation of the labour market itself. I have said that the livelihood of these men will be taken away. The moment the labour of a man in Ontario is displaced by that of a man in the United States we initiate a period of hard times. If you take away a quarter of the work given in a factory in Canada and give it to the United States you may not hurt the man who owns the factory but you hurt one-quarter of the workmen, and they are the people who are the ultimate sufferers. That is the secret of the whole thing.

We hear a great deal about the cattle trade in Ontario. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) told the House with a great deal of chest beating, that he would warrant that the statistics of the 'Mail' were very reliable, and that if one opened the 'Mail' he would find that at any time in the last ten years the price of beef cattle was higher in Chicago than in Toronto.

That seemed strange to me, because when I was a young newspaper man I used to write the market reports for the 'Mail,' and I knew a little about the business. However, I went to the library and I hunted up the files of the 'Mail,' and I took the prices at haphazard during May in these several years, and I have prepared a table, and that table shows among other things that when a profes-

sional man talks to an intelligent audience like this he ought to speak the truth, because I never heard, in all my life, so many absolutely improbable and untruthful—if that is a parliamentary expression—statements made with regard to any question as have been made about this treaty. To get these prices I took the steer weighing about 1,100 pounds, which would average about 70 per cent of the cattle. Of course, there may be a high priced bunch that would fetch a dollar a hundred weight more than the ordinary animals, for Christmas beef or something like that, but I took the prices for the standard animal in Toronto and Chicago, from the files of the 'Mail and Empire,' from 1901 to 1910, and this is the result:

TABLE OF PRICES, 1901 TO 1910.

	Toronto.	Chicago.
May 4, 1901..	$ 4.25	$ 3.95
May 14, 1902..	5.25	5.00
May 13, 1903..	4.90	4.06
May 11, 1904..	4.80	4.90
May 9, 1905..	5.70	4.50
May 9, 1906..	5.10	4.00
May 17, 1907..	5.12½	4.90
May 15, 1908..	5.50	5.00
May 25, 1909..	5.75	5.10
May 13, 1910..	7.00	6.25

Now, I will quote the following paragraph, which will show the kind of accurate reports you got in the 'Mail and Empire' in these days, and I merely take this paragraph as a sample of several others of the same sort:

I quote from the 'Mail' of May 13, 1903:

Mr. W. H. Dean stated to the 'Mail and Empire' that he had bought several carloads (of steers) in Buffalo at about twenty cents per cwt. less than he would have to pay for the same cattle here.

In the face of the wild general statements made by gentlemen on the other side, the best answer is to put these figures on record. Now, with reference to the price of barley before and after the McKinley tariff, I quote as excellent evidence the following letter from the secretary of agriculture for the province of Ontario, who has the facts and figures at his fingers' ends:

Toronto, February 2, 1911.

Dear Major Currie,—I herewith beg to forward you the figures in regard to barley production for which you asked in conversation a few days ago.

The production in 1890 was 15,600,169 bushels from 701,326 acres, value $7,831,285. Then came a big drop in 1892 following the enaction of the McKinley Bill. The low mark was reached in 1893, when the production was 9,806,088 bushels from 467,315 acres, value $3,932,241. After that date, as farmers began to find new markets for their barley, the crop increased. In 1910 there were 19,103,107 bushels from 626,144 acres. While the figures of value are not officially available, it is safe to estimate it at about $13,261,864.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe).

Hoping this will be of some assistance, I am, yours very truly,

W. BERT ROODHOUSE,
Secretary to the Dept.

This shows that the production of barley in Ontario, instead of decreasing, has increased by nearly four million bushels per year, and that the increased production is gathered from a less area under cultivation, which shows that the Ontario farmers are fertilizing the soil and improving its productive powers, and that the value of the crop per acre to-day is greater than it was before we lost the United States market for our barley. The facts with regard to our production of barley were set out very clearly by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), but I would emphasize that the barley quotations given in the United States newspapers are for what is known as malting barley, which grades No. 1, while out of the three or four million bushels of barley grown in the northwest and Ontario over 90 per cent of it does not grade up to No. 3, and there is the additional fact that if the barley is fed to hogs and cattle it is worth one dollar per bushel to-day under any condition of market, as compared with 85 cents paid in the United States for malting barley. Now, this treaty will be a serious injury to the horse trade in Ontario, which does a very large trade in horses with the northwest. The best explanation of the injurious effect of the treaty on the horse business comes to me from a gentleman who is not exactly a dealer, but who (as did his father before him) has done more to improve horse breeding in the province of Ontario than any man I know of; I refer to Major Wm. Hendrie, of Hamilton, who, when he learned about this reciprocity treaty, sent me a note, in which he says:

Free entry of horses into our Northwest will put horse breeding back 20 years and will destroy that market for the Ontario farmer.

That is what Major Hendrie has to say about it and he has put the whole thing in a nutshell. A word about the effect of this treaty on our transportation interests and especially with reference to the carriage of freight on the Great Lakes. Anybody who knows anything about the Great Lakes traffic knows that 15 years ago our freight carriers on the Great Lakes consisted of a few wooden scows of the type of Dr. Drummond's 'Julie Plante.' To-day we have over 70 fine steel vessels engaged in that traffic, none of them less than 2,000 tons capacity, and probably 20 of them built in Great Lake ports, where employment is afforded every day in the year for 1,200 men. That traffic has grown and increased enormously, until now it is estimated that there are over 5,000 men employed on these boats, and from 12,000 to 15,000 men em-

ployed in the trade altogether, from stevedores to captains. The Minister of Customs pointed out that a certain amount of grain automatically found its way to Buffalo at any rate, and asked: 'What does that mean? It does not mean that there is going to be anything to hurt this trade.' But I notice that while there is reciprocity in agricultural products in this treaty, there is not reciprocity in the coasting laws which are in force on the Great Lakes, and once the grain goes south of the line before it reaches Fort William, a Canadian vessel will not get a pound of that freight, but it will go to Chicago or Buffalo, and most of it will be ground into flour. It will act simply as a displacement, that is to say, you will put in so much Canadian wheat at one end and they will send out so much American wheat at the other end. The Americans will use our wheat simply to improve their grades, and they will benefit by it. They will benefit to the tune of exactly $30 a car on every carload of our grain that they take their way, because the only places where they grow No. 1 hard is in Dakota and in other states bordering on Canada, and as these states do not supply the whole market they have a monopoly, which enables them to raise the price above that of our No. 1 Northern in Manitoba. But No. 1 Manitoba wheat is superior to any other class of wheat in America, and the moment we give the Americans access to our market, No. 1 Manitoba wheat will come down to the price of ordinary American wheat, and will not grade higher. At the same time, the moment this treaty goes into force one-half the St. Lawrence trade will be cut off and we will not have one-half the ships built in our shipyards that we have now, and that is something which affects me very seriously. We all hoped to see the shipbuilding industry grow up on all our coasts, but this treaty will prove to be a great disaster to that industry. You might as well dump the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur into Lake Superior, because our grain, instead of going to these ports, will find its competitive point at Duluth, and the elevators there will get all the benefit of it, and if it can be shipped via Duluth without having to be bonded, the shippers are not going to ship it by Fort William or Port Arthur when they can ship it by a route 70 miles shorter. That is what is going to happen to that traffic.

The whole appeal to the people in support of this compact is that if it is put into force prices will go up. I think it is important for us to know what the prices of farm products in the two countries are before this treaty goes into force, and I quote the following prices on January 2, taken from the 'Mail,' of Toronto, and the 'Tribune,' of New York respectively:

	Toronto.	New York.
Bran, per ton	$24 00	$24 00
Hay, No. 1	18 00	16 00
No. 1 dairy butter, per lb.	0 30	0 22
Eggs, new-laid, per doz.	0 50	0 35
Ducks, per lb.	0 17	0 10
Chickens, per lb.	0 16	0 12½
Turkeys, per lb.	0 22	0 18½
Geese, per lb.	0 14	0 14
Apples, Spy, per bbl.	4 50	3 50
Onions, per bush.	1 00	0 75
Potatoes, per bag.	0 90	0 73

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), in the course of his speech, stated, and it was one of the chief points he made, that in a protected country there were two prices, the export price and the home price, and he gave some quotations to show that iron was sold at a higher price in the United States than in Great Britain or elsewhere. That argument would have a great deal of force with an ordinary individual who did not understand the statistics of the iron trade. If the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to examine the statistics on the subject he would have found that free trade England, in nearly everything it ships abroad, has a home price and a foreign price. A few years ago a well known British iron firm was fined heavily for dumping into Canada. The 'Ironmonger,' the official organ of the iron trade in Great Britain, gives prices current for iron and steel in every issue under the heading of 'For Home Trade and for Export.' The following were the figures given in that paper for October 2, 1909, being prices current in the northeast district of England:

	Home prices. £ s. d.	Export price. £ s. d.
Crown bars (iron) per ton.	7 0 0	6 0 0
Best bars, per ton	7 7 6	6 7 6
Angles (iron) per ton	7 0 0	6 0 0
Ties (iron)	5 15 0	6 10 0
Steel—		
Bars	6 2 6	5 10 0
Angles	5 7 6	5 5 0
Ties	5 17 6	5 15 0
Channels	5 12 6	5 10 0
Plates (ship)	6 0 0	5 17 0
Plates (boiler)	7 0 0	6 7 6
Rails	5 5 0	5 2 6

Thus we see that in free trade England the system of a home and a lower export price is practised openly. To use this fact as an argument in favour of protection or free trade is consummate folly. The reason for the difference in price is plain: it is all a matter of the cost of production. The Tariff Reform Commission in Great Britain took the trouble to inquire into this system, and they had before them as a witness a man in the iron trade, who worked out the whole question in the best way, and I do not think I can do better than put on 'Hansard' what he said as to how they happen to have a home price and an

export price: The phenomena of selling at a lower price for export than for home consumption is not due to any influence of home tariff. An English manufacturer of ship plates who was examined by the Tariff Commission, in fact the first witness told how this was worked in free trade England. He explained that if his works were running to their full capacity they could turn out ship plates at £5 per ton, while if the mills were running only half time the cost was £6 12s. He presented the following statement to the commission:

Working half time—	
Weekly output 500 tons sold at £7 per ton..	£3,500
Less cost of production at £6 12s.	3,300
Profit..	£ 200
Working full time—	
500 tons sold at £7 per ton at home.	£3,500
500 tons dumped abroad at £4 10s. per ton..	2,250
	£5,750
Less cost of producing 1,000 tons at £5 per ton..	5,000
	£ 750
Profit full time dumping half product at a loss..	£ 750

The above figures will explain why factory managers when times get a little dull at home prefer to maintain the home price and sell at a loss abroad.

It is not a question of free trade of protection at all, but of economics and common sense, and if those gentlemen who talk so much free trade, would talk a little more common sense, they would not be such impracticable theorists.

We heard something to-day from the right hon. gentleman about the home trade. He said he realized the importance of that trade, and he indulged in a psychological calculation. He could not understand how it was that when, as free traders told him, every man consumed five bushels of wheat, every Canadian consumed six or seven bushels. But he forgot altogether that in growing these five bushels of wheat two or three were planted annually increasing our acreage which accounted for the other two.

He also tried to make some calculation about the home trade. Well, I have taken the trouble to go into the home trade question. There are no statistics available to show the interprovincial trade. That trade does not cut any figure. It is a question of the ton exchange unit. If a ton is moved it is sold and bought, and the ton is the basis of the home trade just as it is the basis of the foreign trade. I find that every ton moved by rail or canal means a ton unit of exchange because every time it is moved it is bought and sold once. These distinctions of foreign tonnage moving through the country, local or interprovincial do not, therefore, cut any figure in the tonnage business of the country at all as regards its trade generation. There is a table of statistics published by the Railway Department called canal statistics. It is rather venerable and moss grown and not very reliable, and we have to take these statistics as we do sausages. There are also several other publications, among them the Year-book. From these I compile the following statistics:

HOME VS. FOREIGN TRADE.

Statistics of Canal Tonnage.

	Tons.
Canadian, 1899..	3,363,906
Canadian, 1909..	13,371,044
Canadian, up, 1909..	3,758,827
Total Canadian and foreign, 1899..	6,225,924
1909..	33,720,748
Grain via canal to Montreal, 1909.	652,742
Grain via C.P.R. and G.T.R. to Montreal, 1909..	285,262
Total grain to Montreal..	938,004

Out of 13,321,004 tons moved via canal only 938,004 tons were grain.

Railway statistics of home trade for 1909 show as follows:

	Tons.
Grain moved..	6,837,506
Manufactured goods..	7,902,258
Total tons moved of freight.. ..	66,822,258
Total canal tons moved..	13,321,044
Grand total tons moved home trade by railways and canals up and down..	80,163,302
Foreign tonnage, ocean—	
Outward..	4,001,678
Inward..	2,250,797
Grand total foreign tonnage.. ..	6,252,475

The home trade is thus 13⅓ greater than the foreign trade. The total foreign trade of Canada, represented by the foreign tonnage in and out equals $286,003,050, or $45 per ton. Estimating the home tonnage at $30 per ton although it is just as valuable as the foreign tonnage, the home trade is worth two and one-half billions.

Home trade..	$2,500,000,000
United States trade..	$285,265,717

Our domestic markets and trade are therefore, worth to us ten times as much as our trade with the United States.

The dollar in domestic trade is exchanged ten times oftener.

Why then are we so anxious to get another market when we have now a market worth ten times as much. Adam Smith said in his 'Wealth of Nations,' that a pound in domestic trade was turned over twenty-four times as often as a pound in foreign trade, so that it makes a profit that many times more employed at home than employed abroad. In his day of sailing ships domestic trade, he said, was twenty-four times as much exchanged as foreign trade, but with

the fast steamships and railways of to-day the comparison of the trade is reduced, as I have shown in this table, from 24 to 10. I have shown you clearly that the difference in favour of the home trade is as ten to one. That is to say for every dollar you put into the home trade, it turns over ten times faster than if put it into trade with the United States. Consequently it would be far better for us to increase and foster our trade at home than to seek foreign markets.

If I desired to follow this question longer, I could show you how every country in the world tried protection before Great Britain did. Adam Smith and the anti-protectionists wrote, towards the close of the Eighteenth century, and their doctrines were promulgated throughout all the countries of Europe, and free trade was adopted and tried by every other country long before Great Britain adopted it.

It was not until 1847, as I have already told you, that they adopted free trade, and they did not adopt it on many manufactures until years afterwards. They always wanted other countries to give them free trade; and as soon as they got free trade in those countries, they stole their markets and took away their business. They did that with Portugal, by what is known as the Methuen treaty. They offered Portugal free admission for its wine in consideration of free admission of British woollens and other goods. Portugal at that time, had a magnificent trade with her colonies, almost as great as that of Great Britain. Great Britain seized this trade, and not only that, but took away the accumulated gold of Portugal. She bought silks in India and China and sold them in Germany, where they had free trade and put the silk trade of Germany and France out of business, bringing immense profits into England. They are pretty keen traders.

To-day you will find that every country in the world has repudiated free trade. Except Great Britain and Turkey. What is the use of any one trying to deny that and to make pretension of being a free trader? If you are a free trader, you must be a cosmopolitan one, who believes that his own country should throw out lifelines to every other country in the world. But if you are a nationalist in tariff matters, you want to help your own country first. And, so far as this country is concerned, I believe it is better for us to be more nationalist. Did I desire to take up the time of the House, I could give quotations of figures for different countries of the world when they had free trade and when they had protection. I could give figures comparing wages in England with wages in the United States and Canada. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) said that wages were as good or better in England than in any other country, except the United States. I grant you that the trade unions have made wages good in the old country. But the real test of a nation's greatness in industrial progress is the test of unemployment, and England has a greater percentage of unemployed than any other country in the world. There is only one other country that can rank with England in regard to pauperism, and that also is a free trade country—Turkey. When you findthat from twenty-seven to thirty persons out of a thousand in England are receiving charity, in order that they may live and not starve, you find a condition of things which we here wish to avoid. We want to grow up and be left alone, and to develop our own resources along the old line of confederation. The best analogy that I have ever seen given of an industrial nation is a hive of bees. Protect the bees, give them a good hive, and they will look after themselves; they will thrive and lay up plenty of honey and will live through the winter and do their work perfectly. But allow some one to come along and knock a few slats off the hive and what happens? You have a disturbance, and in a few days after free trade has been established with other bees, you have a raid on that hive and the honey is stolen. And that is what will occur in this case. We are getting along very nicely. We had our own walls up and the slats of our hive nailed down tight. We were doing business along our own lines and were learning every day how to do it better. Why, we were learning more political economy in a few years than Adam Smith and all these other fellows ever thought about. You could go to one end of our country and find there the hunter, the earliest economic producer. You could find the hunter giving place to the herdsman, the herdsman giving place to the man who wanted to till the whole earth, the extensive farmer, and you could find the extensive farmer giving place to the intensive farmer. These old professors in the old country who wrote about political economy told about something like this that they thought had occurred three or four hundred years before. Why, we saw these things going on right under our own eyes. We learned, for instance, the lesson of land values as they never could learn it. We have seen western towns grow in a few years from little collections of shacks to great cities. We have learned banking in the same way. We have made the mistakes that led to busted banks, and we have seen them bust. We have learned about wages;—we have learned all these elements of political economy by hard practical experience. And when you come down to hard fact,

there is not an educated farmer in Canada. but knows more about practical economy, its facts and its laws, than all the writers that ever came out of Manchester and all the soap box orators that ever came out of Hyde Park. Why, it makes me feel cold to hear these men who have come here preaching to us what we ought to do. It is much the same as if a mandarin from the paddy fields of his native China, were to come over here with his button cap, go into a harvest field in the Northwest, and tell the farmer how to run his reaper; or as if a school teacher who had been instructing a class in physics five hundred miles from the sea, were to go down to an ocean port, go aboard a ship like the Mauretania, and undertake to instruct the chief engineer how to run his engines. These men come over here and from organizations of every kind, and start shouting. In some places they talk on the street corners—and the policeman comes and gently moves them on. But after a while the good wages they get have an effect on them. They become contented, and when they do, they make the best citizens. But I am afraid that in the Northwest the climate has not agreed with some of them, and they have formed organizations there and are trying to show the good old farmer from Ontario how to manage their own affairs and how to be economical.

Let me say to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads this House: After all, the one great thing on trial here, is not so much this trade arrangement as the great compact made between the various portions of the country. Confederation itself is on trial. We have to decide whether we will vote confidence in the constitution that was adopted so many years ago or whether we will vote want of confidence. For my part, I am going to vote confidence in it, and I think the bulk of the men of all parties in this country, whether Liberals or Conservatives, will back up that old historical party that has always stood for the Canadian idea; and, when the day comes to decide on this question at the ballot box, you will find these men voting this government out of office, and you will hear no more of this reciprocity for the next hundred and fifty years.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). I trust my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) will not deem it discourteous of me, if I do not attempt to follow him in his very interesting and very discursive address. That address contained many statements that would require correction, many that would require further illustration and explanation; but if I were to attempt to deal with the hon. gentleman's argument and also to refer to the question with which I wish to deal. I should be compelled to go far beyond the limited time for which I desire to ask the attention of the committee and would need to take up as much time, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Currie, Simcoe) himself, has occupied.

My purpose in speaking on this question at this time is to direct the attention of the committee to the attitude of the province from which I come towards the trade arrangement that has been made between Canada and the United States. I also desire to point out what, in my opinion, will be the effect on the trade of British Columbia when that trade arrangement goes into force. Many of the speeches which have thus far been delivered by hon. gentlemen opposite have been confined almost exclusively to the denunciation of the agreement because its effect has been to remove customs taxation. They have argued that the effects of this agreement would impair the loyalty of Canadians, that it would cause a deflection of trade from east and west to north and south, and ultimately lead to the annexation of Canada with the United States. Now from the standpoint of the province of British Columbia, I can assure this House that the loyalty of our people does not depend upon commercial relations with the United States. Long before confederation, and after confederation, there was in British Columbia a very extensive trade from north to south, there was no trade whatever from east to west. During the old days there was absolutely no trade east and west, but all the trade of British Columbia was transacted with the state of California. Yet the pioneers of that day did not waver in their allegiance to the British Crown, they were quite as loyal then as they are now. The argument that Canadian allegiance and Canadian aspirations of nationhood under the old flag are such fickle things that they must be kept in the straight and narrow path by the imposition of penalties in the shape of trade restrictions, does not seem to me to be one that will meet with the approval of this House, or of the public opinion of Canada. That argument, or something of a similar character, has been made to do duty in Canada for as long as I can remember. The argument has been used for the purpose of discrediting the Liberal party, for purely party political purposes, but always unsuccessfully, as I am sure it will be on the present occasion.

In confining my remarks therefore to the consideration of the question how this agreement will affect British Columbia, I do not ignore the vaster question of how it will affect all Canada. I simply prefer dealing with one phase of a many-sided question, a phase also which I think is of sufficient importance to merit a little special consideration at my hands. After a

careful study of the opinion of British Columbia, as expressed by the press of that province, by public meetings, by letters and telegrams received, I am as confident as one can be that the consensus of opinion in British Columbia is that this agreement is a good thing, that as a business proposition it will be advantageous to that province, that it will accelerate the development of British Columbia, and add very greatly and rapidly to its population. I wish to indicate the opinion of British Columbia in respect to the effect this trade agreement will have on the fruit industry. My hon. friend the member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) delivered a very long and interesting speech a few days ago, in which he dwelt altogether upon the effect of this agreement upon the fruit industry of British Columbia. He placed on 'Hansard' a number of strong petitions from boards of trade, from members of fruit associations and others, and I believe the member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) also read several warm protests against the agreement. Now I have in my hand a large number of opinions from prominent men. I will not read them all, but I desire to give the names of those who sent them and the purport of what they say. I think it is important that the House should know that, even in the great fruit growing district of Okanagan, the opinion is not unanimously opposed to this agreement; I rather think that the majority even of the people of the Okanagan country will be found favourable to the ratification of the agreement. I will briefly state the results as I have them. I have in my hand a telegram from the Nelson Liberal Association.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know why a Liberal should not express an opinion upon the effect of this agreement as well as a Conservative. The Nelson Liberal Association state that they believe:

That the reciprocal arrangement means the greatest boon that Canada has received in years, and will result in great benefit to the Kootenay district, and we heartily endorse the act of the government.

Also a telegram from the Liberal executive of Ladysmith; another from the Liberal executive of the city of Nanaimo; another from the Grand Forks Liberal Association; and as Grand Forks is the home of the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo, I will give it in full:

The Grand Forks Liberals believe the welfare of the large majority of our people will be well served by the proposed changes in the tariff, and heartily endorse your course of action.

Grand Forks is the centre of a very prosperous fruit growing district. From Cranbrook, British Columbia, I have a telegram from Mr. E. H. Small, president of the Liberal Association, which I will read:

At a meeting of the Cranbrook Liberal Association the following resolution was unanimously adopted, after receiving the full contents of the proposed trade agreement, be it resolved that we heartily endorse the same as being entirely in the best general interest of British Columbia and Canada, it undoubtedly now is admitted to be most beneficial to the lumbering, coal-mining and coke industries. While there have been some fears as to the effect upon our young and growing fruit industry, we see no occasion for alarm, but on the other hand gratification. The result will clearly be that our local market will be greatly increased by the stimulating of the above industries, and the demand will, as always heretofore, far exceed the supply. Further the new regulation will be a incentive to the better picking and packing of the home produce. Viewing the whole situation we feel that those engaged in the fruit industry have no well grounded fears as to the operation of the proposed treaty, but we might respectfully urge that the regulations governing fruit entering Canada be rigidly enforced.

E. H. SMALL,
President.

Also a telegram from the Merritt, British Columbia Liberal Association; another from Victoria, another from the Vernon Liberal Association—Vernon is the heart of the Okanagan district; another from Prince Rupert, and as Prince Rupert is the newest city we have in the west I will read it:

Resolved that this meeting of citizens at Prince Rupert, held under the auspices of the Prince Rupert Liberal Association, do hereby express our strong approval of the reciprocity or freer trade agreement so skilfully framed by the representatives of Canada, covering the policy approved by both political parties since confederation, the ratification of which we believe will increase the material and financial welfare of all Canadians, while in no way interfering with Canada's autonomy or imperilling the imperial preference which Canada at the instance of the Liberal party has freely given to Great Britain.

There is also a resolution from the New Westminster and Chilliwack associations. I know that my hon. friend probably does not set much store by these, but all the same, even Liberal associations may represent public opinion in the province of British Columbia. I have one from Alberni, another one from the district of my hon. friend from New Westminster, and a letter which I have received from a fruit grower in Grand Forks. It reads:

Dear Sir,—I take this opportunity of placing before you my views in connection with the proposed new tariff and the British Columbia fruit growers. I believe it would help us for the following reasons:

The new tariff would open up a larger and better market for the fruit growers of British Columbia, as the fruit growers of Washing-

ton get better prices for No. 1 apples than their neighbours to the north.

The fruit growers of Washington have never been competitors of British Columbia fruit growers in the Northwest markets with No. 1 fruit, but with the new tariff the British Columbia fruit growers can compete with them in their better markets at Chicago, New York, &c.

It has always been conceded that Kettle Valley fruit growers could get a better price for their No. 1 fruit if they had enough apples to interest the large buyers. Under the new tariff the larger buyers in the United States could operate in Washington and in southern British Columbia, and get a very large quantity of fruit operating in a very small radius, thus placing the Kettle Valley fruit on equal footing with the Washington.

Yours very sincerely,

THOMAS A. McINTYRE.

Mr. McIntyre is a fruit grower who lives very near my hon. friend from Kootenay. As I know my hon. friends are prepared to denounce the opinions of Liberal executives in British Columbia I desire to call attention to a meeting of the board of trade in the great city of Vancouver. The board of trade of Vancouver met for the purpose of discussing the proposed tariff agreement, and for the distinct purpose of passing a resolution condemning it. The matter was submitted, a resolution was proposed, moved and seconded and discussed very fully. The board failed to agree and they adjourned for another meeting; they again discussed the question and the motion to condemn the agreement was voted down, thus showing that the board of trade, probably the most important commercial and non-political body in Vancouver, is in favour of the agreement as proposed. Now a peculiarity of the discussion at this board of trade was that the mover of the resolution condemning the treaty was an ex-president of the board of trade, and I want to read you a portion of his argument in moving that resolution:

Mr. H. A. Stone, mover of the resolution, gave a resumé of the principal features of the proposed agreement. He pointed out that on the majority of farm products the United States would forego a larger duty than Canada, and thus Canada would secure a greatly extended market for her products, as well as fish, lumber and coke. As regards pulpwood, it was entrusted to the provinces to protect their natural resources. The speaker thought the Dominion should have adopted a policy so important as the conservation of natural resources without leaving it to the provinces. The cancellation of the duty on fish, he said, would give Canada a commanding preference to the halibut trade, and the speaker did not think that the cancellation of the duty on apples would be very dangerous to fruit growers, while the opening of a large market could not but prove beneficial. On the whole, the agreement on the face of it seemed beneficial.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN.

I submit that that argument having been made in favour of the condemnation of the agreement will indicate to the committee that even those who voted for the resolution disapproving of the commercial agreement were not very enthusiastic in favour of the course they took. Mr. R. H. Alexander, a very prominent Conservative, in supporting the resolution said this:

Looked at simply as a bargain, Canada's commissioners succeeded in this agreement.

Ex-Alderman Hepburn, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Keenleyside, Mr. A. G. McCandless all spoke very strongly in favour of the agreement. Right in the middle of the constituency of my hon. friend for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) a resolution was passed approving of the reciprocity arrangement now being negotiated.

That this meeting approve of the reciprocity treaty now being negotiated. That as fruit growers of Summerland we have no fear of American competition; and as Canadians we would gladly see an increased preference given to all British goods.

Mr. BURRELL. What association was that?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Summerland Liberal Association. My hon. friend knows that association, and will agree that they are competent to express an opinion on fruit growing.

I have here an editorial in the Summerland 'Review,' published by a Conservative, a supporter of the member for Yale-Cariboo, on February 21. The editorial is arguing in favour of the agreement and reads as follows:

And yet, our fruit men have had to put their fancy fruit on a demoralized market in competition with the 85 cent and $1.25 article shipped in from the States. Has the tariff been of one whit benefit? Could any reasonable tariff be of any lasting benefit in view of the conditions above referred to?

Strictly high-class fruit, such as that produced in the Okanagan, should be sold only on a strictly high-class market. Steinhardt and Kelly, of New York, the most extensive operators of high-class fruit perhaps in the world, buy the entire output of apples of the noted Hood River, and the price paid, we understand, is $2 per box to the Hood River Apple Growers' Union. Apples from the Hood River do not have to seek a market, for there is a high-class market built up, where the demand for this quality of fruit is in excess of the supply and buyers seek the fruit and pay spot cash on delivery.

Without a tariff either way our fancy fruit could find a home on the fancy market of the States at a fancy price, and the product of our orchard which is not up to the fancy standard could be put upon the slough market of the Northwest and Manitoba. There is, after all no sentiment in the matter of markets. The producer will sell in the market, where he can get the most for his pro-

duct at the least cost to him, and the consumer will buy where he can get the quality desired at the least cost to him.

The editorial goes on to argue that the duty on fruit will not do injury to the people of the Okanagan valley.

I have another authority who I am sure my hon. friend will know, and who I am sure the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) will not deny is an authority, who has a right to speak for British Columbia fruit growers. The writer of this is the Hon. J. H. Turner, agent general for British Columbia, in London, for many years, and a man very well known in the industry in that province. As agent general, in London, it is part of his duty to further the interests of the fruit growers in that great market, and he has taken a personal and very intelligent interest in doing so. He concludes a letter published in the 'Standard of Empire,' as follows:

'My view of the situation is that the important large fruit growers of British Columbia have so far advanced and so control the market that they will not suffer materially from reciprocity, and as I think it is generally considered that the fruit grown in British Columbia is of better quality than that grown in the country to the south, the farmers of the province may look for continued prosperity.'

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell), who made a very lengthy speech deploring that this government had inflicted a smashing blow, as he said, upon the fruit industry, will agree with me that some of these authorities are worthy of credence, and that they cannot be laughed away and sneered at. No one knows British Columbia better than the Hon. Mr. Turner, and no one knows better—I will not say the fruit growing industry, but I will say that no one knows better the marketing of the fruit grown in British Columbia than he does. Now, British Columbia is the largest importer of foodstuffs per capita of any province in the Dominion. I have not the statistics for the other provinces before me, but I can hazard the statement that British Columbia imports more food products per capita than any other province. The population of British Columbia is probably one-fifth the population of Ontario, and yet British Columbia imports a great deal more of foodstuffs than does the province of Ontario. In 1901 the population of British Columbia was 178,000, and the occupiers of farms who would be the producers of these days only numbered 5,900, or less than 4 per cent of the total population, and, therefore, it is not surprising that with such a large percentage of consumers and such a small percentage of producers there should be such a very large importation of food products. Of course, since the census of 1901 was taken, the population of British Columbia has probably more than doubled, and it is not unfair to estimate that it is to-day 400,000 or more. We will assume that producers have increased in about the same ratio, and that there are to-day in British Columbia perhaps 10 per cent of the total population, or 40,000 people engaged in agriculture and horticulture, which, of course, is an assumption, but it is based upon the figures of the census of 1901. The Hon. Price Ellison, Minister of Finance for the province of British Columbia, stated the other day in his budget speech, that British Columbia last year produced of live stock, dairy products, meats, fruit, vegetables, &c., some $14,390,000 worth, and that during the same period the importations of similar products amounted to over $14,900,000 worth, or, in other words, British Columbia really imported more food products than she produced. Now, if the consumer pays the duty, then I submit that when these goods are imported from a foreign country, and when the consumers in British Columbia number 90 per cent of the total population they are paying duty to the extent of $2,500,000 upon the $14,900,000 imported.

Mr. BURRELL. Were not these food products imported largely from eastern Canada, and not from a foreign country?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The importations were very largely from the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. BURRELL. And there was no duty on them.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The people of British Columbia paid $2,500,000 either in duty or in enhanced price caused by the duty on the importations into the province. I assume, of course, that the duty in the majority of instances enhanced the price to the consumer, even on the home product, and it is not unfair to say that if a ton of hay was brought in from Washington and paid $2 a ton duty, hay coming from Alberta would be sold at the same price in the Vancouver market, and, therefore, that the amount of money contributed by the consumers of British Columbia on imported food products was two and a half million dollars, and that, without any reference whatever to the enhanced price which the producers in British Columbia may have obtained for the $14,000,000 worth of products they produced. These figures are sufficient to show that the cost of living in British Columbia, due to this duty and the enhanced price in consequence of the duty, must be high, as we all know it is, and it may be and in all probability will be very materially reduced through the fact that this agreement will remove the duties on agricultural products.

I desire to say that this agreement, on the other hand, will be of enormous benefit to the industries of British Columbia. We have extensive areas of timber lands, probably the most valuable in Canada, or on the continent, and the lumbering industry is possibly the largest of our industries. For many years the lumbermen of that province have been petitioning this government, and I presume the previous government, to impose a duty upon rough lumber coming into Canada. The duty on rough lumber was removed some 18 or 20 years ago, and since that time rough lumber has entered Canada free of duty, and no government has ever seriously thought of reimposing the duty so long as lumber was such an indispensable article in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan. This agreement proposes free trade in lumber, and it removes from the United States tariff the $1.25 per thousand on rough lumber going into the United States, and reduces the duty on shingles from 50 cents to 30 cents a thousand. The effect of this will be to give to the Canadian lumbermen the United States market. When this announcement was first made the mountain lumbermen in British Columbia misunderstood its full purport, and came out with a statement against it, but since then, having better information, they have withdrawn their first declaration with respect to the agreement and now approve of it. Let me quote briefly the authorities I have in support of the agreement from the standpoint of the British Columbia lumbermen, and it is from that standpoint alone that I am speaking. Mr. A. D. Macrae, the manager of the second largest sawmill in the world, which is located at New Westminster, makes the statement, and I think my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) knows Mr. Macrae, and will say that he is a man of splendid judgment, whose opinion is of great value. Mr. A. D. Macrae, managing director of the Canadian Western Lumber Company, says:

The British Columbia lumbermen would benefit greatly by reductions made by the United States.

Senator King, of the province of New Brunswick, who is largely interested in the lumber trade of that province as well as the province of British Columbia, has expressed himself as strongly in favour of the agreement. Mr. J. O. Cameron, of the Westholme Lumber Company, who operates in the Island of Vancouver, with headquarters in the city of Victoria, has published a long letter explaining the agreement and strongly endorsing the same. In that letter he says:

The lumber operator who is not pleased at the prospect of having such a market as that of the United States thrown wide open to him must be afflicted with a perpetual 'grouch.'

Mr. TEMPLEMAN.

Mr. Alexander McLaren, of the Barnett Lumber Mills, a very prominent lumberman of the city of Vancouver, with very extensive interests in British Columbia, says:

The agreement will place the lumber business of all Canada in a much better position than before. The removal of duties on the products consumed in our lumber camps and at our mills, which are at all times very high-priced in British Columbia, will have the effect of reducing the cost of production. We do not manufacture shingles, but the reduction of 20 cents a thousand in the American tariff will be a great gain to shingle manufacturers in British Columbia.

While I am uncertain to what extent it will enable British Columbia lumbermen to send their lumber into the American market, I have no doubt that the effect of the agreement on the lumbering industry of that province will be highly beneficial. As it was found impossible to put a duty on American lumber coming into Canada, for the benefit especially of western mills, the next best thing was to secure the free admission of British Columbia lumber into the United States.

That is the opinion of Mr. Alexander McLaren, a member of one of the largest lumbering firms operating both in the Ottawa valley and in the province of British Columbia.

It would be interesting, but I do not wish to weary the House with quotations, to turn to the American side and see the opposition which exists against this agreement both in Congress and in the city of Seattle, because of the disastrous consequences which are going to result from the importation into the United States of British Columbia lumber. The Hon. Wm. E. Humphrey, representative from Washington in the House of Representatives at Washington, spoke in very strong terms in opposition to the agreement, pointing out that it would be very injurious to the lumbermen of the state of Washington. In Seattle the other day there was a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce to consider this question and Seattle bankers, building owners, lumbermen and shingle manufacturers, individually and collectively, sent telegrams to the members of the Washington delegation at Washington urging them to do all in their power to prevent the passage of the measure now before the Senate. A telegram signed by sixteen prominent bank officials, said:

The banking and business interests of Seattle deem the reciprocity measure of especial menace to the Pacific coast industries. Lumber, coal, fish, fruit, shingles, wheat and the Alaska trade are seriously jeopardized, without any compensating features from Canada. The lumber trade in California, worth $20,000,000 a year to us, is jeopardized because our lumbermen must ship in protected American bottoms, as

against lesser wages on Canadian bottoms from Canada.

The Canadian wheat territory is the best in the world and will seriously compete with Washington.

Seattle's Alaska business will be divided with Vancouver and Prince Rupert.

The fish business will be diverted to the Fraser river, and eastern British Columbia apples will affect Wenatchee, Yakima and Hood river. British Columbia will harm our coal mines. We are simply turning over the resources of this country to Canada without recompense.

The British Columbia lumbermen, with the opening of the California market, can just as easily send lumber from Vancouver or New Westminster or Victoria as from a Puget Sound port. It is evident that the lumbermen will derive great benefit from the free admission of their lumber into the United States.

Another industry in which British Columbia will gain is that of coke. That province produces something like 250,000 tons of coke every year. Most of that is used in British Columbia, but some 60,000 or 70,000 tons have been shipped to the United States. There is a large market in the United States for coke, while we have unlimited quantities of good coking coal on Vancouver island, and in the Crow's Nest Pass. Many of the coke ovens have been idle, particularly those on Vancouver island, for several years. This agreement removes the American duty of 20 per cent, or about $1.20 a ton, and the producers of coke in British Columbia will certainly benefit to that extent, as there are a great many smelters south of the boundary line which will use coke from British Columbia. The coke producers, then, stand to benefit to a very large degree by the removal of the duty.

But probably the most important feature of this agreement to British Columbia is the removal of the duty on fish going into the United States. British Columbia is unquestionably the largest producer of fish in the Dominion of Canada. Last year it headed all the provinces with an output of some $10,000,000 worth. We have on the coasts of British Columbia immense banks of halibut, cod, herring and other fish. Consider for a moment the halibut industry. The banks of the halibut were exploited for the first time about ten years ago by the New England Fish Company, an American company which operates on the west coast of Vancouver island, in Queen Charlotte Sound, in Hecate Straits, Dixon Entrance, and on the west coast of Queen Charlotte islands. The catch was shipped to the Boston market from Vancouver in bond. This company has been taking out on the average 10,000,000 pounds of halibut per year. I believe that their outlay for transportation and express charges, the outfitting of the steamers, and the paying of their crews, would approximate nearly $1,000,000. They, at all events, pay the Canadian Pacific railway alone, over $300,000 a year for carrying their halibut to the Boston market. That Canada has gained because we gave to this American company the privilege of bonding their fish through Canada to the American markets. The duty of 1 cent per pound imposed by the United States on halibut is prohibitive. With that duty, no fish caught in Canadian bottoms can be sent to the United States. Numerous companies in British Columbia did try the experiment. The first to try it was a Victoria company, but it did not continue the business more than a few months, because it found there was no profit in it. But now what is the case? The success of the New England Company encouraged many other companies and to-day there are at least 200 boats going out of Puget Sound ports, fishing in precisely the same ground, that is, outside the three mile limit of the coast of British Columbia, capturing from 50,000,000 to 75,000,000 pounds of halibut, and shipping it all over the United States. That great industry should be in Canadian hands, and could be very easily placed there once this treaty goes into force. Our Canadian ports are from 200 to 300 miles nearer the fishing grounds than Seattle, and besides, the American fishing vessels have no right to fish inside the three mile limit, or use our harbours for any purpose; and it is very expensive for them to catch the halibut in the open sea and then go to Seattle to discharge their cargo. That entire industry can be monopolized by our Canadian fishermen, and scarcely a year will elapse after this agreement comes into force before the entire halibut fishing industry in British Columbia will be in Canadian hands. If the catch of the New England Fishing Company is anything near as valuable to the country as it is said to be, approximately something like $1,000,000, surely the addition of the catch now going to Seattle of five or six times as much, will be of incalculable benefit to British Columbia.

So I say that on all points, on the ground of the improvement in the coke industry, on the ground of the great improvement that will result in the lumber industry, and on the ground especially of the enormous benefit that will accrue to the fishing industry of British Columbia, this proposed arrangement should commend itself to the province. While my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) fears there may be some disturbance in the fruit industry and while quite a number of other very respectable men are of the opinion that that industry will be injured, yet from the facts as we

know them, and from the evidence I have, I am bound to believe that their fears are groundless and that the results they anticipate will not follow.

I am sure that whatever may be the opinion in other parts of the Dominion, there is not one good sufficient reason why any representative from British Columbia should do anything else than vote for this resolution. I have purposely, because my voice is seriously impaired, cut my notes very short and put many of them aside. But I feel very strongly that this agreement is one of the very best policies that has ever been proposed so far as the province of British Columbia is concerned. That province is not a manufacturing country but a producer of natural products almost exclusively. We are a very small farming country, we are growing fruits to a considerable extent, we have very large lumber, fishing and mining industries, and surely, with the addition of a market of 90,000,000 people for all these products, the result cannot fail to be very advantageous to all those engaged in these industries. I desire to repeat that I think my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr Taylor), who knows the fishing business much better than I do, will have great difficulty indeed in explaining his conduct to his electors if he does not support this agreement. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Barnard) whose constituents stand to gain enormously by the carrying out of this agreement, will also have hard work to explain to the electors of that city, why he voted against it. But I have no reason to know that these hon. gentlemen are going to vote against it. I can understand the fears of my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) because he is right in the centre of a fruit growing district, and there is some apprehension there, that competition from the United States may lower prices and injure that business. Nevertheless, I think that all the representatives of British Columbia, should, for the reasons I have offered, give their support to the reciprocal agreement made by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) with the United States.

Mr. GOODEVE. With the consent of my hon. friend the Finance Minister, I would like to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. FIELDING. Is there not still time for another speech? It is still quite early. If we are going to adjourn every night at 11 o'clock, we shall be here until October, and we hope for an earlier prorogation.

Mr. GOODEVE. I understood from the whip that the speech of the hon. minister (Mr. Templeman) would end the debate for to-night, and for that reason I have not got my papers here. If my hon. friend insists, of course I shall go on.

Mr. FIELDING. If there was any understanding among the whips, I shall not insist.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 10.58 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 8, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NEW DEPARTMENTAL BUILDING.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some time ago when the items of my department were under consideration, I promised to lay on the table of the House the plans for the new departmental block. I now ask leave to lay them on the table so that hon. gentlemen may have an opportunity of inspecting them. I would like it understood by unanimous consent that they are not to form part of the records of the House, but that when hon. gentlemen have had an opportunity of inspecting them they may be returned to us again.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I thought that was a petition against reciprocity.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, if it were a petition relating to that subject it would be in favour of it judging from the size of it.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Would the hon. gentleman have the plans placed in one of the committee rooms, because I should judge from the size of them that we could not see them here very well.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a very good suggestion, and I will ask one of the officers of the House to have that done.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When are the tenders to be called for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just as soon as the specifications can be printed. We are ready to call for tenders now.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL—FISH LADDERS.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. OWEN. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I brought to the notice of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) the fact that there were no fish ladders provided in the dams being erected on the Trent Valley canal between Hastings and

Trenton. He promised to look into the matter, and I would ask him with what success?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have looked into the matter and have received a letter from the engineer in charge. I would not dare speak from memory but I shall get my hon. friend a copy of that letter.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MR. BRISTOL'S INDEMNITY.

*Mr. LANCASTER:

1. Referring to the item on page N-9, of the Auditor General's Report for the year ending March 31, 1909, as follows:—'Bristol, Edmund (special vote), Toronto, $2,500,' for how many days during that session of parliament was the said Bristol in attendance at Ottawa, as shown by affidavit required to be made by every member of parliament, and for which he received the said $2,500?

2. Why was a special vote required in order that the said Bristol could obtain the said $2,500?

3. What representations, if any, were made by the said Bristol in order to obtain the said $2,500, and in what country was he supposed to be during the said session of parliament?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. Mr. Bristol's statement furnished to the accountant of the House of Commons says he was present two days in April and during the month of May with the exception of one day, and that he was abroad during the rest of the session on account of health requirements and illness and by medical advice.

2. There was no special vote to Mr. Bristol by name. There was a special vote to cover days lost by members who were absent through illness or on public business. Mr. Bristol's case came within the terms of that vote.

3. We have no recollection of any particular representations being made in Mr. Bristol's case. Such representations usually come through the party whips and probably did so in this case.

WHARF AT SEVEN ISLANDS.

Mr. MONK:

1. What is the total cost to date of the government wharf built at Seven Islands, on the north shore of the Gulf of St. Lawrenec, P.Q.?

2. How far is the said wharf from the village of Seven Islands?

3. What revenue has been derived from said wharf since its completion?

4. Is the said wharf used by any one besides the North Shore Power and Navigation Company?

5. Who has been appointed as collector of revenue at the said wharf?

6. Who had the contract for the construction of the said wharf?

7. Who acted as government superintendent or clerk of works during the said construction?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. $101,442.89.

2. 7 miles.

3. None.

4. Apart from North Shore Power and Navigation Company, wharf is used by Holliday Brothers, and the General Navigation Company, carrying mails and passengers.

5. None.

6. The North Shore Power and Navigation Company.

7. Mr. J. C. Taché, district manager at Chicoutimi.

FARMERS' BANK—REMOVAL OF WM. R. TRAVERS TO KINGSTON PENITENTIARY.

*Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. Was the removal of Wm. R. Travers, former manager of the Farmers' Bank, from Toronto to Kingston Penitentiary, made with the knowledge and consent of the government or any department thereof?

2. Was the action of the sheriff in so removing the said Travers, before the prosecution had finished with his evidence in support of the charges then being investigated, taken with the knowledge and consent of the government or any department thereof?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. The answer to both questions is, no.

QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Have the plans and the specifications of the new Quebec bridge been submitted to the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, pursuant to the agreement or statute? If so, with what result?

2. Has the company been consulted or referred to in any way about the bridge? If so, in what way and with what result?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The plans and specifications of the bridge have not been submitted to the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, as the said bridge is not comprised in the eastern division of the Transcontinental railway, as covered by statute.

2. The question of using the bridge has been discussed with the Grand Trunk Pacific, but it was considered premature to endeavour to make arrangements with the railway companies until the construction of the bridge was further advanced.

EXPENDITURE ON NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. In a return brought down 27th February last, Sessional Papers No. 77, where the ex-

penditure of the National Transcontinental railway to 31st December, 1910, is stated to have been $89,553,740.32, is this correct, or should the amount be $93,920,956.16?

2. In the order of the House requiring an estimate of the amount required to complete and fully equip, does the sum mentioned in the return, $55,785,959.68, include equipment or merely cover construction?

3. Is any portion of the construction of the Quebec bridge included in the return?

4. In the figures given, or in the corrected figures, is there anything included for interest during construction, or the seven years' period after the road is handed over to the company? If so, for how many years, at what rate and what amount?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. $89,553,740.32 was the amount of money paid out to December 31, 1910, and $93,-920,956.16 was the cost to December 31, 1910.

2. $55,785,909.68 is the estimated amount required to complete the road. The equipment, with rolling stock, is to be furnished by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. See clause 22 of agreement, schedule to National Transcontinental Railway Act, cap. 71, 3 Ed. VII.

3. No.

4. No.

IMPORTS OF MICA.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. How many pounds of mica were imported into Canada in the years 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909 and 1910, respectively, and from what countries?

2. How many pounds of mica were exported from Canada to the United States in each of the years named?

3. How much mica was exported from Ontario and Quebec, respectively, in the years named?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The department has no record of the quantity of mica imported into Canada, as it is not separately enumerated in the classification of imports.

2. The quantity of mica (Canadian produce) exported from Canada to the United States during the fiscal years 1905 to 1910, inclusive, was as follows:

	Pounds.
1905	555,013
1906	1,038,465
1907 (9 months)	1,148,613
1908	634,570
1909	338,824
1910	829,340

3. The quantity of mica (Canadian produce) exported from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, respectively, during the fiscal years from 1905 to 1910, inclusive, was as follows:

	Ontario. Pounds.	Quebec. Pounds.
1905	298,903	691,654
1906	236,067	876,823
1907 (9 months)	284,625	1,040,807
1908	95,508	612,782
1909	57,575	377,922
1910	175,507	676,301

THE CORONATION CONTINGENT.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe):

1. Who exercises the right to select officers to take part in the coronation contingent?

2. Has the officer commanding regiments the sole right to say what officer shall be chosen?

3. Has the officer commanding a district the right to say what officers shall be chosen in his district?

4. Have any non-military organizations or civilians interceded on behalf of officers seeking to be chosen for this service? If so, what are the names and particulars?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. His Excellency the Governor General in council.

2. No.

3. No.

4. No, so far as the official records show.

MR. W. O. CREIGHTON.

Mr. STANFIELD

1. What position under the government did W. O. Creighton, of Pictou county, Nova Scotia, hold in the year 1910?

2. For what length of time was he in the service of the government and between what dates?

3. What was his salary, how much was he paid for salary, and how much was he paid for expenses?

4. Where did he carry on the work for which he was appointed?

5. Did he succeed in bringing any immigrants to Nova Scotia, or other parts of Canada?

6. How many immigrants did he induce to settle in this country, from what places did they come, in what places did they settle, and to what classes, in regard to occupation, do they belong?

7. What was their several occupations in Great Britain?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Farmer delegate to Great Britain.

2. From January 20 to April 15, 1910.

3. Salary $100 per month. Was paid $300 for salary and $350.87 for expenses.

4. In England.

5. The government does not know. He was expected to interest people in Canada so that they would come, but was not expected to bring them.

6. See answer to No. 5.

7. See answer to No. 5.

PIG IRON IMPORTS.

Mr. SPROULE:

How much pig iron used in the Steel Rail Mills, Sault Ste. Marie, was supplied from

sources outside of Canada for the year 1910, and how much was supplied by Canada for same year?

Mr. PATERSON. 16,675 tons imported pig iron, valued at $263,884, were entered for consumption at Sault Ste. Marie during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1910.

The Department of Customs has no information as to how much of this pig iron was used in the Steel Rail Mills at Sault Ste. Marie, nor how much was supplied by Canada for the same year.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS BUILT PREVIOUS TO CONFEDERATION.

Mr. FRASER:

1. What part or parts of the Prince Edward Island railway, if any, did that province cause to be built previous to confederation?
2. How many miles of said railway did the province build and pay for?
3. In what years was such construction carried on by the province?
4. How much did the province expend on such work?
5. Was such expenditure paid to said province? If so, how much, when, and in what manner?
6. Was such expenditure charged to the province on the arrangement of debt account with Canada? If so, in what year or years was it arranged and settled?
7. Did any other province in Canada except the maritime provinces construct railways at their own expense, and transfer them to Canada without compensation? If so, what province or provinces, what railway or railways, and at what cost to such province or provinces, respectively?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. From Charlottetown to Royalty Junction; from Royalty Junction to Summerside; from Summerside to Tignish; from Tignish to Mount Stewart; from Stewart to Souris; from Mount Stewart to Georgetown.
2. 198½ miles.
3. From 1871 to 1875.
4. $3,114,735.11.

5 and 6. Assumed as provincial (Prince Edward Island) debt account, 1874, 1875 and 1876.

7. No.

Mr. FRASER:

1. What part or parts of the Intercolonial railway, if any, did the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, respectively, cause to be built previous to confederation?
2. How many miles of the said railway did each of said provinces build and pay for?
3. In what years was such construction carried on in each of said provinces?
4. How much did each province expend on such work?
5. Was such expenditure paid to said provinces, or either of them? If so, how much when, and in what manner?
6. Was such expenditure charged against each province on settlement of the debt account between Canada and those provinces on entering confederation?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. In Nova Scotia—

	Miles.
Halifax to Truro	61
Windsor Branch	32
Truro to Pictou	52
Total	145

In New Brunswick—

	Miles.
Moncton to Shediac	19
St. John to Rothesay	9
Rothesay to Hampton	13
Hampton to Sussex	22
Sussex to Moncton	45
Total	108

2. Answered by No. 1.
3. In province of Nova Scotia, 1854 to 1858. In province of New Brunswick, 1856 to 1860.
4. Province of Nova Scotia, $6,124,241.15. Province of New Brunswick, $4,642,484.39.
5. Assumed as provincial debt account, years 1874, 1875, 1876.
6. Answered by No. 5.

JAMES BAY FISHING LEASE.

Mr. THOBURN:

1. Is the lease of the exclusive right of commercial fishing in James bay granted to Archibald McNee, of Windsor, some years ago, still in existence? If so, to who was it assigned?
2. What is the duration of said lease, and what is the annual rental?
3. Have the rentals been paid regularly? If not, what are the arrears still due?
4. Have any operations been cancelled under the lease? If not, is it the intention of the government to cancel it?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Yes. It is still in the name of Mr. McNee.
2. Twenty-one years, $10 per annum.
3. Yes, up to and for the year 1909. No further payments were accepted.
4. No. Yes.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH UNITED STATES.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to make a few remarks on the proposed motion in respect to the subject that has engaged the attention of the House for the last two weeks. I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the Prime Minister yesterday but I trust he will pardon me for saying that in the absence of any convincing argument contained in that speech I am more absolutely opposed to this treaty after hearing it than I was before. The right hon. gentleman is sometimes fond of epithets. He indulged in them yesterday to a very con-

siderable extent. The protests of the market gardeners and fruit growers, the protests of the men engaged in the packing and milling industries in this country, even the earnest views of many men in this country who have as good claim to the title of Liberal as he has, are described by him by no better term than the howling of wolves. I would like to say to the right hon. gentleman that wolves sometimes stand savagely at bay. I observe in the Montreal 'Gazette' of to-day that another gentleman who had not before given his opinions very fully, Sir William Van Horne, has now written a letter indicating his views upon this subject. I suppose that the opinions of Sir William Van Horne as a man of great business experience and knowledge of the conditions of this country, a man who, as he says, has not taken any part in politics, ought to be entitled to some respect. I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman would regard him as an addition to the pack of wolves which he described yesterday, but I do want at the very outset to read one or two paragraphs from that letter which has been made public only to-day, to the end that we may have recorded in Hansard another expression of opinion from one of the leading business men of this country. Sir William Van Horne says:

To my amazement and distress and shame I now see the magnificent work of a generation traded away for a vague idea or a childish sentiment—the splendid commercial and industrial position we have reached and our proud independence bartered for a few wormy plums, and I feel it my duty to join in the protest which is heard from every section of the country.

To-day we are in an enviable position, with a commerce three times as great per capita as that of the United States, and without a cloud in our sky save the one which has just now been raised. Does not common sense tell us to stay where we are and to let well enough alone?

I suppose the answer of the right hon. gentleman to that protest would be some fatuous reference such as he made yesterday to conditions as they are in China. I had not been aware that this country, according to the claims of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House had been governed during the past fifteen years by Chinese traditions and yet that is the direct logical result of the argument the right hon. gentleman made yesterday. I shall read also the concluding paragraph of the letter:

Let us not run away with the idea that if we make a mistake in this matter of reciprocity we shall be able to correct it at pleasure. We may not be permitted to do it. It should be remembered that there are such things as vested interests with nations as with individuals and corporations, and that the vested interests of nations, real or alleged, are terribly binding upon the weaker party. When Mr. Hill has extended his seven or eight lines of railway into the Canadian northwest lines which have for some years been resting their noses on the boundary line waiting for reciprocity, or something of the kind, to warrant them in crossing—and when other American channels of trade have been established, affecting our territory, and when the American millers have tasted our wheat and the American manufacturers have got hold of our markets, is it probable that we shall be permitted to recede? Not a bit of it. We are making a bed to lie in and die in.

A very considerable part of the time of my right hon. friend yesterday was devoted to resuscitating very old speeches of himself and others of twenty years ago. Has the right hon. gentleman been asleep? Must we in future dub him Sir Wilfrid Rip Van Winkle. This is not 1854, this is not 1866, this is not 1879, this is not 1897. Will the Prime Minister wake up and remember that this is 1911? The question is one of national gravity and the country is not very seriously concerned as to whether the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has a good memory or a bad memory. About twenty or twenty-five minutes were devoted to that subject yesterday. The right hon. gentleman indulged in an occasional sneer in the course of his remarks; and he sneered at the business ability of the hon. member for North Toronto. It is not very customary in this House to go into criticisms of the private affairs of any hon. member; and I would like to say to the Prime Minister that if any man is unfortunate enough to make mistakes in respect to his own private affairs he bears the penalty, but if a man at the head of affairs in this country makes mistakes, he does it at the expense of the country and not at his own expense.

To come down to a question of reasonable business statement, where do we find the Prime Minister in his remarks of yesterday? Why, Sir, the Prime Minister of this country used as an argument in favour of his reciprocity proposals these statements—I do not know whether he intended them to be serious or jocular.

One thing is certain, one thing cannot be denied, that the relations which have existed between the two countries for the last fifty years, especially for the last twenty years, still more for the last twelve years, and which almost came to a crisis a year ago—those relations have been a blot upon the civilization of the two countries.

Mark what follows:

They have amounted practically to a proclamation of non-commercial intercourse between the two countries, so far as legislation could bring that about.

Later on, in the following column of 'Hansard,' he reiterates the same state-

ment that there has been substantially a policy of non-intercourse between Canada and the United States especially during the past ten years. I take the last ten years and I find that during that period our imports from the United States amounted to $1,555,000,000; our exports to the United States during the same period amounted to $763,000,000, and the Prime Minister of Canada, making I suppose, a serious statement, tells us as an argument in favour of his reciprocity proposals that there has been practically no commercial intercourse between Canada and the United States during that period. Did the Prime Minister intend to be taken seriously? What does he say about the conditions between this country and Great Britain? Has there been a condition of non-intercourse between Canada and the mother country absolutely so, according to his own argument yesterday? Because if you take the total trade between Canada and the mother country during the past ten years, you will find it is about $300,000,000 less than the trade between Canada and the United States. If the Prime Minister desires to modify that outrageous statement to which I have just called attention, I will give him an opportunity to do so at this moment. Why, Mr. Speaker, last year the imports from the United States into Canada amounted to three-fifths of the total imports into this country; and yet the right hon. gentleman as the head of this government declares, as a serious argument that these proposals should be put through the parliament of Canada, that there has been a condition of practical commercial non-intercourse between Canada and the United States in the past ten years.

The right hon. gentleman went on to say that you cannot control trade, you cannot affect trade, by legislation. What, then, is the object of these proposals? Why, at the Imperial Conference of 1907 the Prime Minister referred over and over again to efforts made by legislation in this country to direct trade into British channels, a policy which he has absolutely departed from in bringing these proposals before parliament. At that conference he said:

> So far as legislation can influence trade, we have done everything possible to push our trade towards the British people as against the American people.

Then Mr. Asquith interposed:

> May I say I did not in the least dispute that? My object was not, as I think I made clear, in any sense to complain of the Canadian preference; on the contrary, I recognize both its intention and its effect. My point was that natural conditions were such that it was inevitable that the Americans should get the best of it.

To which the Prime Minister responded, 'exactly.' He went on to say:

> Not only have we done it by preference, by legislation, but we have forced our trade against the laws of nature and geography. If we were to follow the laws of nature and geography between Canada and the United States, the whole trade would flow from south to north, and from north to south. We have done everything possible by building canals and subsidizing railways to bring the trade from west to east and east to west so as to bring trade into British channels. All this we have done, recognizing the principle of the great advantage of forcing trade within the British empire.

To-day he is entering upon a policy which is absolutely divergent from that which he laid down at that conference. Trade cannot be controlled by legislation? Ask the millers of the western United States whether or not trade can be controlled by legislation. Look at the exultation of these men. I have their views under my hand, but I will not weary the House with them, as they have already been quoted. They point out the enormous advantage to the milling interest of the United States and to the industries associated with that interest which would be brought about by their having a supply of raw material from Canada. Ask also the American Newspaper Publishers' Association whether or not these proposals will have any effect upon the manufacturers of the United States in relation to our pulpwood. I will quote a memorandum of these gentlemen under date of January 28, 1911, and signed by Mr. John Norris, chairman of the committee on paper. These gentlemen say:

> This draft is entirely satisfactory to publishers. It will provide for the immediate entry of print paper and wood pulp from Canada. The snarl with the provinces of Canada has been completely avoided by an entirely new turn to the stipulations, which now follow the wood—not the province. If wood is free from restriction, such as wood from private lands, the products of that wood will come into the United States free of duty. A province owning land holds the same relation to the Dominion government that an ordinary land owner maintains. The province has no power to stop the exportation of wood from private lands in that province. Recent tariff legislation in the United States aimed to coerce provinces of Canada to part with Crown land wood and those provinces resented such coercion. In the reciprocity arrangement, each province can do with its own land as it pleases and can do this without affecting the immediate and free entry of paper and pulp made from wood cut on private lands in that province. The distinction between wood free from restriction of exportation and wood that is not free will show itself in various ways. Print paper made from wood cut on lands subject to restriction will be liable to a duty of $5.75 per ton of paper. That duty will be prohibitory in competition with paper made from wood cut on private lands. The provinces of Quebec and Ontario have been offering premiums and inducements for the transfer of American paper industries to Canada. Brown

Bros. of Berlin Mills, N.H., recently installed a plant at La Tuque, Quebec, and propose to expand it materially. That plant depends on Crown lands for its timber supply. The International Paper Company has been flirting with the Quebec government for similar concessions. The reciprocity clause will give no encouragement to such diversion of industry from the United States to Canada. A barrier of $5.75 per ton on print paper will confront such products until the Quebec government removes the prohibition. The revenues which the province now obtains on wood cut from its Crown lands and shipped in manufactured form to the United States will be diverted from the Quebec treasury to the owners of private lands. The pressure from holders of Crown lands limits upon the provincial authorities for an opportunity to reach the greatest market in the world, that of the United States, will be irresistible and a diplomatic victory in the removal of restrictions will have been achieved without harshness, or coercion, or ill feeling of any sort. Each side will obtain an advantage, and that is the element of a good trade.

Then the memorandum goes on to show in what respect each side does get an advantage, and I quote its concluding words:

Under the new arrangement, American paper makers will gain a large market for their products in Canada, especially in the higher grades of paper.

The ultimate outcome of the proposed reciprocity arrangement, if ratified, will be a tendency toward the concentration of the pulp business in Canada and the conversion on this side of those pulps into paper, with great growth and advantages for each side.

Every one knows what that means; the finished product is to be manufactured in the United States with a maximum of wages paid to the labouring men of the United States, and the minimum labour on that product will be expended in Canada with a minimum of wages to Canadian workingmen.

My right hon. friend says that present conditions are not really altered by these proposals at all—that we can now export in bond to the United States, and that everything will go on exactly as it does at present with respect to the export of our products through United States ports. I am not going into that subject to-day beyond saying this, that if my right hon. friend will consult any business man in this country who has had any experience in such matters, he will find that he never made a greater mistake than he did when he made that statement. Conditions have been entirely altered, and there will be facilities for exporting through United States ports which are unknown to-day.

My right hon. friend says that these proposals will not affect the possibility of a preference. How is it possible that American wheat can come freely into Canada,—and no restrictive conditions can be imposed under this arrangement—and that Great Britain can at the same time give an effective preference on Canadian wheat? I would like to see how the right hon. gentleman can work that out. That may be his opinion, but it is not the opinion of business men, who, in respect of a matter like this, ought to be able to offer a judgment entitled certainly to as great respect as that of the Prime Minister. Mr. James J. Hill, one of the shrewdest men on the American continent, puts the matter squarely as an issue between Imperial confederation and continental union The two, he thinks, cannot go together. He pays no heed to the effect of the latter on Canada, but thinks only of its advantage to the States. A fifteen cent import tax on grain in England, he says, would retain the whole of the grain industry and all its allied industries to Canada, and develop the all red imperial lines of communication, and the building up of manufactures in Canada and the old country. But if this reciprocity treaty be accepted, such a duty will not be imposed. The grain grown in the central provinces of Canada will be shipped across the border, will be milled there, the flour will be shipped along American lines, and the by-products will be retained to feed and fatten American stock. And so with all other natural resources of this country. So with many articles which we could with advantage work up in this country into the finished product and export to the markets of the world.

Then my right hon. friend dealt with the question of natural resources, and here he was delightfully amusing. He referred to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as an Indian, because the Indians had not developed the natural resources of this country. I would like to call my hon. friend's attention to one or two other characteristics of the Indians. In days gone by they owned the whole of this continent, and there are traditions, and even veritable history, that some shrewd trader, with a few old muskets, some gaudy cotton, bright coloured scarves and attractive beads, would often acquire 20,000 or 30,000 or 40,000 square miles of land in exchange for them. Well, unfortunately for Canada, the political Indians of the country are on the treasury benches to-day. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to depart in any way from parliamentary language; therefore I withdraw that expression, and apologize to the Indians, because I am sure that there are thousands of Indians in Canada to-day who would be too intelligent to have embarked this country on such an enterprise as that which is before this House at the present time.

My right hon. friend says that the proposals he has made do not in any way imperil our industries. Well, let us look at that for a moment. Let me read what the

right hon. gentleman says with regard to the matter:

There are men who believe that we are going to recklessly ruin industry and capital. Capital is timid under all circumstances and the man who is at the head of affairs and the ministers who assist him, would not be worthy of the public confidence if they were not always careful to see that capital will be safe, whenever it is invested in any industry in this country.

Mr. BURRELL. Would my right hon. friend permit me one question? Does not the very argument he has put up on behalf of the manufacturers apply with crushing force to the fruit industry?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not in the least. My hon. friend will observe that we have not obtained for the manufacturers a free market on the other side of the line, but we have obtained a free market for the fruit growers.

What, then, will be the answer of the right hon. gentleman when he opens this country to the manufacturers of the United States? Exactly what is contained in the answer he has given to my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell):—We have opened to you the markets of the United States, and therefore, you have absolutely no ground of complaint. I am taking his own reason and even his very words. In fact, it is exactly along the line of what he said on 17th of November, 1891, in Boston, for I have his words as then reported, and they can be verified:

We are willing, therefore, whenever a new treaty is negotiated between the two nations that it shall not apply to one class but to all classes of goods, whether natural or manufactured.

Well, does the right hon. gentleman imagine for one moment that the farmers of this country will submit to have competition with twelve or fourteen countries in the world, under a system of free trade in natural products when they are called upon to pay taxes on every manufactured product that comes into this country? Will they be willing to undertake this burden for the benefit of our industries? I can best answer that question by a quotation which I will give to my right hon. friend. This is the view, not of farmers in Canada, but of farmers in the United States. It is a reasonable view from the farmers' standpoint, and I think it is much more convincing for the point it makes than anything uttered by my right hon. friend in his long speech of yesterday, I quote from page 241 of the hearings before the committee of Ways and Means in the United States House of Representatives:

This Bill puts the farmers' products on the free list, and taxes the articles in the form in which they reach the consumer. Do you suppose for one single instant, gentlemen, that the farmers of this country who have furnished the money, and are to-day furnishing the money for the best market of our manufacturing interests in this country, do not understand this argument? Do you believe they will ever tamely submit? No; never.

And again:

We insist that there shall be no free trade for the farmers and high tariff for the manufacturers, but that if the farm products go on the free list, manufactured articles must also be made free, and they will, inside of a very short time.

That argument, made by the farmers of the United States is precisely the argument which will be made by the farmers of Canada, and especially by those engaged in every one of these industries which have been injuriously affected by the proposals of the government.

Now, my right hon. friend dealt with the question of imports from the twelve favoured nations to whom our markets will be opened by these proposals. I am not going to spend very much time on that, but what the right hon. gentleman said deserves some answer. What he says amounts to this: Because we have few imports under a protective tariff from these twelve or fourteen countries, therefore we shall have no greater imports when the protective tariff is abolished. What, then, is the object of these proposals? Will these proposals create no changed trade conditions between Canada and the United States? If they are likely to change trade conditions between Canada and the United States, are they not equally likely to produce changed conditions between all the countries I have referred to and Canada. Has the Prime Minister taken the trouble to investigate the products of these various countries? Has he any idea of the wages of labour and the cost of production in any one of the countries he mentioned yesterday? I have an interesting statement under my hand which has been compiled from official sources by my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid). I will not attempt to give the data with regard to these countries, but only one or two items with regard to one country, and the House can judge as to the value of the argument put forward by the right hon. gentleman yesterday. Argentine, in 1909, exported 461,595,818 pounds of frozen beef, the export value being $20,210,525, or an average of 4½ cents per pound, when exported. The same country exported in the same year 146,555,326 pounds of frozen mutton, having an export value of $5,133,426, or 3½ cents per pound. What is the cost of transportation from Argentine to Canada? What will be the duties on these meats when they reach Canada? Beef and mutton can be laid down from Argentine in Canada, freight and duty

paid, at between 6 cents and 7 cents per pound. And the Prime Minister seriously assured this House in his speech of yesterday that conditions in this country are not likely to lead to any competition with the products of Canada. Further than that, Argentine exported in 1909, 8,799,764 pounds of butter, the export value being $1,459,591 or 17½ cents per pound. Under these circumstances, it is utterly idle for the Prime Minister to pretend that trade conditions between Canada and the various countries which have been enumerated will not be altered by the consummation of these proposals.

Now, I come more particularly to the matter which is touched by my motion. The Prime Minister thinks that he has had a mandate for these reciprocity proposals. He admits that no election has been held at which that subject has been discussed, since 1891. He admits that his own government took off the statute book the standing offer of reciprocity in 1897. He admits that there was no discussion and no issue raised in the elections of 1900, 1904 and 1908. Yet, for some mysterious reason, he finds a mandate where no one else in the whole country can find it. I venture to say to the right hon. gentleman that he had a better mandate at every one of these elections to abolish the Senate than he had to make this arrangement so seriously affecting the business of this country. He says he merely discontinued his efforts for reciprocity. He never asked or received a mandate to renew them. Did he receive a mandate to restore the standing offer of reciprocity? That is what he proposes to do. He abolished it in 1897 and, in addition, as has been pointed out over and over again, in this House, he most distinctly gave a pledge to this country that there should be an investigation by royal commission before any substantial change was made in the fiscal conditions of this country. He proposes now a standing offer of reciprocity—because that is the result, now that the Congress of the United States has declined to ratify these proposals and to put them into effect. Would it be wise and dignified for us in this country to put out another standing offer of reciprocity, after having maintained one on the statute-book of this country without effect for more than twenty years? Congress has declined to carry out the proposals. Another party has come into power in Congress, and it is altogether uncertain that the special session will pass these proposals. Meantime, we are to pass them and to wait the pleasure of the United States, as we did in the thirty years between 1866 and 1896.

My right hon. friend the Prime Minister says that we wore out a good deal of shoe leather between 1866 and 1896 in endeavouring to get reciprocity. He now proposes to wear out a little more. Well, I respectfully submit that the time has come when we should wear out no more shoe leather in endeavouring to obtain reciprocity, and that it is now the turn of the United States to wear out some of their excellent shoe leather in coming to this country for reciprocity if they desire it. What is the present situation? Is there anything to be lost by holding our hands? Let us look for a moment at the programme of the Democratic party in that country. Every one who has followed political events and political agitation in the United States knows that the Democratic party has been pledged for many years to a lower tariff. The platform of that party has been a lower tariff and a reduction of the high cost of living. What does their leader in Congress say on that point? I shall quote from Mr. Clark, of Missouri, who, I understand, will be the next speaker in the House of Representatives, and who is the virtual leader of that party in the United States Congress at present. Mr. Clark said on the 14th of February last:

I wish to suggest to my party fellows that if this Bill is passed it is not the end of the chapter, or the end of the world. At high noon on the 4th day of March we shall come into the possession of this House, and if this treaty does not go as far as we want it to go, we can then make it go still further. (Applause on the Democrat side.)

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman says his party will come into power after the 4th of March?

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. In this House.

Mr. DALZELL. Suppose this treaty does not pass at this session of Congress. What will his party do with it if it is put up to them at the next session of Congress?

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. (Laughter and applause.)

Mr. DALZELL. Would you pass this Bill?

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. I think we might amend it and pass it. The chances are that we would pass a tariff Bill that would very largely take the place of this Bill; a Bill that, to say nothing of this Bill at all, will go into every branch of the subject; a Bill or Bills. And I want to say that while I am in favour of taking a separate Bill for a separate schedule, in order to expedite revision downwards, in the end 14 separate Bills for 14 separate schedules would amount to an entire tariff Bill. The Democrats are committed to a revision of the tariff, and so far as this House is concerned, we are going to revise, wisely and thoroughly, according to promise.

Further on he says:

Mr. KENDALL. I want to inquire if the gentleman is accepting this Bill as a substitute for a general tariff revision?

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. Good heavens, no. (Laughter and applause on the Democrat

side.) I am accepting this for what it is worth, and no more, as a step in the right direction.

Then further on at page 2626:

Reciprocity is a good Democratic doctrine in spots, and until we can get a general Democratic tariff Bill perfected and put upon the statute-books I am going to stand by this treaty.

Further on in the same page:

In levying a tariff I am in favour of putting the highest tariff on the luxuries of life, except in those cases where the luxury is of such a character that it would incite smuggling. I am in favour of putting the lowest tariff, or none at all, on the necessaries of life. (Applause on the Democrat side.) And just exactly in proportion as things become necessary I would take the tariff off them and put them on the free list, or lower the tariff on them to the vanishing point. I do not think anybody can misunderstand that or misconstrue it.

It is perfectly plain, therefore, that the Democratic party in the United States is committed to a lower tariff, and it was most inopportune for this government to have entered into this treaty on the very eve of that change in the American tariff. As things now stand, the Democratic party has a majority in the House of Representatives, and they propose to bring in a tariff Bill, a general tariff Bill, on a lower basis. In those circumstances it seems to me that as this Bill has failed to pass Congress at the session which has just come to a close it would be absolutely inopportune for us to put on our statutes a second standing offer.

I desire now to make a general objection to this system of making tariffs. I am opposed to any system of secret tariffs. I am opposed to any system of making tariffs by convention with another country, which cannot be altered in this parliament. What is the difference in principle? In the one case the government brings down its tariff; it can be amended in parliament, with the consent of the government, when difficulties and injustices are shown to result from it which were not in the minds of those who framed it. But in the other case we must accept or reject the tariff as a whole. It is an ironclad scheme, not susceptible of any alteration. Such a tariff is not consistent with democratic government, and my right hon. friend has always claimed that he stood for democratic government. Let me give the opinion on the subject of a man of great eminence who was speaking from his experience in South Africa, when he was high commissioner in that country. He was dealing with the conditions which had obtained in South Africa and which led up to the South African union; and he pointed out the difficulties which always surrounded the making of secret tariffs.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). What name?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is a state paper which Lord Selborne submitted to the Imperial Parliament in 1906. Speaking of the results of the conference in South Africa which had brought about the South African customs tariff, he said:

The proceedings of the conferenec were private and when it was closed, the strictest secrecy as to the nature of the results produced had still to be observed by some forty persons for several months. The new convention had then to be carried through five different legislatures, and each of these public assemblies were told that they might discuss the details, but they could not be allowed to alter one of them. The convention was cut and dried, and they must each and all take or leave it as a whole.

Compare this procedure with the process by which a customs tariff would be framed in the United Kingdom, if the government had decided to embark on a new fiscal policy. To begin with, it is probable that either the government would appoint a royal commission or parliament itself would appoint a select committee to investigate the question, and the whole proceedings of that body would be open to the public, the evidence placed before it would be the subject of public discussion. When the actual proposals were framed, they would be framed by the government itself, and the greatest attention would of course be paid to the claims of each business and industry and also to the views put forward by the various interests and parts of the country.

Then he goes on to deal with the other side of the case. He said:

A customs tariff, framed as a treaty between independent states, must not only be a compromise, but is likely to be one which its authors know to be in some respects bad in itself.

Further on:

If the conference succeeds in producing a unanimous result, the scheme is taken as a whole, and submitted to the various legislatures of the country, simply for acceptance or for rejection. Whatever may be the constitutional law on the subject, the elected representatives of the people have in practice no power to modify the details because the alteration of one item by one state would, unless agreed to by all the others, render the whole scheme unworkable and be tantamount to rejection by that state. The members of the legislatures know that the scheme must be taken or left as a whole.

Further on:

The details upon which the whole depends and which ought to be settled, and which could be settled by the representatives of the people themselves are taken out of their hands. It is difficult to imagine a less democratic, or indeed—

I invite the special attention of my right hon. friend to these concluding words of Lord Selborne:

It is difficult to imagine a less democratic, or indeed a more dangerously undemocratic method of dealing with one of the most important departments of public business.

Now, some reference has been made by hon. gentlemen opposite to an increase of the British preference. I do not know whether the gentlemen who spoke on that subject were inspired or not. I have expressed my views on this subject eight or nine years ago in this House, and I stand by them to-day. I stand, in the first place, for the empire as against the world, and within the empire I stand, first, for Canada. I believe that a mill or a factory in Canada is worth as much to this great empire as a mill or a factory in Yorkshire or anywhere else in England.

Our transportation lines run from east to west, and we are establishing many others. In connection with what Sir William Van Horne has said in his letter with regard to Mr. Hill's lines of railways, reaching up to tap Canadian trade, I would like to point out that he has very much understated the actual conditions. Here is a railway map of the west of Canada from the Great Lakes to the Pacific ocean, and looking over that, I find there are no less than 19 lines, all of them I believe controlled by Mr. Hill. A few of them have entered Canada, and the others, as Sir William Van Horne says, are standing there with their noses resting on the Canadian boundaray line, all ready to tap the traffic of this great western country. Well that was not the object with which we undertook this Canadian confederation, that is not the object for which we have poured out treasures untold in time past, that is not the object the Prime Minister had in view when he used the words I have quoted at the Imperial Conference of 1907.

We have accomplished a great work in Canada. The project of creating the Canada of to-day was a great, even an audacious one. It has well been said by a great writer of modern times that as providence is on the side of the big battalions, so providence is always on the side of a great idea; and Providence was on the side of the great idea of building up a Canadian confederation on the northern half of this continent. Let us continue the work so well begun. The same writer to whom I have alluded has said that the United States have been fortunate in the possession of a great and constant tradition, compounded of an intense belief in their institutions, in their destiny and in themselves. An equal tradition is the birthright of every Canadian. I realize that Canada has a plain duty and a grave responsibility in one important respect. She ought to be, I trust that she will be, a bond of union and of amity between the empire and the republic. But I

believe that this high mission can best be fulfilled when Canadians are inspired by a belief in their institutions, their destiny, their country and themselves as intense as that which pervades the people of the United States. Our strong determination to work out our own destiny with a firm heart by our own efforts and along our own lines, will most surely win the respect of our neighbours who have given us therein an inspiring example. Let each country adopt towards the other a trade policy as generous as its true interests will permit; but let this be done without entangling engagements or indefinite understandings. No Canadian should be told that although he presents a substantial grievance it is too late to redress it, because a secret and unalterable tariff has been made at Washington. No Canadian should be told that our parliament is not free to redress the grievances of the Canadian people, because its hands have been fettered by an entangling trade alliance. Let our fiscal policy be worked out, not by secret diplomatic tariffs whereof no injustice can be redressed, but by the ordinary parliamentary methods which permit mistakes to be rectified and injustices to be removed. Thus and thus only can we preserve and maintain the true fiscal independence, and autonomy of the Canadian nation.

Now, Sir, I regard these proposals as reversing the policy of the people of Canada for the past thirty years, given by an unmistakable mandate at every election which has taken place during that period. What should be the course of the government at this time? Take the census, give the west its increased representation, then submit this question to the people of Canada and let them decide. We held out to the United States for twenty years a standing offer of reciprocity, and they did not accept it. It will not lessen their respect for us if we permit them for a few years to put a standing offer of reciprocity upon their statute-book. We have worn some shoe leather in going to Washington; as I said before, let the Americans wear out some shoe leather in coming to Ottawa. They are submitting these proposals to a new Congress; let us in Canada submit these proposals to a new parliament. I therefore beg to move:

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be omitted and the following substituted therefor:

The reciprocal agreement embodied in the resolutions submitted to this House by the Minister of Finance on the 26th day of January last was also submitted on the same day by special message of the President to Congress of the United States of America which was then in session.

That the said session has now expired and Congress has failed to approve and carry out the said agreement.

That a considerable length of time must necessarily elapse before the said agreement can be dealt with by Congress at a special session.

That the fiscal changes proposed by the said agreement are of a far-reaching character and constitute a substantial reversal of the policy which has been approved by the people of Canada.

That in the opinion of this House, the said resolutions should not be proceeded with until the electors shall have had an opportunity of pronouncing upon their merits.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). It does not seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the motion which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) has placed in your hands calls for that general discussion of the question upon which he has entered at considerable length. We have been discussing this agreement day after day, we shall continue to discuss it, we shall continue to discuss it for a sufficient time, I trust, to give the people of this country the fullest possible knowledge of its contents. We are satisfied that there has been a vast amount of misunderstanding—I do not wish to say misrepresentation, it is too harsh a word—there has been a vast amount of misunderstanding as to the contents of this agreement; and we feel that day by day the people are being made acquainted with the facts of the case, and that every day is increasing the number of the supporters of this proposition. We have been proceeding with the discussion of the question in the manner which the hon. leader of the opposition himself desired and suggested. It was his suggestion that we should take up and discuss this matter in Committee of the Whole. We were proceeding, Sir, to debate the question while you were in the chair, but the hon. gentleman asked that you leave the chair in order that we might continue the discussion in Committee of the Whole. It was his proposal, we have assented to it, we have carried on the discussion for over a month, and why my hon. friend should again and again want to break away from that arrangement is difficult to understand, except upon the one theory that the hon. gentleman knows that the country is against him on this question, and it is the desire of some hon. gentlemen on that side to, if possible, dodge a vote on the main question. We want to say in all frankness that we do not sympathize with that object. We, on this side of the House, desire that the discussion shall continue soberly, quietly, regularly, for a sufficient time to have the question thoroughly threshed out. Then, we on this side, who believe in this agreement, want an opportunity to vote for it, and it is our intention that hon. gentlemen opposite shall place themselves on record. The motion that the hon. gentleman has made, I say, does not call for discussion of the whole question, and I am not going into a discussion of the whole question at this stage. Much that my hon. friend has said to-day has already been dealt with effectively by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and that portion of it which has not been dealt with, that portion of it which may be deemed to deserve further consideration, will no doubt be dealt with in the usual way at a later stage. Again I say I do not propose to enter into the general discussion of the question to-day at this stage not even to oblige our respected friend, Sir William Van Horne, whose letter was dragged into the debate here in a way that was somewhat remarkable. Sir William Van Horne is a distinguished citizen of our country and we are glad to have his opinion on any other question—on any question. This is not the first time we have had the misfortune to differ from our good friend Sir William Van Horne. There have been occasions when we have been obliged to differ from him in the past; I shall regret if we have to differ from him in future—I suppose it may be unavoidable—but, if this matter shall take such a shape that on the one side we have Sir William Van Horne and various other estimable sirs, and on the other side the toiling masses of the people of Canada, there is no question as to which side the Liberal party is going to be on. As I said, Sir, I think the moment is not opportune, but when you leave the chair, when we take up the consideration of this subject in the way chosen by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and for which he seems to be so frequently sorry, when we get into the ordinary course of debate, I am sure that the whole matter will be threshed out thoroughly. At the present time it seems to me that the only thing to be considered is whether or not we shall proceed with the discussion of this question of vast importance, or whether, as the hon. gentleman suggests, we shall abandon it and throw it overboard. Upon that question there cannot be a doubt as to the wish of the people of Canada, or as to the wish of the members of this House. There was an agreement between the government of the United States and the government of Canada not only as to the details of tariff arrangements, but as to the manner in which this debate, this discussion, this negotiation should be carried on. In the official copy which I hold in my hand of the letters which created the agreement I find, in a letter addressed by my colleague, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and myself, to Secretary Knox, and confirmed by him as a correct statement of the arrangement, the following:

13. It is understood that upon a day and hour to be agreed upon between the two governments, the President of the United States will communicate to Congress the conclusions now reached and recommend the adoption of such legislation as may be necessary on the

part of the United States to give effect to the proposed arrangement.

14. It is understood that simultaneously with the sending of such communication to the United States Congress by the President, the Canadian government will communicate to the parliament of Canada the conclusions now reached, and will thereupon take the necessary steps to procure such legislation as is required to give effect to the proposed arrangement.

The President of the United States has loyally lived up to that agreement. If the government of Canada, or the parliament of Canada which supports this government, should deviate one step from this arrangement it would be a breach of faith which would dishonour the government of Canada——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FIELDING. A breach of faith which would dishonour the government of Canada and through the government, the parliament and people of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. Whether or not this agreement is a wise one is a proper matter for debate, and the fact that so many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have differed from us is the best evidence that there must be a difference of opinion on that. But whatever our views may be with regard to the arrangement itself there should be no difference of opinion as to the obligation which the government of Canada entered into with the government of the United States to conduct this negotiation, to press it forward and to obtain the judgment of the Congress of the United States, and the parliament of Canada upon it.

Mr. COWAN. Mr. Speaker, does the minister give the House to understand that he and his colleagues entered into an obligation to deny the people a free opportunity of voting upon this question?

Mr. FIELDING. I have read the obligation within the last few minutes, and I will leave my hon. friend with his knowledge of the English language to understand it. I desire to repeat that it would be a gross breach of faith. My hon. friend opposite (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has stated that Congress has declined to pass this agreement. That is not an accurate statement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I said at the session just terminated.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman says at the session which has just terminated.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I said that before. I said there was no action at the session just terminated.

Mr. FIELDING. Congress did not decline to pass the arrangement and when my hon. friend says that Congress declined to pass it he is not putting it fairly before the House. Congress has, I say, not declined. The President of the United States has loyally kept faith. The President of the United States sent a message to Congress cordially recommending the measure to the two branches of the National legislature.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will my hon. friend permit me to interrupt him for a matter of personal explanation? The words of my motion are:

That the said session has now expired and Congress has failed to approve and carry out the said agreement.

That, I say, is absolutely correct.

Mr. FIELDING. I was not referring to the words of the hon. gentleman's motion. I was referring to the words of the hon. gentleman's speech. I quote him correctly. I took down his words and he stated that Congress had declined to pass this measure. My hon. friend will see upon reflection that that is not a correct statement of what happened.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What did happen?

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend say in view of my correction that he does not understand what happened?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I say in effect that Congress at the last session declined to pass this measure.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not talking about effect. The hon. gentleman's statement is that Congress declined to pass it. I say that the hon. gentleman knows that Congress did not decline to pass it. He knows that the House of Representatives by a substantial majority passed the Bill, he knows that, in regard to the case of the Senate, the Senate did not decline to pass it, he knows that by a system of filibustering, which may exist on that side of the line and which we have known in times past to exist here, what was understood to be the deliberate judgment of the Senate of the United States was frustrated by their not having a vote upon it at all, and if they had never voted upon it how did they decline to pass it? The readers of the American press, the readers of our Canadian papers which pay any attention to American affairs, know perfectly well that it was generally understood that there was a majority in the Senate in the United States who were ready to pass the Bill but by the filibustering methods of a few senators, some of whom have left the Senate of the United States never to return, a vote on the question was prevented.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). So they will in the future.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend should not be a prophet; it is not wise to prophesy, unless you know, and my friend's knowledge is no greater than that of the average of mankind. The matter does not rest there. I assure you the president of the United States has loyally kept his part of the bargain; we are asking the parliament of Canada to see that for the honour and good name of Canada, no matter what we may think of the details of this measure, this parliament will keep the engagement which in the name of the Canadian people we made with the government of the United States. What do we find? No sooner had it been determined that this filibustering movement at Washington was to be successful, no sooner had it been made apparent that the good intentions of the president of the United States were to be frustrated by that movement, then President Taft in his anxiety to keep faith with the Canadian government and people, called an extra session of Congress.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister referred to something being frustrated by some movement. Would he tell us what movement?

Mr. FIELDING. By the filibustering movement at Washington. I am not referring to the filibusters of this House; we may have to pay some attention to them later on. My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, has placed on 'Hansard,' the letter of Sir William Van Horne, a gentleman whom we highly respect, but I am not aware that his letter is of any more importance than the letters of many estimable gentlemen who have written on the other side. We can quote many letters written in cordial support of this agreement, but it does not strike me that the moment is appropriate for reading such letters. I think the president's proclamation has an important bearing on the question and I desire to put it on 'Hansard,' for convenience of future reference. No sooner had the president found that his efforts to keep faith with the Canadian government were prevented by filibustering than he took the extraordinary step of calling an extra session of Congress to deal with the agreement. Let us look at it from our own point of view; let us suppose that a question of importance had failed of success in this parliament, that parliament had been prorogued, and suppose the government of Canada should advise His Excellency to call a special session of parliament for the consideration of that question. I would say that in the taking of that step the government was proving its strong determination that that particular measure should receive their fair consideration and should engage the best attention of parliament and the country.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand that this special session is being called for the special purpose of dealing with this? Is it not a fact that the new Congress may deal with any question and refuse to deal with this question?

Mr. FIELDING. This Congress is to be called for the special purpose of dealing with this question; they may deal with other questions surely, a thousand.

Mr. AMES. And may they not leave this question entirely alone if they see fit?

Mr. FIELDING. They may leave it alone, Congress is a free body just as this parliament is, but as my hon. friend asked the special purpose for which this Congress was called, we will let the president speak for himself, let the document speak for itself:

THE PROCLAMATION.

The President's proclamation reads:

'Whereas, in a special message dated January 26, 1911, there was transmitted to the Senate and House of Representatives an agreement between the Department of State and the Canadian government in regard to reciprocal tariff legislation, together with an earnest recommendation that the necessary legislation be promptly adopted; and

'Whereas, a bill to carry into effect said agreement has passed the House of Representatives, but failed to reach a vote in the Senate; and

'Whereas, the agreement stipulates not only that the President of the United States will communicate to Congress the conclusions now reached and recommend the adoption of such legislation as may be necessary on the part of the United States to give effect to the proposed agreement, but also that the governments of the two countries will use their utmost efforts to bring about such changes by concurrent legislation at Washington and at Ottawa;

Now, therefore, I, William Howard Taft, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the power vested in me by the constitution, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the convening of both houses of the Congress of the United States at their respective chambers in the city of Washington on the fourth of April, 1911, at twelve o'clock noon, to the end that they may consider and determine whether the Congress shall by the necessary legislation make operative the agreement.

'All persons entitled to act as members of the sixty-second Congress are required to take notice of this proclamation.

'Given under my hand and the seal of the United States at Washington the fourth day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eleven, and of the independence of the United States, the one hundred and thirty-fifth.

WILLIAM H. TAFT.'

By the President.

P. C. KNOX,
Secretary of State.

I hope I have satisfied my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) that this Congress is called in special session to keep faith with the government of Canada in this important matter. A duty rests upon this government. A duty we believe rests on the parliament of Canada, so far as it is willing to give us its support; whether the members agree with this agreement or arrangement or not, there should be no division of opinion as to the obligation which we, as a young nation, have entered into with the great nation beside us. The president of the United States is loyally doing his part, it remains with us to loyally do ours. How? By throwing it overboard and saying we will have nothing more to do with it?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Yes, we have that right.

Mr. FIELDING. Shame on that suggestion. It finds no favour here. We desire that this matter shall be discussed, as I stated in the earlier stages of the debate, not hastily, not in a rush, not unduly; we desire that every member of this House shall have abundant opportunity to form and express his views, we desire that every member shall have abundant opportunity to give his free and untrammelled vote, but we say we should, day by day, not to the exclusion of all other business, but to the exclusion of things of less importance, keep this measure before us, and prove to the people of the United States that we are going to keep faith and to fulfil the contract we made with them. We believe, Sir, that that is the only true policy to adopt. Somebody must move first. It is childish to say that one side must wait for the other to move; if that policy were adopted we could do nothing. If the United States Congress had debated that matter and voted against it, if the Senate of the United States, after what had occurred in the House of Representatives, had declared it would not pass this measure, if there were good reasons to believe that the United States Congress were refusing to implement the president's engagement, that would be the time for us to consider what next. That time has not arisen. The president has tried his best to have it passed in the Congress that has just transpired; he means to do the same in the Congress that is to meet very shortly. We say, let us put this measure on our statute-book, and then, if within a reasonable time the United States Congress fail to do their part, we shall be free to consider what next. In the meantime, I say that the honour of the Dominion government and through the Dominion government the honour of the country, is pledged to this arrangement with the United States. While I quarrel with no man for differing from us on the merits of the agreement, I say there is no room for difference as to our condemnation of the motion which the hon. leader of the opposition has placed in your hands.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). There is nothing, Sir, in the argument which has been addressed to the House by the hon. Minister of Finance that calls for a reply from this side of the House. If there was needed any single indication of the position in which Canada was placed when my hon. friend and his colleague went to Washington and made this compact—if there was anything needed to show why these two men should not have gone, or more particularly why the present Minister of Finance should not have gone, it was amply supplied in the remarks he has just made. I can hardly trust myself to characterize my impressions and my feelings at the effort which has been made by the Minister of Finance. After the argument which was put up by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, short, pertinent, and especially strong, we naturally looked for the Finance Minister to make some rebuttal of that argument—to at least attempt to answer it; but I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this House and to the country, if the hon. gentleman made any attempt to answer a single one of the strong positions taken by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. Instead of attempting to argue upon the merits of the case, he has made three or four genera. assertions, and I would not have been on my feet at this moment if it had not been for the bad doctrine, the inadmissible doctrine, which my hon. friend has put forth. What are those assertions, in brief? In the first place, the general assertion was made, and not qualified, that it is quite sufficient on every occasion to give time for the discussion of a measure in parliament, and that if that is done the people have no right to complain that the matter has not been submitted to them for their approval. What does that mean, Sir? It means that once a parliament has been elected the people count for nothing. It means that mandates are not necessary. It means that two men in a government can bind the country by their sign-manuals, that they can deliver the goods, and that, provided you give parliament a reasonable length of time to discuss their proposal, the people have no concern in the matter at all, and ought not to be applied to. You only need to state that doctrine to see how untenable it is. Is my hon. friend afraid of the people? He was very brave in declaring that they were going to make every man on this side of the House poll his vote. Every man on this side is willing and ready to poll his vote; but, different from my hon. friends opposite, every man on this side is willing

that the people shall poll their vote too. The hon. leader of the opposition has put it up to my right hon. friend to go to the people as the final court of appeal, and let the votes be polled where the people are free, and not bound, as representatives of the people often are in the House of Commons. Now, that is the position which is democratic; that is the position which will appeal to the country, and again I state, and will state it to the end of this debate, instead of two men binding the country to a reversal of the policy of this country for 30 years, let the people say whether they wish to have that policy changed or not. It is arbitrary, it is tyrannical, it is the very opposite of responsible and free government, to take the position which my hon. friend has taken to-day.

The Finance Minister also said that the hon. leader of the opposition and other gentlemen on this side of the House knew that the country was against them. Well, Sir, whether the country be against us or not, we take the fair position that we are willing to submit the matter to the country to see what their real views are. In that we differ from hon. gentlemen opposite, who are not willing to submit it to the country, who fear of all things an appeal to the country on this matter at this moment. What folly it is to say that because 200 members of parliament, for ten days, twenty days, two months, three months, debate a matter in parliament, that gives the people sufficient knowledge, and that is sufficient to preclude your going to the people. Suppose that does give the people sufficient knowledge, suppose that the object of a two months' debate here is to give the people knowledge, why are you giving the people knowledge if not to know what the people think about it? And how are you to know what the people think about it if you do not submit the matter to the people and get their vote upon it? So that the very doctrine implied in the argument of the Finance Minister, that we should give leisurely time for the information to filter through the country, involves as a necessary consequence the conclusion that the reason for giving the information is that the people may know how to cast their ballots when they go to the polls to decide this question for themselves.

The Minister of Finance had so little thought of the dignity of his position and of what ought to weigh with him and other men on a question like this that he endeavoured to array the 'knights' against the 'horny handed sons of toil.' If that is the issue, says my hon. friend, if it is Sir Van Horne against the man with the smock frock and the cap on his head; if it is these 'estimable Sirs' against the horny handed sons of toil, we welcome the issue. Well, it is only necessary to state this position to stigmatize it for what it is worth. It is worth absolutely nothing; it is worth less than nothing. It is a bad doctrine, one which no people like the people of Canada will stand. For how long has my hon. friend had such a deep contempt for 'estimable Sirs'? He has eaten at their boards, he has sat beside them at their council table, he has even ridden with them on the public highway. But to-day he has found out that these 'Sirs' have no standing when compared with the horny handed sons of toil. I doubt if there is a man in this House, or a man in this country, who has put more hard work into a lifetime than Sir William Van Horne himself; and it does not remove him from the category of industrious and honourable citizens that her late Majesty saw fit to recognize his great services by conferring a title upon him. This appeal of the minister is to be characterized simply as an unworthy appeal.

Now, the minister lays down this doctrine: can we for a single moment adhere to it? Here we have this agreement: it is not for us to ask whether there was a mandate for the agreement, or even whether the agreement is a good one; it is not for us to ask whether it twists the destinies and fortunes of this country in the wrong way or not; all we have to look at is, was there an agreement between the government and Mr. Taft?—if there was we are not to look at the agreement, we are simply to be loyal to the gentlemen who have signed with the President of the United States. Why, then, are we discussing this matter at all? What was the necessity of having a single hour's discussion upon the merits of it? According to the Minister of Finance, the only question at issue is this: Shall we loyally carry out what two men promised Mr. Taft we would carry out?—it is this and this alone that parliament has to think about and vote upon. I deny this wholly, for my part; I deny it for gentlemen on this side of the House; and I think I can deny it for every man of common sense in the country. The question really is: By what right did these gentlemen make that agreement?—who authorized them to sign an agreement with Mr. Knox and Mr. Taft pledging the two countries to carry out this trade arrangement? These two gentlemen purported to sign something for the good of their country; but it was to be determined by this parliament in a constitutional way. Now, the minister tells us that it does not matter at all as to the agreement at issue; the only point is that the faith of the Dominion of Canada, is pledged. Who pledged it? And what mandate had they to pledge it? I thought we were discussing this agreement as to whether it was beneficial to the country or not. But now we are told—and the gov-

ernment evidently stand behind the Finance Minister—that the thing we are discussing, the thing we are asked to decide, is as to whether we shall keep faith with Mr. Taft or not. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) did not do justice to himself when he quibbled on the point as to whether the Congress has passed this agreement or not. Has Congress passed it?—that is the only question. Before which Congress was this agreement? Before the 61st Congress, 3rd session. Did that Congress pass it or not? Is this session of Congress now in existence? The next Congress that comes into existence, will not be the 61st Congress. The 61st Congress is functus offico and can do no more legislative work. It is dead, and it has not passed the agreement. Therefore, just exactly as my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) said, the Congress has declined to pass it.

Now, my hon. friend talks about filibustering tactics. As it happened, the matter got before the Senate of the United States in the late hours of the session, when there was a congestion of business, and the Senate declined to take this up in preference to other measures which had been sent it by the House of Representatives. Not ten minutes was spent in the Senate in the discussion of, or attempt to get a discussion of this question. Senator Gore attempted to get in an amendment when the Tariff Commission Bill was being passed through, but he was ruled out of order by the Speaker. The few minutes consumed by Senator Gore in trying to get his amendment before the Senate and the ruling of it out of order is all the time given by the Senate to this subject. So it was not talked out or filibustered out. But it makes no difference; the 61st Congress did not pass it, and the 61st Congress is dead. Now, Sir, there is just this difference.

If the Governor General of Canada had pledged himself to Mr. Taft, or anybody else, to call a session of this parliament and bring the measure before this parliament and do his utmost to have it passed, such a pledge would have some force in it. But Mr. Taft has no more power over the 62nd Congress than has any official in the administration of the United States. Their system of government is absolutely different from ours. Consequently, no pledge which President Taft can give need necessarily be implemented by the Congress of the United States. The next Congress will be one outside of the Republican party, to which the President of the United States belongs. It will take its own course and do such work as it pleases entirely regardless of any pledge President Taft may have given. Of what effect or force, therefore, has the proclamation of President Taft as read by my hon. friend the Finance Minister? My purpose in rising was to protest against what I consider to be two bad points of doctrine. One, that the people need not be consulted provided you give parliament a certain length of time to discuss the question; and the other, that because two or three members of the government, without a mandate from the people, choose to commit themselves to an arrangement with another country, this country is bound in loyalty and good faith to carry that out. It is for this parliament to go down into the essence of the question itself, and if the thing itself is not good for this country to decline to pass it and throw the responsibility on the gentlemen who made the agreement without a mandate.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). The question submitted to the House involves a great organic change in the constitution of this country. It involves the idea that hereafter the tariffs of Canada are to be made in secret negotiations with other countries. That is a change of the most momentous kind. It is an organic change so sweeping in its character that the people of Canada ought to be consulted before it is made. There is a proverb which says that he who gives quickly gives twice, but there is also a proverb which says that those who act hastily rush in where angels fear to tread. Now, there is no reason under the sun why this matter should be rushed through. If this is a democratic country and the people ought to rule, should we not consult the people before we enact such an organic change in our constitution? I am ready to trust the people of Canada, but I am not ready to trust the three tailors of Tooley street, who say that what they propose is what the people of England want. There sits the master tailor and his two apprentices on either side. No harm can be done by the fullest deliberation of this matter, but a great deal may be done by rushing it through. In fact, the future of our country is at stake. If this measure be a good thing it will stand all the deliberation we can give it. We can go to the country on the question this coming fall if we wish. The people would be quite willing that a redistribution measure should be introduced and a proper representation given to the west and the cities of this country. We hear about the insolence of the cities and manufacturing towns in criticising this policy, but take Toronto and the suburban riding I represent; what have we there? We have a population of 400,000. With what representation? With six members only, or one member for each 60,000. The same in Montreal, the same in Vancouver, Winnipeg and the other cities of this Dominion. Yet the people who live in these cities are stigmatised as not being the equal of those who live in the rural parts. Let us have a proper redistribution Bill; let us give repre-

sentation by population; then let us go to the country, and let every man's vote be as good as every other man's. What we want is deliberation. We do not want to be rushed into an agreement that involves the very future of the country and our alliance with the mother land. What are we asked to do? We have had a National Policy in this country during a great many years, and that policy succeeded so well that two of the leading provinces have adopted it from a provincial point of view. The provinces of Quebec and Ontario have adopted the National Policy with regard to the pulp-wood and paper making industry, and have declared for a policy of their own to encourage that industry within their own respective provinces. And that policy has been successful.

What has happened on this occasion? Two men in the government of this country go to Washington and sign a secret treaty which puts a big stick in the hands of President Taft with which to club two of our provinces into making concessions to the United States. Is that patriotic? Is that a precedent to establish hastily? The President of the United States is given a club by two representatives of the government of Canada with which to coerce our provinces into any policy he may see fit to impose on them. Surely in a matter of that kind the fullest deliberation ought to be given. The people of Canada do not want to be rushed into this bargain. They wish to be heard before it is completed, and they wish to have full time to discuss it. They wish to have it discussed in the schoolhouses of the back concessions and townships. That is their right, but we are taking from them the right of public meeting and discussion. I say that we should have public meetings all over this country for the discussion of this measure before we decide to adopt it. And I pledge myself to do what I can to keep this question in this House until the people of Canada have had the opportunity of discussing it from one end of the country to the other. British Columbia wishes to discuss it in detail; so does Nova Scotia. I met some men from Nova Scotia interested in the fishing industry, who told me that after considering this thing a second time they thought it was wrong. But they are to be denied the privilege of sober second thought, according to the speech of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and we are simply to be rushed into this thing because two or three members of the government made an improvident deal with the President of the United States. The honour of the country, I say again, is not involved, but the discretion and the wisdom of those who made this bargain are in question. They talk about keeping their word with the United States, and about a breach of honour. But what about their disregard of the rights of parliament to fully discuss this matter and pass its opinion on any tariff Bill introduced into this House? One of the serious objections to a measure of this kind is that not even parliament can alter it. The people are to have no say about it, parliament is to have no say about it, even the followers of the government are to have no say about it, and the consequence is that Liberals all over the country object to going into a proposition on which they cannot be heard.

A while ago I was discussing a question in this House which involved the idea of responsible government. I believe it is the right of a government to assume responsibility upon matters which they introduce into this parliament. They may have to do it in matters of war; they may have to do it in matters of policy; but when a great organic change is proposed, when the relations of this country to the mother land are involved, then I say time must be taken, the people must be consulted, and an opportunity must be given them to pass upon it. To-day they are to be denied the privilege of passing upon this question, and they are asked to rush it through. Why this haste? Cannot President Taft deliver the goods he has signed to deliver? He is an important man. I had occasion to say the other day that he is the only man in diplomacy to-day whose name and whose signature is not worth the paper on which it is written, because he cannot deliver the goods. All he says is, I will undertake to do it, I will submit it to Congress. But Canada is bound to pass it through, according to hon. gentlemen opposite. All Mr. Taft undertakes to do is to submit it to Congress, but we are asked to put it through parliament. He has delivered the goods when he has submitted them to Congress, but according to the Minister of Finance, we have not finished our part of the contract until we have put it on the statute-book. President Taft has less power in the new Congress than he had in the old one. The new Democratic Congress is committed to reduce the tariff all round, and they will do it. If we had only waited until the Democrats had had an opportunity of reducing the tariff, there would have been no need of this upset in our public affairs. Let the Democrats reduce the tariff as far as they like, and after they have gone as far as they wish, we may get far more than we are getting under the present proposals. In fact, if hon. gentlemen want to get wider markets from the United States let them withdraw now and put the responsibility on the Democratic party.

Mr. KNOWLES. Does the hon. gentleman want more? I understand that he is displeased at getting so much.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Let the Americans make their tariff and we will make ours, and what we want we will get. Let them reduce the tariff as much as they like, but for God's sake let them mind their own business, and we will mind ours. Now the Minister of Finance talked about filibustering in the United States Senate. That has always prevailed in the United States Senate; and shall we make the greatest interests of Canada, the control of our tariff and the maintenance of our connection with the mother land, subject to filibustering in the United States Senate? That is the doctrine that is preached here to-day. That is not Canadianism, that is not the British idea of constitutional government. Surely there never was in the United States the slightest approach to national magnanimity. Look at the proclamation that was signed and read by the minister to-day. 'Signed and sealed in this 135th year of American independence.' Is the political salvation of the world dependent upon the United States in that way? As I said the other day, the hope of the world and of its progress lies in the British constitutional system and in our own methods, and we ought to strive ever to come within the filibustering methods that prevail in the United States.

Now is this proposal the government has submitted to us, the logical outcome of our history for the past 25 or 30 years? Is it on the line of that National Policy which has obtained in this country, of which we are all so proud, and to which both parties and all the people have now subscribed? This proposal is an absolute contradiction of that policy. It has been brought into this House under a secret agreement. It is not a natural and logical consequence of what has taken place in the past, but it is a proposal surreptitious in its origin, and it is a straight contradiction of the policy that we have been hitherto pursuing. Now there is something happening to-day that ought to make all Canadians pause. The record of the United States in regard to national magnanimity is not anything to be proud of. At this very moment the whole of America is disturbed by the report that the United States government is massing 20,000 troops on the Mexican border. Some day when Canada does not do as she is bid in regard to our tariff, will there be a massing of 20,000 American troops on the Canadian border? The Canadian people do not like that idea. Let them go back, let them decline to have further tariff negotiations with the United States. After vested interests have been created, as Sir William Van Horne has said, would it not be a likely thing for the United States government to mass troops on our border if we chose to assert our tariff independence? I say this thing ought to be considered with the greatest deliberation, it ought to be taken to the people, it ought to be taken to the farmers of the west, it ought to be taken to the manufacturers, it ought to be taken to the men who work in factories, it ought to be taken to all our people. In all fairness, I suggest to the Prime Minister that, inasmuch as the late Congress failed to pass this agreement although the president did his best, we should take time, we should avail ourselves of the constitutional practice of declining to go any further with this proposal before it is submitted to the people of Canada. Let every man who is interested have an opportunity to discuss it with his neighbour, then public opinion will be elicited, and we can come back in a new parliament, which can assemble here before Christmas if necessary. We can sit here and deal with public business until May. The government can send their representatives to England if they wish; they can come back here in July, and readjust the representation according to the new census, the voice of the people of Canada can be taken on this question by September, and parliament can be called in session in December, when the whole thing can be threshed out according as the people have expressed their views. Then parliament will have a mandate on this great question, which it does not have to-day. Surely this proposal is in line with our constitution, it is in line with our rights, and especially is that the right course to take, when a great organic change is proposed like this. I read in one of the great Republican papers of the United States, the Chicago 'Tribune,' of yesterday, something that will interest the House. It seems that the 'Saturday Review,' published in London, had the misfortune to criticise these proposals, and because the 'Saturday Review' had the temerity to do so, the people of the United States are asked by the Chicago 'Tribune' to 'look at this enemy of the United States.' The 'Saturday Review,' a British newspaper, is called the enemy of the United States because it objects to these proposals, and notwithstanding the fact that the 'Saturday Review' is a very friendly paper to Canada. That sums up the attitude of the American people. They have no regard for other people's ideas, they have only regard for themselves and they believe themselves to be the greatest people on the face of the earth. If we undertake to deal, in relation to the tariff with people of that class of mind, who do not respect the rights of others, we will at all times be subject to their idiosyncrasies. Let us keep the making of the Canadian tariff actually in the hands of the Canadian

people. If you propose to take the right to make our tariff away from the people first let us have the judgment of the people upon the question. I intend to vote for this motion and I intend to ask the people to support us in declining to allow these proposals to go through this House until the people can be consulted in a general election and until after a proper redistribution has been effected.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, I would not have ventured to occupy the time of the House at this stage of the session had it not been for one observation made by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), when he lately addressed the House. I differ from my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who expressed his surprise that the Minister of Finance had no argument to advance in answer to the admirable speech made by my hon. friend the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I differ from my hon. friend from North Toronto in that respect; I did not expect any argument to be advanced by the Minister of Finance in answer to those supporting the motion when he would dare to come before parliament with the most important piece of legislation that has been presented in years, and not even pretend to advance any argument in its support except to offer the suppositious history of the negotiations touching reciprocity. This tragedy of errors, I think I am justified in calling it, has become more and more complete, and perhaps the most remarkable feature of the minister's answer was that, in pointing out why the motion should not be adopted, he was very careful to throw away from himself the belted knight and to declare to this House, and the country that he represented the toiling masses. I wrote down his exact words, and so I am prepared to pledge my faith that he said that in introducing and supporting this agreement he was doing so in the interest of the toiling masses. I suppose that it is perfectly reasonable to say that when the Minister of Finance spoke of toiling masses he was speaking intelligently having reference to a certain definite class of people in his mind, or else he was talking unpardonable twaddle. I do him the justice to believe that he thought he was speaking of them in the former way. Who would the toiling masses be in the Dominion of Canada for whom he presumes to speak? Who would they be down in his own province of Nova Scotia? I suppose it would be fair to assume that the men who are toiling in the coal mines of Nova Scotia would be included among the toiling masses, and he stands here to show his love and devotion to them by reducing the duty on coal eight cents a ton in the interest of that portion of the toiling masses who work in the mines of Nova Scotia. That is the way that he represents that section of the toiling masses. He will find in his own province men toiling in the iron industry. While the iron industry is perhaps not very much affected, yet rods are put on the free list and whatever protection there is in that item for the iron industry, and, therefore, in the interest of this portion of the toiling masses who are engaged in the iron industry, is taken away. If there is anything in this treaty, this pact, for the farmers of Nova Scotia it must be because they will get more for their products hereafter than they have been able to get heretofore. I do not say that will be the result, but if there is anything in it, it must be that, and so the hon. gentleman stands up here and assumes to speak on behalf of the toiling masses who are to be benefited by decreased wages, and an increased cost of living. Then, we come westward to New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario, dotted with manufacturing towns and cities, and I presume that any man who understands the English language will admit that the men who are working in our factories are a portion of the toiling masses. I cannot imagine what justification the Minister of Finance has for standing up here before this intelligent House, and saying that this pact is introduced in the interest of that portion of the toiling masses that we find in the workshops and factories of Ontario. Has there been anything coming over the ground from the various workshops and factories? Is it possible that he reads the papers? Has he received any communications, is he not aware, as I believe he must be aware, that the practical men who are working in the workshops and factories of Ontario are opposed to this pact? Then we go to the west; we go to the prairie farmers—the grain growers, perhaps I should say. I cannot believe that, as a matter of accurate description, he would be justified in calling the men who are becoming rich—as we are all glad to see by growing grain in the Northwest, the toiling masses. I am afraid that the farmers of my own province of Ontario, who are an industrious, prosperous and contented people, would be offended by being described as a portion of the toiling masses. In the far distant province of British Columbia again we have our mines, and we have a portion of the toiling masses at work in them. If my description be true—if not I hope to be corrected—I would like to ask what possible justification the Minister of Finance could have for saying that, in introducing this pact to this House, and in opposing the suspension of a consideration of it, he was standing up for and supporting the interests of the toiling masses of this country. If the hon. gentleman had not the faintest idea whom he represented

as he has not, if the hon. gentleman who made the bargain has not the faintest idea what his bargain is, I ask, is it not a reasonable proposition that other people who have not had the same opportunity that he has had should have an opportunity of studying so wide-reaching and far-spreading an agreement as this? When I say that the hon. gentleman does not understand his own bargain I justify that statement by his own speech in which he introduced the bargain to the House. After the Minister of Finance had used up column after column of 'Hansard' with an historical retrospect, very interesting, but unhappily inaccurate, he, in a half dozen lines at the end of his speech, referred in a rather contemptuous way to a few old musty, almost forgotten treaties which Great Britain had made, and which would allow a few countries other than the United States to enjoy the advantages of this pact. Ought not any man, as honest as I am sure the Minister of Finance is, as appreciative of his responsibilities to this House as I am sure he is, as regardful of his reputation in the country as he must be, in introducing any important piece of legislation of this kind involving an agreement between Canada and the United States which also brought in twelve other countries at a cost to them of not one penny, and to whom we open our doors, to have called the attention of the members of this House to that fact, that it might honestly and intelligently consider the question, especially in view of the circumstance that by reason of this pact, whatever we might receive from the United States, we could by no possibility receive anything from these other countries to whom our doors are thrown open. I feel that I am all the more justified in assuming that the Minister of Finance was acting honestly, but under a misunderstanding of his own bargain from what the right hon. gentleman said only yesterday when he pointed out, that, even if the Argentine Republic had the advantage of the Canadian market, and could send her wheat into Canada, Canada on the same principle could send her wheat into the Argentine Republic, and that was an ample and a perfectly satisfactory explanation in the mind of the hon. gentleman.

When I hear such statements I feel justified in saying that no wiser motion could be made than that the consideration of this important measure should be postponed for at least a time in order that the Finance Minister might learn that in the Argentine Republic labourers are content with about 45 cents a day, and until we are ready in Canada, as the government has declared it is ready, to reduce the wages of the men employed on our farms to 45 cents a day, we cannot compete with the Argentine Republic. And even when we have reduced our wages to a point where we can compete, we are met with a duty when our wheat reaches the Argentine, which their wheat does not when it reaches Canada. So under no possible combination of circumstances can we deal in wheat with the Argentine Republic. The Minister of Finance pointed out that President Taft had agreed to recommend this pact to Congress ,that Congress had died without discussing it and he had recommended it to a second Congress and he said that therefore we were in honour bound to keep on with the consideration of the case. Does it not strike him, if his argument is sound and his logic worth listening to, that if our American friends discuss this and do not actually kick it out of doors, if the Democratic party choose to go on with its own measures without refusing to consider this, we are bound to stay here until Doomsday to keep our faith or else must pass this enactment without having the faintest idea of what they intend to do. Would not one think that when such an opportunity was offered to the government of reasonably postponing the decision of the question, they would have discovered that no other party in the world but the present government would have made such a bargain as this with a high tariff party, already defeated when their successful opponents were elected, pledged to a low tariff. When they had once made the mistake of having a bargain with the high tariff party instead of with the low, if the interests of the country appealed to them, they would be only too glad now, the President having done his part and failed, to carry out all he agreed to do—for all he agreed to do was to submit the matter to Congress and recommend its adoption—the President having failed in what was expected on his side, one would expect that the government would have taken advantage of these facts and if they were bound to make a bargain would have made it with those who would be a thousand times more willing to make a bargain than the Taft administration were before the present Congress came into power. That would seem self-evident and if the government had been acting in the interests of the country instead of from some motive I cannot explain, they would have adopted the course I have suggested.

I do not pretend to say why they have acted as they have done but it is common report from one end of Canada to the other that the only reason the pact was made was in order to divert the attention of the people of Canada and particularly of the right hon. gentleman's own province of Quebec, from the unhappy naval policy to which this country is pledged. I cannot vouch for that but from end to end of

the country it is said that this is another price we are paying for our Canadian navy. Knowing the feeling of the people of Quebec and other provinces against this extraordinary expenditure of $22,000,000 on the army and navy, the government wished to draw a herring across the scent and so sent ambassadors to the United States to make a bargain. By doing so, they have attracted a good deal of attention for a little while, the people have forgotten the navy, although when an election comes on they will remember it again; but would it not be worth while for the government to abandon for a while their personal interests and consider the interests of the country and if they are bound to make a bargain make it with the party pledged by Champ Clarke, in the House of Representatives, to reduce the duties on the necessities of life as soon as they came into power to the vanishing point or remove them altogether. If they removed the American duties on the necessaries of life we would have all we have got to-day and more. The Canadian farmer would have better access to the American market under what Champ Clark promised to the House of Representatives under this agreement. Strange to say there are gentlemen sitting behind the government who, after carefully avoiding listening to the debates, up to ten minutes ago actually had not the faintest conception of what the objection of Canadians to this agreement is. The hon. gentlemen seem to think that as long as Canadians get access into the American market they should be satisfied. No one on this side of the House is objecting to any admission of Canada to the American market. The Americans have control of their tariff and can remove the duty on everything tomorrow and we would have no reason to object but surely even some of the hon. gentlemen opposite should be able to understand the difference between getting access to the American market and the Americans and 12 other nations getting access to the Canadian market. I apprehend that before the country has finished discussing this question, many hon. gentlemen opposite will find that the constituents who sent them here perfectly understand the difference between getting admission to the American market which the leader of the winning party in the United States says they are obliged to give us anyway, and giving the Americans and 12 other countries, for nothing, admission to our markets. If hon. gentlemen could only for once take their eyes off the foreign country and fasten them on their own they would see that the interests of Canada are as they have been admitted to be by this and preceding governments, to keep the Canadian markets for the Canadian people.

Although I do not pretend to stand here on behalf of the toiling masses, I do represent an agricultural constituency and therefore, I am prepared to support the motion made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) because I stand here to protest, as the representative of an agricultural constituency, against the compact made in 1878 and renewed in 1897 being violated by the hon. gentlemen opposite; I stand here to protest against the bargain by which the province of the Minister of Finance gets a duty on coal and iron which is of no benefit to my province of Ontario and by which Ontario is given a duty on her breadstuffs being violated, it being understood that the duty on breadstuffs was a sort of bargain, Nova Scotia being given one thing and Ontario another. I warn the Finance Minister that if he is as regardless of his own province as he apparently is of the Dominion as a whole, the farmers whom he has selected as the particular objects of his animosity, who, of all people, are to be deprived of protection, whose markets are to be given not to the United States but to the world, I warn that hon. gentleman that if he really is true to his newly found and oft-professed although rarely acted-up-to belief in the doctrine of protection, the day is not far distant when the farmers of Ontario will say: We only bear the duty on coal and iron in consideration of a duty on our products and since that was the direct bargain made in 1878 and renewed since, as you have broken the bargain, and removed our duties, we will insist that the duty on coal and iron be removed in order that justice may be done. I, as a protectionist, would be exceedingly sorry to see a movement of that kind on the part of the agricultural element of this country. I think perhaps the most dangerous feature in this measure is the unhappy setting of one class against another, for nobody can possibly argue, even the Finance Minister, and the Prime Minister know it is impossible to argue this agreement on any platform without denouncing the manufacturers and appealing to the farmers. If it is to the interests of this country to set class against class, let us proceed with this discussion, but if not, let us know that the true basis of our national prosperity is a protective policy, then let all classes enjoy it, or as the farmers say, either all shall have it or none, and I am sure there is no man in Canada so rampant a free trader, except possibly the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), as to believe that it is the true interests of Canada that all protection should be removed from all industries.

One other word. It seems to me that the Minister of Finance threw out a hint that while he intended to give ample op-

portunity for every member to discuss the question, the House was not to sit here indefinitely. I take his hint to be that if necessary a closure would be applied in order to secure a vote on this important question. I sincerely hope that I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. I am not going to ask him whether I understood him rightly or wrongly. If I understood him rightly, I would be sorry to have him repeat the statement and be bound by it. But in the discussion of a question like this, on which the people of this country are more excited than on any other, because there has perhaps been a time when their pockets have been so immediately touched, whether we are right or wrong, if the discussion were to be shut off by the application of a closure, I am inclined to think that we would come nearer to a rebellion in Canada than we have been for many a day. It is bad enough to have the rights of this House taken away; it is bad enough to have two gentlemen go to Washington and sign a treaty which binds every man in this House, which for the first time in Canada compels us to vote for items whether we like them or not——

Sime hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TALBOT. How is the hon. gentleman going to vote against it if he is compelled to vote for it?

Mr. NORTHRUP. If I were able to vote for such a measure as this, I would not think it necessary to call attention to myself in public. I would retire to the remotest privacy, and would hope that I would not be discovered. I was appealing to those who have to accept this measure as a whole or oppose it as a whole. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite can see if they lay aside party feelings and apply their common sense to the question, that it is a monstrous thing to be placed in this position, when deliberating in the interests of the country, for each man here, though elected by a single constituency, represents the whole electorate of Canada. Therefore it seems extraordinary that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, who represent British Columbia, are obliged to vote to kill one of the greatest industries of that province, or else refuse to accept the bargain as a whole. If this House undertakes to amend a single clause in the agreement, the whole thing has to go back to the United States again for their ratification. The right hon. the Prime Minister represents the fruit growers of British Columbia as much as the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo, and the Minister of Finance represents the milling interest just as much as any man from Manitoba; and they must either vote to kill the industry which is interested, or to take back this agreement as a whole. I, therefore, hope that the government will see that there are advantages, and very great advantages, in withdrawing the measure for a time, as it is quite possible that the American Congress may not agree to it all. If this House should pass this measure, in the opinion of many of the best financiers in this country—and surely they are more competent to judge of a question of finance than even the toiling masses whom the minister so much respects—the very passing of it by this House would have an injurious effect on the country. This measure affects the banks, the transportation companies, the investment of capital from the mother land and even capital from the United States, which has been coming here so rapidly of late; and if it is true that the mere passing of the measure by this House, irrespective of carrying it out, is liable to cause tremendous injury to Canada, why not let it stand until we see whether the American Congress will pass it? If they fail to pass it, we shall have done no harm; and if they pass it, the right hon. the Prime Minister will still have an opportunity to have it dealt with by this House. It must be borne in mind that the Democrats have a majority in the House of Representatives, and that while the Republicans have a majority in the Senate, it is a very uncertain one, being only eight or nine, including the insurgents; so that it is by no means certain that this measure will pass the Congress of the United States. It cannot be too well remembered also that their system of government is very different from ours. If the right hon. gentleman insists, this Bill must sooner or later pass this House, but it is not so in the United States. The President might use every means in his power to secure the passage of the Bill, and yet it is not certain that it will pass. For these reasons I appeal to the right hon. gentleman to let the measure stand at all events until the American Congress decides what it will do. If it should pass that body, I can quite understand that the right hon. gentleman might feel bound to endeavour to have it passed by this parliament. But in the meantime the country will have an opportunity to consider it; and if the measure is, as he seems to think, so transparently in the interest of this country, and the people express their approval of it, he will then be able to have it passed by parliament, supported by a majority of the people of this country, and all criticism from this side of the House will of necessity be closed.

Mr. DEVLIN. If action is delayed here, and the United States Congress passes the measure, will the hon. gentleman then favour the proposal before the House?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Most certainly not. I would not act so illogically, I hope.

Mr. H. GUTHRIE (South Wellington). Mr. Speaker, the question before the chair seems to be a simple one, and not one which

invites a general discussion of the main issue. Therefore I think we might limit ourselves to discussing the single question whether, in view of what has recently transpired in the Congress of the United States, it would be well for the parliament of Canada now to halt, or whether we should proceed. I believe the wording of the motion is that in view of the failure of the United States Congress to approve of the proposed trade agreement, the discussion of the matter in this House should be postponed, and the matter should be referred to the people. Now, we must all agree that the question is to-day fairly and squarely before the parliament of Canada. I think it came properly before us. It was the result of negotiations which took place between Canadian ministers and negotiators on behalf of the United States government.

It does come before us and is launched in the regular form, and we are discussing it, I assume, as a serious matter and one on which we expect to reach a definite conclusion one way or the other. Is it not more dignified to discuss this as a matter pertinent to Canada and Canadian interests, independent altogether of what in the meantime Congress may or may not do. The fact that the 61st Congress has not seen fit to deal with the matter ought not to influence this parliament. If this proposal be a good proposal for Canada, why halt in the discussion? If it be not a good proposal, then let us refuse to entertain it; but to my mind, no proper logical reason has been offered for postponing that discussion. The 62nd Congress will be just as powerful and potent as the 61st. Its session will probably last two, or three, or four months. True, it may deal with other questions besides the tariff. That is the privilege of a special Congress of the United States; but it has been convened for a single purpose, the trade arrangement with Canada, and it is very probable that that arrangement will be given precedence. We can, therefore, reasonably expect that the Congress about to be convened will pass upon that arrangement one way or the other within a very limited range of time. Then why should we halt or hesitate in dealing with it or discussing it? There has been no attempt on the part of this government to limit the discussion in any way. I have heard no threat of closure, and I think I am correct in saying that there is no rule of closure really applicable to the proceedings of this House. We can, I think, fairly say that it is the desire, not only of the government, but of all members on this side, to have this matter most fully threshed out before a vote is taken, and we are having a most full discussion of it, not only here, but throughout the country, and in the press of the country, so that all the people and their representatives, if they pay any attention to what is going on, will be fully aware of all the aspects of the proposed bargain now before parliament.

My hon. friends opposite, however, give as their reason for delay that they want to submit the question to the people before this House passes on it. Well, I am just as thorough a believer in the voice of the people as any hon. member of this House, and, perhaps, just as often as any other hon. member have I consulted my constituency with regard to matters which come up in this parliament, and I would have no hesitation in submitting this matter to my own constituents at any moment. I am satisfied that there is a very strong opinion, in that part of Ontario at least, in favour of this proposal. But is it proper or necessary that in so many of these questions the will of the people should be directly taken? I submit it is not. I cannot accept the doctrine that we are mere delegates of our constituents. I believe that we are here in a representative capacity to exercise our own judgment, after discussion and deliberation, and we are in a position to do this more fully and effectively than our constituents, and we are consequently in a better position in all probability to pass on this question. But if we are mere delegates to register the wishes of our constituents, there is no necessity for our being here at all. A letter would serve the purpose just as well as our presence. We are here, however, as representatives, and as such we have the right to deal with this matter if we see fit so to do. During my experience in this House I remember that when the Transcontinental railway question was up it was said that we should have had a mandate from the people. Again, when the new northwest provinces were being established, it was said that we should wait for a mandate from the people. And, lastly, when the naval proposals were before the House, we were equally told that we should have waited for a mandate from the people before submitting them to parliament. Why, if appeals to the people had been granted in all these cases, we would have had a succession of general elections and no time to discuss the business of the country. For these reasons I submit it is not necessary that on a question of this kind we should go back to the people for a mandate. Surely we have a mandate with regard to the regulation of trade, the raising of taxation, the arrangement of our fiscal policy. Surely the arrangement of our fiscal policy is one of the first reasons for sending us here at all. On this matter, therefore, if on no other, we have authority from the people to act as in our best judgment we feel warranted in doing. I think that is about all that can fairly be said on the motion before the Chair. Are we to postpone or go

ahead? I see every good reason for our going ahead with this discussion without curtailing it in any way, and I see no good reason for postponing it. It is said that when the 62nd Congress of the United States meets, in all probability we shall receive better terms from that country than under the proposed arrangement. Well, if I understand the arrangement, better terms will not affect it so far as Canada is concerned. The tariff may be lowered, the free list may be as much more extended as the United States Congress may see fit to enact, but so long as we get what we have agreed for the agreement will stand. In other words, there may be as much plus as possible, but no minus.

Mr. AMES. Does my hon. friend realize that by this arrangement we allow all parts of the British Empire and 12 of the most favoured nations in on the same terms? Whereas if the United States, of their own volition, give any of these privileges, we do not have to extend them to other countries.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I realize that situation quite well, but I really have so little regard for that favourite argument of my hon. friend that I pay absolutely no attention to it. I think that this objection has no weight. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup) talk of the Argentine Republic and the 45 cents per day labour in that country and ask how Canadians could compete against that labour. I do not know the rates of labour in the Argentine Republic, but I do know that the chief exports of that country are cattle and wheat, and that we are competing with them and beating them every day in the British market, and I do not expect to see the day when cattle or wheat from the Argentine Republic, or Bolivia, or Colombia, or the eight or ten other countries mentioned will ever come into Canada in serious competition with the products of this country.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Might I interrupt? What authority has the hon. gentleman for stating that Canadian cattle are beating the Argentine cattle every day in the British market? In stating this he is stating what is absolutely not the fact, and I would refer him to the hon. member for St. Lawrence division of Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike).

Mr. GUTHRIE. I can answer my hon. friend that the county of Wellington sends beef to the English market labelled Wellington beef, and it commands the highest prices in that market to-day. I have never discussed the question with my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), who is well up in the cattle business, but I do say that the general price of cattle, as between Canada and the Argentine, is regulated in Liverpool, or, at least, in Great Britain, where we are selling our cattle, day after day, in competition with the Argentine and with the world. I suppose that, in regard to the general grades of cattle, prices will be about equal. But my point is that this 45-cent-labour which my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) states will be ruinous to Canada has never been ruinous to us in the past.

Mr. NORTHRUP. We have always had a tariff.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Not in Great Britain—we have never had the benefit of a tariff there, and yet we compete in that market, and compete successfully. And, if we can compete in the market of Great Britain, three or four thousand miles away from Canada, surely we can compete right here at home where we save that long haul. I have more faith in the Canadian farmer, and the Canadian stockmen than to be afraid of the competition with which my hon. friend from East Hastings threatens us from the Argentine Republic. Now, to come back to the question immediately before the committee, and avoid discussion on the general issue, what is the dignified course for Canada at the present moment?—to cry 'Halt!' or to go ahead? We have launched on the consideration of this question, and not any action of the United States short of refusal should terminate these proceedings in this House. To take the other view, it seems to me, might be called accepting the dictation of the United States. I think our proper course is to go ahead—either to enact the arrangement or to refuse the arrangement; at all events, do not let our action be dominated to the extent suggested by possible action of the United States. If they give us what we think they will give us on this arrangement, well and good; if they do not, as I understand it, the arrangement falls to the ground. There need be no unsettling of trade, no uncertainty about the matter. If it should be that we approve this arrangement before Congress approves it, as my hon. friend from East Hastings well knows, it will not come into force until this government is assured that it has received the sanction of Congress. So, there need not be any uncertainty or any unsettling of trade about the matter. Why should we hesitate? It is possible, if not probable, judging by some statements we have seen in the newspapers, and even statements made in this House, that this discussion will be a long one. It may be that Congress will decide this matter on their side before the House decides it on this side. If I am to take serious meaning from the statements of the hon. member for East Hastings, we are almost face to face, in this country, with something like

rebellion. I do not like the idea of rebellion against the authority of the Crown coming from any member of this parliament of the standing of the hon. member for East Hastings. My solution of the matter would be a simple one. I think we should proceed. I have not the power my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has in regard to those members on the other side of the House. I cannot turn around on this side and declare that every man will stand up and support this agreement as he announced that hon. gentlemen on that side would vote against it. I have no doubt that the real idea of the hon. member for North Toronto and of his leader (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is to obtain what might be called a snap verdict in this matter without experience or full consideration; and what they most fear is that there will be a ratification of this arrangement between Canada and the United States, and that the arrangement may have one or two years to operate and bear fruit before there is a general election. And, while predictions do not count for much, I can at least give my prediction that, if an election comes on only after this agreement has been ratified, and has had a fair opportunity of working out as between these two countries, there will come back to this parliament after the next general election only the wreck of the Conservative party.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to correct my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) on a point of fact. If he questions it, I suppose we shall have to leave it to 'Hansard' to-morrow. I did not undertake, in my own right, to say how hon. gentlemen on this side would vote. What I did say is that every member on this side of the House would be ready to cast his vote——

Mr. BELAND. On the measure?

Mr. FOSTER. On the merits. We never cast our vote on anything but the merits.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Before I address myself directly to the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax), I think it would not be amiss if we had a word of discussion upon the assertion which has been made several times in this debate by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), and repeated, I think, by almost every one on that side who spoke after him to the effect that, in asking parliament to ratify this agreement, we are departing from true constitutional principles. It was stated that we had carried out a new idea, the idea that tariffs could be made in secret and brought before parliament to be ratified or rejected. If there were anything in this statement, you would have to come to the conclusion that this is the first time in any British parliament in which a treaty of commerce was ever presented for ratification. The treaty of commerce necessarily implies a change in the tariff of the country. Well, is it the first time that such a thing has happened? You have to-day twelve treaties, which have been spoken of in this House, and which are still in force. These at one time or other have been negotiated by Great Britain as this treaty was, and presented to parliament and accepted by parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the Prime Minister how many of them defined specific duties and contained tariffs?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. These treaties are tariff legislation as affecting relations with these countries, with which they are made. I will go further and call my hon. friend's attention to a treaty which was negotiated by Mr. Cobden, in 1863, between England and France, and which certainly affected the wine duties of England. It was negotiated just as this was, secretly—if you choose to call it so—and brought to the parliament of Great Britain and by that parliament ratified. We have even heard in this debate of the treaty of 1854, which was accepted unanimously by the parliament of Canada. Was this treaty negotiated by Lord Elgin and Mr. Hincks in any manner different from this arrangement which was made by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). The procedure was exactly the same. In the face of these historical facts, which are known to every schoolboy, it is idle to say that we are introducing any new departure in constitutional government. And I am reminded by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) of a case which applies, if possible, even more directly. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), when he was acting Prime Minister, was one of those who ratified a treaty which had been negotiated by Sir Charles Tupper, in secret—to use the words of hon. gentlemen opposite—with the French government.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask a question? There must be a limit somewhere——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. What I want to ask is this: If the right hon. gentleman claims that right in regard to the items of the tariff changed by this agreement, does he claim the right in this way to change the whole tariff? For instance, would he make a treaty in the same way, including manufatures as well as natural products?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All this is subject to parliamentary approval. And what we have done has been done again and again, and done by my hon. friend him-

self, although he has forgotten it in a moment when he is served by a treacherous memory. But he knows he did this very thing in 1893, which he now reproaches us for doing. But my hon. friend knows that they did this very thing in 1893 which he now reproaches us with doing. There was a treaty, not a secret arrangement, but an actual treaty negotiated in secret by Sir Charles Tupper with the French government, which was brought here and accepted by the whole Conservative party. So I say that it is childish to present such an argument at the present time in opposition to this agreement.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

House divided on amendment—(Mr. Borden, Halifax).

YEAS.

Messieurs

Ames,	Macdonell,
Arthurs,	Maclean (York, S.),
Barker,	McCall,
Barnard,	Maddin,
Beattie,	Marshall,
Best,	Meighen,
Blain,	Middlebro,
Blondin,	Monk,
Borden (Halifax),	Nantel,
Boyce,	Northrup,
Bradbury,	Owen,
Broder,	Paquet,
Burrell,	Perley,
Campbell,	Porter,
Crocket,	Price,
Crothers,	Reid (Grenville),
Currie (Simcoe),	Roche,
Daniel,	Russell,
Donnelly,	Schaffner,
Edwards,	Sexsmith,
Elson,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Foster,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Gilbert,	Sifton,
Goodeve,	Stanfield,
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Staples,
Harris,	Stewart,
Henderson,	Taylor (Leeds),
Herron,	Taylor (New Westminster),
Hughes,	Thoburn,
Jameson,	Thornton,
Kidd,	White (Renfrew),
Lake,	Wilcox,
Lalor,	Wilson Lennox & Addington) and
Lancaster,	Wright.—70.
Lennox,	
Lortie,	

NAYS.

Messieurs

Allard,	McColl,
Allen,	McCraney,
Aylesworth (Sir Allen)	McIntyre,
Beauparlant,	McKenzie,
Béland,	McLean (Huron),
Black,	McLean (Sunbury),
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Major,
Boyer,	Marcile (Bagot),
Brown,	Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Bureau,	Martin (Regina),
Carrier,	Martin (Wellington),
Carvell,	Mayrand,
Cash,	Meigs,
Champagne,	Michaud,
Chisholm (Antigonish)	Miller,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Molloy,
Clark (Red Deer),	Murphy,
Clarke Essex),	Nesbitt,
Congdon,	Neely,
Conmee,	Oliver,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Papineau,
Demers,	Parent,
Devlin,	Paterson,
Douglas,	Pickup,
Dubeau,	Proulx,
Ecrément,	Prowse,
Fielding,	Pugsley,
Fisher,	Rankin,
Fortier,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fowke,	Richards,
Gauvreau,	Rivet,
Geoffrion,	Robb,
Girard,	Ross (Middlesex),
Gladu,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gordon (Kent),	Roy (Montmagny),
Graham,	Rutan,
Harty,	Savoie,
Hodgins,	Schell,
Hunt,	Sealey,
King,	Seguin,
Knowles,	Smith (Middlesex),
Kyte,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Lachance,	Smith (Stormont),
Lafortune,	Sperry,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Talbot,
Lapointe,	Tobin,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Todd,
Law,	Tolmie,
LeBlanc,	Turcotte (Quebec County),
Lemieux,	Turgeon,
Loggie,	Turriff,
Lovell,	Verville,
Macdonald,	Warburton,
MacNutt,	White (Victoria, Alta.) and
McAllister,	Wilson (Laval).—111.
McCoig,	

PAIRS.

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Brodeur,	Haggart (Lanark),
Templeman,	Magrath,
Emmerson,	Fraser,
Pardee,	Smyth,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Low,	Wallace,
McGiverin,	Osler,
Guthrie,	McCarthy,
Bickerdike,	Rhodes,
Sinclair,	Crosby,
Chew,	Chisholm (Huron),
Roy (Dorchester),	Lewis,
McMillan,	Bristol,
Turcotte (Nicolet),	Clare,
Ethier,	Armstrong,
Delisle,	Cowan,
Gervais,	Doherty,
Lanctot (Richelieu).	Sproule.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. LLOYD HARRIS (Brantford). Mr. Chairman, I think that the question before the House and the country is perhaps the most important question that we have had to consider in Canada since confederation. I have one of the hardest tasks of my life allotted to me to-night, for the simple reason that I find I am not able to support the government on this important proposal. I have reached this conclusion with very considerable regret. It is not easy, I think every one will admit, to cast off party ties on an important issue of any kind, and I deeply regret the fact that I have been forced to the conclusion that I cannot support the government in this proposal, because I do not think the proposal is in the best interests of Canada. Ever since the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) made his announcement in this House, I have been endeavouring to get a sane and safe view from a Canadian standpoint as to the effect of this proposal on our present national life and on the future development of the national life of Canada. When the announcement was first made, I had a very strong impression that it was a departure from a policy which I had thought had been the policy of the Liberal party, but I also thought that it was a departure which would lead us into ways and in directions which would not be for the future best welfare of Canada. At that time I was apparently alone on this side of the House because the announcement was greeted, I thought, with considerable enthusiasm on the part of members on this side, but since I find that the views I formed at that time are shared very largely by very many people throughout the country. I do not consider that all the brains of Canada are confined within the four walls of this room. I think there are men engaged in large undertakings who are just as good Canadians, who have just as good, and perhaps a great deal better opportunities of sizing up the real conditions in Canada and the real facts of an issue of this kind as we have in this House.

I have purposely refrained from making any public utterance on the question until I had an opportunity of listening to the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I listened to him yesterday with a very great deal of interest and with a very great deal of pleasure. I think I might say that I have always been an admirer of the right hon. the Prime Minister. I have been very glad indeed to serve under him, because I think that he has done as much for Canada as any man whom we have ever had here, and I listened yesterday with perhaps more admiration than I have ever had for him before for the simple reason that he made certainly a magnificent speech; he aroused the enthusiasm of our friends on this side of the House. He covered every aspect of the subject, excepting the one important one. I was glad to see the right hon. the Prime Minister very frank about this, because he frankly admitted that he was not a business man. I must confess that the only training I have ever had has been along business lines and perhaps I look at things from too practical a standpoint, there may not be enough sentiment in my makeup. However, I think what we need in this country is a good practical business consideration and discussion of a measure of this kind before we allow it to become law. I had intended saying a few words on the amendment, which was introduced by the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) before the recess; I thought an opportunity would have been given for the members to speak on that after dinner.

Apart entirely from the economic features of this case, I have four good and sufficient reasons, at least they are sufficient for me, for opposing this measure. First of all I do not think that this government has any mandate from the people. The main arguments that have been advanced in favour of this measure have been the fact that this is an historic policy, a policy of both parties in Canada for the last 50 or 60 years. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in making his announcement reviewed the history of the different negotiations which have taken place between Canada and the United States with reference to reciprocity between the two countries. Other speakers have done the same thing. I am not going to weary the House by going into the details of these different negotiations, but all the speakers who have touched upon the subject, have brought down the history of these negotiations from 1854, the time of the first treaty, to 1896. Since 1896 I do not think that any case has been made out. For my own part, I can only say that unfortunately I was absent from Canada from 1889 to 1900 and have only been familiar with Canadian conditions and politics in the last 11 years, and I know positively that in that 11 years reciprocity has not been an issue with either party in this country. I have no mandate from the people of my own constituency to support this measure. If I go back to my own constituency and tell the people exactly what I think of the effect this is going to have on that particular constituency, and say that I have supported it, I do not think they will have any use for me in future.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Have you a mandate to oppose it?

Mr. HARRIS. That is an easy question to answer. A man always has a mandate to oppose anything he has not a mandate to vote for. I have been a little surprised that no authorities have been quoted on this subject. I have been looking up the question, and I find in a work entitled 'The Government of England,' by Lovell, who, I believe, is a recognized authority, under the head, 'The Doctrine of Mandate,' the following:

> Another sign of the times is found in the doctrine, now sanctioned by the highest authority, that parliament cannot legislate on a new question of vital importance without a mandate from the nation. The theory that the individual representative is a mere delegate of his constituents, so that he is bound to resign and submit to re-election if he changes his views, has long been a subject of discussion; but the idea that parliament as a whole exercises a delegated authority in the sense that it is morally restrained from dealing with questions that have not been laid before the people at the preceding general election would formerly have been regarded as a dangerous political heresy. Yet during the recent agitation in regard to fiscal policy, Mr. Balfour, while repudiating the suggestion that the existing parliament, having been elected on the single issue of the South African war, ought to be dissolved when peace was made, refused to grant time for a debate on free food on the ground that it would be constitutionally improper for parliament to act on the question until it had been submitted to the people at a general election, and that it would be unwise for the House to discuss a subject on which it could not act.

I think we are wasting time in discussing this question, because we have not any mandate from the people of this country with regard to it.

My second reason for opposing it, is the method of doing it. If the government had a mandate, the method would have been quite correct, but the government having no mandate, the very fact that we in this House, who have been elected by our several constituencies to represent the people of this country, have never even been called into consultation, that we have never been asked to express our views on a measure which is perhaps the most radical departure in policy that we have ever had in this country, and the fact that two men went to Washington and made this arrangement and have come back to this parliament and are practically trying to force this measure through the House, is a method which I, personally, cannot support. Let us consider for a minute the procedure in the case. It has not been brought out in the debate, I think, up to the present time, what really has happened. As I understand it, a year ago representations were made by President Taft through Mr. J. A. Macdonald of the Toronto 'Globe,' to this government, that he found himself in a difficult position, owing to the Payne-Aldrich tariff having in it a clause which required him to penalize Canadian importations into the United States. I do not know whether it is known or not, but I have heard, and I think it is quite correct, that this clause in the Payne-Aldrich Tariff was copied from the Canadian tariff. We had such a clause in our tariff for some time. We had it several years ago when Germany found it necessary to attack us in its tariff, and what was the answer that Germany got? We simply put the Act into force as it was, and we said to Germany: Very well, if you want to penalize us, we will penalize you, which we did; and I think that action had the support of everybody in this country. And when the United States made representations that it was necessary to have legislation put through at Ottawa to save the president of that country, I think we should have given them the same answer that we gave to Germany. Now, what consideration has been given to this arrangement? I have been very much interested in these negotiations ever since they commenced; and as far as I can find out, the two ministers returned from Washington on a Wednesday, and at that time apparently the other members of the cabinet, or at least those that I spoke to, knew no more about the conditions of this compact than I knew myself. The council evidently met on Thursday for an hour—if I am wrong in this, I hope I shall be corrected; this proposal was evidently considered by the council for one hour, at three o'clock this House met, and at 3.30 the hon. Minister of Finance came in and laid the agreement before the House. I am only speaking for myself, but personally, I do not think that any man should be asked to support a measure which is forced through in that way, and which means so much to this country.

The third reason which I have for opposing it, is the one to which I attach the most importance. No doubt all of the hon. members of this House have had the same experience that I have had while these negotiations were in progress. I had letters and interviews, and when I went to western Ontario, I met a great many people who expressed their anxiety that something might happen which would effect them or their interests adversely. To one and all of such requests for information, I said: You need have no fear whatever, because there will be no revision or alteration of the tariff of this country without a thorough investigation. I want to state my reasons

for having given that answer, and if I make a longer quotation from 'Hansard' than I would like to do, I hope the House will bear with me. The right hon. the Prime Minister, on the second day of this session, speaking in the Debate on the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne, referring to his visit of last summer to the west, made this statement:

The people of the west are now asking for a reduction of duty on certain articles which they consume. That is a very proper subject of investigation, and we intend to investigate it. But at the proper time. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) is very impatient. We who have been in office for a certain number of years know that if there is one thing more than another essential to the business prosperity of a country it is stability of character. And my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who has special charge of these matters on his side of the House will not dispute this, although when in office he was delinquent on this point—he tinkered with the tariff year after year. But with the warning before us given by his course, we were particularly careful not to fall into his error. It has been our policy to have a revision of the tariff periodically, but not year after year. I stated to the people of the northwest during my recent trip that it would be our duty to consider their requests and to deal with them in the spirit in which we have always dealt with requests from the people. And I repeat that now. I stated, and my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) quoted my words, that we would have a commission of investigation before we undertook a revision of the tariff. I noticed that that evoked a cheer on the part of hon. members on the other side of the House. And may I be permitted to say without offending my hon. friend, and with every hope that he will pardon my pride in the matter, that the parts of his address that were most applauded were his quotations from my speeches. I trust that this flattery will not make me vain; I mention it only as a fact which is within the knowledge of all who heard the hon. member's speech. The statement made by myself and quoted by the hon. gentleman that we would have an investigation by commission before we altered the tariff called forth a special cheer from hon. members opposite. Does any hon. member on the other side take issue with the promise I made? Would any of them advocate rushing into a revision of the tariff without previous investigation?

That I consider a statesmanlike utterance. I was perfectly satisfied with it. I took it as a distinct and definite promise, and I made other promises on the strength of it.

The fourth reason that I have, is one which may not perhaps appeal to some members of the House, but I do not think we should look upon this reason in too light a way. It is that it has hurt the pride of Canadians. Some of my hon. friends laugh.

I think a glance over the history of Canada since confederation will prove my point. For many years we felt that we were absolutely dependent on the United States, and we had these pilgrimages to Washington, for the purpose of negotiating free trade relations. But every time that we went wearing out our shoe leather, as one hon. gentleman has put it, what was the result? We simply met with one rebuff after another. Every time we knocked at their door, we were refused admittance; and the load we had to carry in Canada for a great many years seemed greater than we actually could bear.

Had we got, however, what we wanted at that time, the whole course of Canadian history would have been changed. We would not have had a country such as we now have. Our maritime provinces would have been connected by trade and commerce with the eastern states; Ontario would have been dealing entirely with the state of New York and the adjacent states and in the Northwest of Canada, I doubt if we would have built a railway around the north shore of Lake Superior. But not having been able to get what we wanted, we were forced to initiate a policy of our own, and that was to take off our coats and seek to bind this country together and create a nation. We have done this. We have done perhaps what no other country in the world has accomplished. You all know what it means for a man when he feels he has done something. It makes him a better in every respect. One of the good things that has come to us in recent years is the knowledge that we have a separate and distinct entity. The word 'Canadian' stands to-day for something. Years ago it did not stand for much. At present, however, it means that Canadians have done something that they have accomplished things, and that means a great deal to a people just as it does to an individual.

I claim that this measure—the method of doing it, and the measure itself—is one that will have far reaching consequences on Canada perhaps more than anything that has ever happened. I give these four reasons for opposing it, which perhaps will not be considered sufficient by my hon. friends on this side. But for these four reasons alone I have made up my mind that I cannot support the government in this measure. I propose now to deal with its economic features, and shall have to do that in my own way. Each one approaches all these questions from his own standpoint, but I think every one will agree that we should approach the discussion of a measure of such importance as this in a sane manner. I cannot say that some of the arguments and remarks of the advocates of this measure are made in that spirit. I was reading in the Toronto 'Globe,' of March 4, an account of a meeting at Woodstock the other

night at which the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. King) was present. The article is as follows:

VOICE OF CANADIAN TRUST.

In this agitation against the agreement we find the beginnings of the subtle and skilful manoeuvrings of the Canadian trust. We are being warned to-day to beware in this arrangement that we do not deliver ourselves into the hands of the American trusts, but I sometimes think that we hear in this warning the voice of the Canadian trust speaking not so much for the Canadian people as for its own selfish interest. What is the first principle of a trust? It is monopoly of the market, complete control of the sources of supply. What is one of the most effective weapons in combating that influence? It is the opening of new markets, the giving to those who have products to sell other and wider markets in which to make their sales.

I wonder if the so called Canadian trust was responsible for the unanimous resolution of the Berlin Board of Trade condemning the proposal.

Mr. KING. Will my hon. friend permit me to say that the Berlin Board of Trade did not pass the resolution attributed to it, according to a statement made subsequently by the secretary of that board.

Mr. HARRIS. I think I got the information in both cases from the Toronto 'Globe.' I did not read that, however, to in any way belittle my hon. friend the Minister of Labour. What I read it for was to contrast the utterances of one of our Canadian ministers with those of one of the American ministers, which were delivered a few days ago at a public meeting in Chicago. At a dinner given by the Chicago board of commerce on the 15th February, at which one of the speakers was Mr. James J. Hill and Mr. Knox, Secretary of State for the United States, the latter spoke to this large and important gathering of Chicago's best business men on the question of reciprocity as follows:

BUSINESS KNOWS IT WANTS RECIPROCITY.

This function could cease now and here without a moment of speech, and still go down in history as almost epochal, because when has it occurred that a matter of such grave economic significance as the one which is now not only being considered by the Congress, but by the people, has gathered together such an assemblage as this, men whose hands are upon the throttles of great enterprises for the development of our country, and who are worth more to its ultimate and its present prosperity than a thousand times as many politicians going up and down the land demanding that something shall be done for fear something will happen.

The point I was making was this, that there is a great deal of opposition to this measure throughout the country, not confined to any particular class. The opposition to it is not restricted by any means to the business, manufacturing, financial and commercial interests, but it also extends to the farmers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HARRIS. I have been interested in following several of these ballots which have been taken by different newspapers. In one Canadian Agricultural journal which I was reading to-night, I find that the number of votes throughout Canada apparently in favour of this measure was about 1,000 and against it 600, so that the opposition to it is not, as some hon. members would have us believe, coming from the one quarter. But even if it did come from one class, every Canadian has the right to make up his mind on any important question, and in so doing he shoulld not be subjected to the imputations of unworthy motives. We have in Canada all classes of people. We are not purely and simply an agricultural country. Manufacturing is a necessity. At least I think that we require manufacturing industries, but if it be not the policy of the Liberal party to have manufacturing, I suppose I shall have to remove myself from Canada. But I submit that one man in one industry in Canada is just as good as a man in another industry. We are all Canadians working together for the general benefit.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to all the arguments which have been put forth in defence of this measure. I listened with great pleasure to my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), the other night—I always listen with pleasure to the hon. member because he always says something good, something of interest. But, in reading his speech next day, I found that it was one of his characteristic speeches. He quoted Peel, and Cobden and Gladstone. I am interested, as much as anybody possibly could be, in the free trade history of England. The men who inaugurated the policy of free trade in England were doing exactly what we at the present time in Canada are trying to do. They were trying to frame a policy which will make England a great country. Their policy, I believe, was the best that could possibly be pursued for that country at that time. But the fact that that policy was a good thing for England seventy or eighty years ago is no reason why we should accept it as the policy for Canada in 1911. We have to study the conditions of our own country.

I have given a great deal of thought to what I suppose is the real policy of the Liberal party. When the present government came into power, the existing policy was one of protection to all industries. That policy, I think all will agree, has been retained. It

has been changed to suit the conditions arising from time to time—I do not believe in a hard and fast policy of any kind. Added to that fiscal policy, however, the government immediately inspired a new faith in the future of Canada. They undertook a vigorous programme of development of our natural resources. We advertised in a large and comprehensive way, and in the proper places, our potentialities. We undertook in a large way additions to our transportation facilities. We have followed a policy of encouraging agriculture, the growing of products for our available markets; and, what was more important, a policy of transportation facilities which would carry our surplus products to the best markets of the world in the best possible condition. The government granted the imperial preference. They made very large expenditures on agriculture, in order to give information to the farmers of this country of the best methods of growing and putting up their products so that they might command the highest price. This, I consider, has been the policy of the Liberal party, and that policy has been eminently successful. I can remember twenty-five or thirty years ago—though I am a young man yet—when the farmers came on our market in Brantford and sold chickens at 10 cents each; to-day they are getting in the neighbourhood of 75 cents. They would sell butter at 10 cents to 12 cents a pound, we are paying 30 cents to 40 cents per pound to-day on the Brantford market. Eggs were sold in those days from 8 cents to 10 cents a dozen; now we are well off if we get them at 50 cents to 60 cents at certain seasons of the year. What is the reason of this? The first reason is that we have built up a consuming population in Canada which is the best market our farmers have, and any surplus products can be shipped and delivered and sold in the best markets of the world where they will command the highest prices. We have done all this without any assistance from the United States. We were forced to do it on our own account. Now we have got the home market, and, what I have always felt as to the future policy of this country—and this is the crux, I think, of the economic situation in connection with this measure—is that our agriculture should be put in such shape that nothing should go out in its crude condition. I do not want to see the wheat of our Northwest go through United States channels. If it must go out of Canada in its raw state, I want to see it go through Canadian channels. But I want to see as much of it milled in transit as possible. That is building up our own country. I do not want to see that second grade wheat they have in the west sold on the market at all—it is not going to give us a good name for our Canadian wheat. I want to see the meat industry established in such a way that such wheat should go out of the country in the shape of dressed meat, bacon, hams, and other similar products. In the province of Ontario, where we are at present growing $200,000,000 worth of field crops,—first, I want to see that raised to $1,000,000,000,—I do not want to see one dollar's worth of it go out of Ontario in its crude state, but in its most highly finished condition. And that, I think, is an ideal worthy of any Canadian, and a policy that any party should be glad to maintain.

A great deal has been said to prove that the effect of opening up our market in this country to ninety millions of people in the United States and to other nations which can send in their products here on the same terms as the Americans can, will have no effect on the farm produce of this country. First, I wish to take up the question of our own production and export. Many hon. members who have spoken on this subject, ridicule the home market. They want to know what the home market is worth anyway. Well, here are some figures which I think will be of interest to the members of the House. In the year 1908 the estimated value of the field crops of Canada was $432,534,000. In the Trade and Navigation Returns for the year ending March 31, 1909, the total exports of field products from Canada for the year—which would be the crop to which I have just referred—were $82,718,926, leaving a total of $349,815,074, which was consumed in Canada. In other words, for every $1 of field produce raised in Canada, 80 cents worth was consumed and only 20 cents worth exported. That is what all this noise is about— to get markets for that 20 cents worth. Now, included in the exports are the following which have gone through a process of manufacture—I wish to show how closely agriculture and manufacturing must come together in this or any other agricultural country:

Flour	$ 7,991,517
Indian meal	4,818
Oatmeal	535,963
All other meal	58,104
Cereal foods	1,380,507
Bran	858,900
Canned berries	204,246
Total	$11,064,055

Those products all went through a certain form of manufacture. I use those figures for comparison. In the following year, 1910, the amount was much larger in every way so far as crops in Canada were concerned. The total value of the crops was $531,690,000. The exports were $102,747,694; consumed in Canada, $229,342,406, or exactly the same percentage as the year be-

fore, notwithstanding the fact that the value of the crops was $100,000,000 more than the year before. Our home market increased in one year from $349,000,000 to $429,000,000. The total amount of exports which had undergone a partly manufactured state, was $19,866,653 as against $11,000,000 the year before. That is what our home market consumed in field crops alone. Now in animals and their products, in 1909, the exports were $52,026,710, and of that sum $38,144,107 went out of this country in the form of finished products, leaving only $14,000,000 which went out in the raw condition. I will submit the following tables in support of the remarks which I have just made:

REPORT OF TRADE AND NAVIGATION FOR YEAR ENDING MARCH 31ST, 1910.

Exports.	1909.	1910.
Animals and their products	$ 52,026,710	$ 54,696,630
Agricultural products	82,718,926	102,347,694
Minerals	37,257,699	40,528,998
Fisheries	13,332,871	15,760,391
Forest	39,867,387	47,688,256
Manufactures	28,711,944	40,331,467
Totals	$253,915,537	$301,353,436

In the item 'animals and their products' are included many articles which have gone through a process of manufacture, viz.:

	1909.	1910.
Butter	$ 1,575,877	$ 1,010,274
Cheese	20,398,482	21,607,692
Furs, dressed	69,077	35,371
Furs, undressed	2,504,878	3,680,949
Grease	197,299	171,363
Glue stock	7,239	8,872
Hair	147,407	172,583
Hides	4,034,343	5,430,591
Horns and hoofs	5,459	8,924
Honey	1,188	621
Lard	35,883	133,268
Bacon	8,415,247	6,431,359
Hams	422,851	416,886
Game	3,330	6,244
Tongues	3,356	264
Canned meats	195,917	193,479
Condensed milk	91,388	541,372
Tallow	34,886	16,279
Totals	$38,144,107	$39,866,391

It has been stated that the favoured nation clause would have no effect on prices in Canada for farm produce. It is a very peculiar thing, but it is a fact, that every country in the world with the exception of Denmark, which is known as an agricultural country, has high protection. I have schedules here showing for several of these countries the duties on the different articles of produce going into them. As I interpret the Act, Australia is not a favoured nation country, I do not think they get favoured nation treatment that other British colonies get.

An hon. MEMBER. All British possessions.

Mr. HARRIS.

Mr. HARRIS. As I interpret the Act, I do not think Australia is included, New Zealand is.

Mr. EDWARDS. In answer to a question I put the other day, the Minister of Finance said that all British possesions came in.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They do not come in under the favoured nation treaties, but under a policy which the government has announced.

Mr. FIELDING. The policy which Canada has always adopted is not to give to a foreign nation any advantage which is not given to the whole British Empire.

Mr. HARRIS. Then Australian produce comes into Canada free of duty.

Mr. AMES. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will read the clause in the original resolution which refers to that. It will be found in the motion moved by the Minister of Finance on the 26th of January to go into Committee of Ways and Means:

That the advantages hereby granted to the United States shall extend to the United Kingdom and the several British colonies and possessions with respect to their commerce with Canada.

Mr. HARRIS. Australia has a very high protective tariff on all articles of farm produce:

RATES OF DUTY ON CANADIAN PRODUCTS ON IMPORTATION INTO AUSTRALIA.

Articles and tariff rates of duty.

Cattle, $2.43 per head.
Swine, $1.22 per head.
Sheep, 48.6 cents per head.
Wheat, 36.5 cents per 100 pounds.
Barley, 48.6 cents per 100 pounds.
Beans, 36.5 cents per 100 pounds.
Potatoes, 21.7 cents per 100 pounds.
Butter, 6 cents per pound .
Cheese, 6 cents per pound.
Eggs, 12 cents per dozen.
Hay, $4.34 per ton.

Then I have a table relating to Austria-Hungary which I will not take up the time of the House by reading, but will hand it into the 'Hansard'.

Mr. FIELDING. The other day the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) objected to anybody handing anything into the 'Hansard' which was not read. Therefore I hope my hon. friend will read it, because I would like to have it on 'Hansard'.

Mr. HARRIS. I may say that I have not had time to get information about all the countries, merely about those which are the largest exporters of agricultural products.

Mr. HUGHES. I think the same courtesy should be extended to the member for Brantford (Mr. Harris) that has been tre-

quently extended to the Minister of Finance on many occasions.

Mr. FIELDING. I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Then I will hand the table for Austria-Hungary to the 'Hansard'.

RATES OF DUTY ON CANADIAN PRODUCTS ON IMPORTATION INTO AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

Articles and tariff rates of duty.

Cattle—
Oxen, live weight, 86.6 cents per 100 lbs.
Bulls, $6.09 each.
Cows, $6.09 each.
Young cattle, $3.65 each.
Calves, $1.02 each.
Swine—
Weighing up to 10 kilogs., 30.5 cents each.
Weighing up to 120 kilogs., $2.44 each.
Weighing over 120 kilogs., $4.47 each.
Sheep, 50.8 cents each.
Lambs, 30.5 cents each.
Wheat, 58 cents per 100 pounds.
Barley, 25.8 cents per 100 pounds.
Beans, 22.1 cents per 100 pounds.
Potatoes, free.
Butter, natural, fresh, $2.21 per 100 lbs.
Butter, natural, salted, $3.22 per 100 lbs.
Cheese—
Stracchino, Gorgonzola, fontina, montasio, and grana (Parmesan, lodigiano, regiano); also sbrinz cheeses in the shape of millstones, $1.11 per 100 pounds.
Other fine cheese for the table, $5.52 per 100 pounds.
Hard cheeses in the shape of millstones—
Weighing each 50 kilogs. (110 lbs.) or more, $1.11 per 100 pounds.
Weighing less than 50 kilogs., $1.29 per 100 pounds.
Other hard cheese, $4.60 per 100 pounds.
Eggs, free.
Hay, free.

Then I come to Denmark. Denmark is practically the only agricultural country which admits agricultural products free. Probably Denmark is the most highly educated country agriculturally in Europe, or possibly in the world.

Their agriculture is carried on under the most perfect system. The Technical Education Commission propose to visit Denmark and they will find so much of interest and gain so much information that will be of importance to Canada that I hope that when they come back with their report the people of Canada, the government, and this parliament will recognize the necessity, up to a certain point, until we get our agricultural and technical education thoroughly well established, of protecting the agricultural industry. With the permission of the House, I will submit the following tables:

RATES OF DUTY ON CANADIAN PRODUCTS ON IMPORTATION INTO DENMARK.

Articles and tariff rates of duty

Cattle, swine, sheep, wheat, barley, beans, potatoes, butter, free.
Butter in hermetically sealed vessels, $4.86 per 100 pounds.
Cheese, $2.43 per 100 pounds.
Eggs and hay, free.

RATES OF DUTY ON CANADIAN PRODUCTS ON IMPORTATION INTO FRANCE.

Articles and tariff rates of duty.

Cattle (fat cattle excluded)—
Oxen, cows, bulls, steers, bullocks and heifers (live weight), $1.75 per 100 lbs.
Calves (live weight), $3.51 per 100 lbs.
Swine—
Pigs (live weight), $2.20 per 100 lbs.
Sucking pigs weighing 15 kilogs. or less, 77 cents each.
Sheep—
Rams, ewes and wethers (live weight), $3.51 per 100 lbs.
Lambs, weighing 10 kilogs. and less, 77 cents each.
Wheat, 61.4 cents per 100 lbs.
Barley, 26.3 cents per 100 lbs.
Beans, 26.3 cents per 100 lbs.
Potatoes, 3.5 cents per 100 lbs.
Butter—
Fresh, $2.63 per 100 lbs.
Salted, $1.75 per 100 lbs.
Cheese—
Hard, known as Dutch or Gruyere, $1.05 per 100 lbs.
Fine (affine) soft, $1.75 per 100 lbs.
Medium hard (demi dure) and other, $1.32 per 100 lbs.
Eggs, 52.7 cents per 100 lbs.
Hay, 4.4 cents per 100 lbs.

RATES OF DUTY ON CANADIAN PRODUCTS ON IMPORTATION INTO ITALY.

Articles and tariff rates of duty.

Cattle—
Oxen, $7.33 each.
Cows, $1.93 each.
Bullocks and calves, $1.54 each.
Bulls, $3.47 each.
Sheep and lambs, 58 cents each.
Swine—
Weighing up to 20 kilogs., 58 cents each.
Weighing over 20 kilogs., $1.93 each.
Wheat, 65.8 cents per 100 lbs.
Barley, 35 cents per 100 lbs.
Beans, 10.1 cents per 100 lbs.
Potatoes, free.
Butter—
Fresh, $1.32 per 100 lbs.
Salted, $1.75 per 100 lbs.
Cheese—
Hard cheeses—
Formaggio dolce, formaggio dell della paglia, also Emmenthal, Gruyere, Bernese, saanen, sbrinz, spalen, 35 cents 100 lbs.
Other hard cheeses, 87.7 cents per 100 lbs.
Soft cheeses, $1.32 per 100 lbs.
Eggs and hay, free.

RATES OF DUTY ON CANADIAN PRODUCTS ON IMPORTATION INTO JAPAN.

Articles and tariff rates of duty.

Cattle, 10 per cent.
Swine, 25 per cent.

Sheep, 25 per cent.
Wheat, 21.46 cents per 100 lbs.
Barley, 16.94 cents per 100 lbs.
Beans, soja, 16.18 cents per 100 lbs.
Beans, red or white, small, 16.94 cents per 100 lbs.
Beans, (vicia faba), 13.93 cents per 100 lbs.
Potatoes, 43.29 cents per 100 lbs.
Butter, $10.02 per 100 lbs.
Cheese, $6.40 per 100 lbs.
Eggs, $2.18 per 100 lbs.
Hay, 6 cents per 100 lbs.

RATES OF DUTY ON CANADIAN PRODUCTS ON IMPORTATION INTO NEW ZEALAND.

Articles and tariff rates of duty.

Cattle, $2.43 each.
Swine and sheep, free.
Wheat, 18.2 cents per 100 lbs.
Barley, 48.6 cents per 100 lbs.
Beans, 18.2 cents per 100 lbs.
Potatoes, 21.7 cents per 100 lbs.
Butter, 20 per cent.
Cheese, 20 per cent.
Eggs, 20 per cent.
Hay, 20 per cent.

I have a few figures showing the exports in 1908 of domestic produce from the following large exporting countries:

Exports for year 1908 of Domestic Produce from following Countries:	
Argentine Republic	$353,195,154
Included in above—	
Wheat	$124,333,118
Flour	4,953,668
United States—	
Animals	$ 34,101,289
Animal products	156,915,293
Breadstuffs	216,494,100
	$407,510,682
Lumber (unmanufactured)	$ 67,043,960
Denmark—	
Butter	$ 48,000,000
Eggs	7,600,000
Dressed meats	31,500,000
	$ 87,100,000
New Zealand—	
Meats (frozen)	$ 15,517,449
Wool	25,952,866
Butter	5,699,752
Cheese	3,812,688
	$ 50,982,755
Australia—	
Breadstuffs	$ 20,295,332
Animal products	23,599,894
Wool	111,513,145
	$155,408,371
France—	
Animals	$ 8,536,183
Butter	11,686,122
Cheese	4,183,724
Eggs	2,694,296
Potatoes	8,678,921
Wool (raw)	45,709,754
Fish	7,531,960
Raw hides	21,597,771
	$110,618,731

The United States are producing exactly the same class of agricultural products that we produce, and in 1908 they produced over $400,000,000 worth. I do not think the area of Denmark is as great as that of our maritime provinces. With reference to Australia, included in the item of animal products is $5,932,987, which is the value of the frozen mutton which was exported during that year. In Australia sheep are grown for wool and not for meat. The meat is really a waste product. In so far as the sheep industry is concerned, with our farmers trying to grow sheep for the wool and the meat as they do in this country, the sheep industry would be wiped out of existence. It may be said that the sheep industry does not amount to anything any way. I know it does not at the present time, but I would like to see it properly developed as well as other branches of agriculture. France is not regarded by us as an agricultural country, but it really is one of the greatest agricultural countries in the world. I have only given these figures to show the competition that we will have in agricultural produce, not only from the United States, but from a great many other countries. At the present time New Zealand buttter is finding its way to this market, and if the duty should be off New Zealand butter I am thoroughly satisfied it will reduce the price of butter in Montreal by at least four cents a pound. The price of New Zealand and Danish butter in England at the present time is from 21 to 22 cents a pound, and in Montreal it is from 26 to 27 cents a pound. It can be brought over here for about one cent a pound.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Has my hon. friend a table showing the imports into Canada from these countries for the last year, of butter and eggs?

Mr. HARRIS. No, I have not. I cannot prophesy what will really happen from allowing ninety millions of people access to our market, but if it does not mean very strong and keen competition with the farmers of this country I do not know anything about the business.

Then, there is another point. The treatment we have had from the United States in fiscal matters has been of such a character that we have resented it at different times. I think, of course, that they were doing exactly as they had a right to do. They were engaged in exactly the same problems that we are engaged with at the present time. From the time they started in the development of their country un-

til they reached what is practically at the present day their maximum development they brooked no interference from anybody, they allowed no one to come into that country and have their markets, they insisted that the people of the United States should have the markets themselves. As a matter of fact, the home market is the only market that any nation has absolute control over. We have not any control over the United States market. Now, when they come to a point in their development when it is to their interest to allow Canadian goods to come in they are willing to let us come in. But, we are in the same position that they were in—I do not know just how many years ago it would be—but we have got started in our development, we have not reached our maximum development, and will not reach it for a great many years to come. I have the highest kind of regard for my United States friends, I have a great many friends over there, and I have had a great deal of business to do in that country.

An hon. MEMBER. You are still loyal?

Mr. HARRIS. I am still loyal. I am not dealing with the loyalty feature of this question; I am dealing with it from the business standpoint. I think our best plan is simply to keep as closely as we possibly can, and as closely as we dare to the plan that they themselves have laid down. While they were developing they would brook no interference from us; while we are developing we do not want them to come in and interfere with us. When we get to the state of development in this country where we have given our agricultural population and the people generally every facility to acquire the best, the most scientific and the most intelligent methods of agricultural production so as to enable them to turn their products out in the most highly finished condition, I am perfectly willing that we should trade with the world.

Mr. TALBOT. How long will that be?

Mr. HARRIS. I do not know, but we certainly are not there yet. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) made a very excellent speech the other evening, and I think he has been the only speaker on this side of the House who has attempted at all to touch with any detail on the economic feature of the different articles which would naturally pass from one country to the other. The minister in his statement the other night said that the farmers will get the American price for wheat. What is the American price? I have here an extract from a speech made by Mr. J. J. Hill, in Chicago, the other night, at the Chicago Chamber of Commerce dinner. He said:

The price of any commodity of which a country produces a surplus for export is fixed in the market where it must be sold. The demand of the whole world for wheat meets the supply of the world in the Liverpool market. To that, Russia and Argentine and Canada and the United States all send their surplus. The visible supply is noted, the probable demand computed, the prospects of growing crops taken into account, and these automatically determine the price.

The Farmer Gains Either Way.

This Liverpool quotation regulates wheat prices in all the markets of the world. It is cabled daily to New York, Chicago, Minneapolis, Duluth, Winnipeg and the other primary markets of wheat-exporting countries. The price in each of them varies daily with the Liverpool advice. It is, therefore, impossible that this price should be affected by the trade relation of any two of the countries to each other. It can make no difference in the total stock of wheat for sale, which fixes the price, over what route it goes to market. The quotations would not be changed by the fraction of a penny if all the wheat of Canada went abroad by way of Minneapolis, Chicago, Duluth and New York——

Which Heaven forbid.

—instead of by way of Winnipeg, Port Arthur and Montreal. But every bushel milled in transit helps the price, by withdrawing from the visible supply, on which prices are based, the wheat that has been turned into flour.

That is exactly the situation so far as wheat is concerned. Everybody knows that, so that any advantages that our western farmers may gain in price of wheat are purely imaginary.

I wish to emphasize the point that I want to see every bit of wheat exported from this country sent out in no form less crude than flour.

I now come to barley. The minister stated that on account of the McKinley tariff our farmers lost a great deal of profit. He quoted the amount of profit they have lost by taking the figures that they had received in a certain number of years for their barley. I know something about the barley country in Ontario; I know that when the McKinley tariff was put into effect the farmers along the north shore of Lake Ontario were almost stunned, the blow had been so heavy. But I also know that since that time those same farmers have changed their methods of farming and are producing crops at present which give them more money than they got for their barley, and in addition their land is in much better condition.

Now the meat trade. The minister apparently would be glad to see the whole of our meat trade thrown over to the control of the United States packers. I do not take this view of it at all. I want to quote a resolution which was presented to the government by the farmers' deputation in December on the chilled meat industry:

Whereas it is of very great importance to the whole of Canada that prompt government action be taken towards establishing a complete chilled meat system on a sound and permanent basis, with the interests of the producers adequately protected; and

Whereas, the live stock industry of Canada has been neglected, and if the neglect is continued it will soon result in impoverished farms, and the live stock industry of the country will make no headway until it is made worth the farmers' while to produce and furnish more and better stock; and

Whereas the farmers are on account of the unsatisfactory market going out of the meat producing business, and will not again take it up until the market is placed upon a stable basis, and further that under the present system of exporting there is always a danger of the markets of the world being closed to us, which would result in ruin to many; and

Whereas on account of the danger of encouraging monopolies the farmers cannot be satisfied with anything short of a meat curing and chilling process inaugurated by the Dominion government, and operated in such a way that will guarantee to the producers the value of the animals they produce.

Of all the memorials they presented, I was most in sympathy with that one, because if we are to build up a big meat industry in the west and assist the farmers in getting the prices they should it is necessary that this industry should be carried on by either private enterprise or government assisted enterprise. I do not believe in the government going into the meat business, but no private company or firm or individual can attempt to establish a meat industry in the west at the present time on account of the enormous amount of capital it would require. I think it is an industry that we should encourage, and it should be under Canadian and not under American control.

Now take the packers. They came to Ottawa, they presented their memorial. They were practically told that they did not know what they were talking about, that they would not be hurt. I do not know much about the packing business. I did have a large investment in a packing house once, and lost it all. But the packers of Canada have done good service. They have spent large sums of money in good faith, they have done as much as any other class of people to make a name for Canadian farm products, and they should be considered; they should not be left in such a position that their business is going to be jeopardized. The present situation, if this goes through, is that the American packers can come to Canada and get all the hogs they want, while our packers cannot bring over a single American hog, as every hog coming to Canada must be held at least 30 days in quarantine and must be accompanied by a certificate.

The minister also mentioned hay. I quite agree with him that it is good farming to grow hay on certain kinds of land, just as it is good farming to grow wheat on certain kinds of land, but I do not think it is good business to grow hay and ship it out as hay. I think it is better to encourage the farmers who do grow hay to feed stock and ship it out in a finished state. That is the argument I am trying to make all the way through.

This question of competition is also dealt with by Mr. Knox in that same Chicago speech. He says:

In making a reciprocity agreement it is proper and right that we should consider the market which our neighbour has to offer us as well as the market which we offer her. Thus, we provide that the agricultural classes of a great section of our country should have the benefit of the free admission of cotton seed oil into Canada. We also obtain the exemption from duty of all fruits and vegetables and various other agricultural products of which some sections of the country as widely separated as California and Florida have a surplus at certain seasons, while we are not unmindful of the producers of the border states who at times have large quantities of surplus products which will be benefited by free entry into the Canadian market.

Mr. Knox himself thinks that this will be of assistance to the American farmers along that side of the line. He also says:

The free admission of grain from Canada thus meets the present situation and provides against contingencies when the Canadian surplus becomes greater by placing the control in the hands of our own grain growers.

In the hands of our own grain growers!

They have no cause to fear a demoralizing influx under the conditions which result from the reciprocity agreement.

The proposition with which we have dealt is economic, not political.

The horse industry is a very important industry. Every farmer in the province of Ontario at the present time is following the system of mixed farming. Every farmer is raising one or two colts every year, and they bring a good price in the Toronto market, which, I believe, is the best market for horses on this continent. We have greatly improved the breed of horses in the province of Ontario, and our horses are very much superior to those we would naturally get from the south. The horses we would get from the south would have a deteriorating effect on all Canadian horses in the west if they were allowed to come in free.

Now, to sum up the result of this change of policy, as I see it, so far as agriculture is concerned. It causes us to send out everything in the crudest possible state instead of in the most highly finished state.

It is a serious blow to several important branches of agriculture. It seriously injures the hog industry. It prevents the development of the chilled meat industry under Canadian control. It gives a premium to the farmers to export hay instead of sending it out in the finished product. It bonuses the cheese factories and creameries to close up. It causes the farmers to send out their cattle in frames rather than finished. It kills incentive to more intensive farming. It puts a premium on the mining of the lands of the west rather than farming it. It destroys our hopes and ambitions for better technical agricultural training. It destroys the salt industry. In other words, I look upon the whole measure as a raw deal for Canada—we get the husks and they get the substance.

Conservation has not been spoken of very much during this debate. I was reading the other day in the Ottawa 'Citizen' a report of a speech which had been made by Professor Robertson before the Canadian Club of Ottawa, and some of the things that he said placed this conservation question, so far as farming is concerned, in a much better light than I could do it. We have heard of conservation of our natural resources, but there is conservation of farms as well. Hon. members may not know that there is a department of our Conservation Commission which deals directly with farm conservation. Professor Robertson said:

FARM CONSERVATION.

I happen to serve as chairman of the committee on lands. Let me tell you of two instances that came out in our investigations. On 100 farms surveyed in Manitoba, every man reported that the wild oats were bad and getting worse. There is a how-d'ye-do—wild oats in the land where grain growing is the staple occupation of the people.

You must conserve the land by intelligent methods. I offer two instances of conservation. One farmer came before our commission who was working a farm settled from 68 to 72 years ago under old Col. Talbot. He told us that he had 103 acres which he had been farming for 23 years, and his crop now was more than twice as much in a year as when he began. He told us, if he could get the right kind of labour, he could again double the production in ten years. There is conservation. (Applause). Then in Prince Edward Island a farmer from near Summerside testified. We asked this farmer how long he had been on the place he then held. Twenty-two years. He had 97 acres. Twenty years ago he had a mortgage of $1,100 on the farm. For ten years he just held his own. Then he learned to grow clover, keep cows and make butter. There is conservation—land, cattle and the family. The previous year, 1909, he had sold $900 worth of butter and $300 worth of pork, and he sold a horse every second year. There was no mortgage on his farm.

That is conservation of the farm.

I do not know anything about the fishing industry, so I am not going to deal with that subject.

Much has been said of the fact that this arrangement will change the transportation routes of this country. I think it is absolutely necessary that we should have legislation which will as far as possible keep the trade and commerce of this country within ourselves. I do not mean to say that I would put up a high wall. so that no one could come in; but we must provide every possible encouragement for the people of Canada to trade with each other. I do not know why it should be a hardship to the people of the west to trade with us in Ontario; I do not know why it should be a hardship to the people of the maritime provinces to trade with us in Ontario; but apparently it does not mean anything to have the pleasure and privilege of living in a country like Canada. I think that all the statements which have been made about the effect which the measure will have upon our east and west routes cannot be too lightly put aside.

Now, I do not want to conclude my remarks without touching upon the subject of agricultural implements. Some members of this House attribute my opposition to this measure to the fact that I am unfortunate enough to have an investment in a business which manufactures agricultural implements. I hope that the members of this House will give me the credit of not allowing any reduction of the duty on agricultural implements to influence me on this matter in any way, shape or manner. The fact that I happen to be interested in the manufacture of agricultural implements does not, I think, make me any worse a Canadian. Much has been said on the subject of implements, and much has been done that I do not think has been altogether fair to the implement industry of this country. It is strange that any government should pick out one industry and make a political football of it; but I think I have to charge both political parties with having done that with the implement industry. The duty on implements was reduced by the Conservative government from 35 to 20 per cent, and I do not think there was any investigation held. The government simply thought that the reduction was a good thing to catch votes with in the west.

Mr. FIELDING. Did they have any mandate?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, they had the National Policy mandate.

Mr. FIELDING. To reduce?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. Then, when this government came into power, they thought they might get some more votes by hitting the implement industry another crack of 2½ per cent. Well, I have no objection at all to the government doing anything with the tariff, provided they know that what they are doing is right and proper and just to the thing done.

Mr. MACLEAN. And give every one a chance to be heard.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. So far as protection is concerned, I am not a high protectionist and never was. I do not think any one has ever heard me make any utterance in that behalf, but I do think that we require a tariff in this country. I think it is the only practical way of raising our revenue. If any government would even make the suggestion to change our system and raise revenue by direct taxation, I do not believe it would last 24 hours. We must have a tariff and raise our revenues under it. The agricultural implement industry is perhaps one more indigenous to the soil than many others, and therefore should not enjoy so high a tariff. But the inconsistency of our tariff is this, that when the duty was reduced on agricultural implements from 35 per cent to 20 per cent, the manufacturers of these implements were still paying as high as 50 per cent on their raw material. When the duty was reduced from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent the government took the ground that 20 per cent was a revenue tariff and made a concession on the raw materials for implements on which the tariff was reduced —there were only two or three of them. Binders, mowers and rakes. The government made a concession in the duty on the raw material of these implements which compensated the manufacturers to some extent for the reduction from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent in the duty. At present these same implements are being manufactured, and the manufacturers are paying duty on all the raw materials, with a few exceptions, as high as 50 per cent although they only get a protection of 17½ per cent.

Again, the manufacturers of implements in this country have to pay 27½ per cent duty on every bit of machinery which they import for their plant and on all the materials which go into the construction of their plant. About 40 per cent I think would figure out as duty on their coal because I do not think coal is worth more than $1.10 at the mine mouth; and on their factory supplies, which would amount to a very large aggregate, they pay duties varying from 25 per cent to 35 per cent.

My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) introduced a motion this session to which he and some other hon. members spoke. I intended following him if I had had the opportunity, but not having that advantage, I would like to make a few explanations and corrections with regard to the statements he then made, and perhaps I may be able to give my hon. friends on this side a little more satisfaction than I have given them so far. The hon. gentleman made the statement that under the late Conservative government, the binders imported into Canada came in at a fixed valuation of $80. He quoted the imports of binders in 1897, 1907, and 1910, and taking these three years he made an average valuation of the binders and the average duty. I might say now, for his information, that the statement he made was not correct. The late government never had a fixed valuation of $80 for binders imported into Canada. In 1907 he said the average valuation was $144.44. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) thought that in this he had made a mistake because he questioned him about it. He evidently did make a mistake in his arithmetic because the figures themselves show that the average valuation of the binders that year was $109.70. I have gone to the trouble of looking up this question, and I have a statement here showing the average value of binders from 1890 down to 1910.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to put on 'Hansard' the total valuation of the imports of binders for that year and the total number of binders so that I can check the figures. Since making my speech, I went to the trouble of rechecking my figures and found them absolutely correct.

Mr. HARRIS. I have the statement here:—

STATEMENT of Imports of Self-Binders from 1890 to 1910.

Fiscal Year.	No. of Binders imported.	Value.	Average value.	No. of Binders entered for consumption	Duty paid.	Average duty.
		$	$ cts.		$ cts.	$ cts.
1890	69	7,574	109 76	69	2,650 90	38 42
1891	302	35,054	116 07	216	9,246 65	42 81
1892	633	61,235	96 74	670	22,774 51	33 99
1893	644	63,624	98 80	654	22,625 40	34 60
1894	761	75,573	99 38	755	24,478 50	32 42
1895	1,006	78,208	77 74	1,045	16,418 80	15 71
1896	1,198	130,780	109 17	1,201	26,216 75	21 83
1897	1,946	203,537	104 59	1,943	40,647 39	20 92
1898	4,292	407,542	94 95	4,290	81,464 98	18 99
1899	6,931	664,610	95 89	6,931	132,920 50	19 18
1900	9,038	806,979	89 29	8,918	160,860 40	17 92
1901	7,920	831,204	104 95	7,888	165,623 60	21 00
1902	9,230	894,474	96 91	9,288	180,035 80	19 38
1903	10,878	1,053,021	96 80	11,002	213,055 00	19 37
1904	7,646	751,550	98 29	7,598	149,378 80	19 66
1905	3,567	353,864	99 20	3,594	71,510 00	19 90
1906	932	96,756	103 82	927	19,169 20	20 68
1907	2,878	315,744	109 71	2,876	62,938 25	21 88
1908	881	85,822	97 41	880	14,990 95	17 04
1909	1,207	129,965	107 68	1,205	22,710 71	18 83
1910	1,481	165,759	111 92	1,483	29,052 34	19 59

Average duty paid per binder for seven years under Conservative rule, $31.39.
Average duty paid per binder for fourteen years under Liberal rule, $19,60.

giving the total importations from 1890 to 1910. This gives the number of binders imported, their values, the average value, the duty paid and the average duty. But for the information of the House I would like to point out the results of this statement. The result is this. The average duty paid per binder for seven years under the late government was $31.39 and the average duty paid for 14 years under this government was $19.60, so that there was quite a reduction. I also want to correct my hon. friend in the statement he made with regard to drawbacks. He made the statement that the total drawbacks paid to the International Harvester Co., the Massey Harris Co., Frost and Wood, and Noxon Manufacturing Co., amounted to $217,458.99, and then proceeded to work out the drawbacks per machine. But this included the drawbacks paid on machines manufactured in Canada for export as well as for home consumption; and in the year 1909-10—which is the year he had under review—the drawbacks paid the implement manufacturer on the machines manufactured in Canada and exported was $128,134, and on the machines manufactured for home consumption was $83,569, making a total of $211,703. My hon. friend constituted himself the judge, jury and counsel, he tried the manufacturers of agricultural implements and found them guilty, but with extenuating circumstances in favour of the plough manufacturers because 60 per cent of the total imports consisted of ploughs. But the plough importations into Canada will now be absolutely taken care of by the manufacturers with the new plants they are erecting.

Mr. HUGHES. In the debates in the United States House of Representatives, the statement has been made over and over again that the American agricultural implement manufacturers do not recognize the Canadian manufacturer of agricultural implements as a quantity to be considered. They say that they can export into Canada against the duty without fear of competition from the Canadian manufacturer.

Mr. HARRIS. I was just coming to that. I have been investigating the conditions of the plough business because I am not interested in that line and have been looking it up more than the others. The American manufacturer of ploughs at the present time, with a duty against him of 15 per cent, is in just about as good a position to supply the Canadian western trade as will be the manufacturer in Ontario with freight and other things against him. I represent a constituency where we have 6,000 men employed in the factories, and, of these, I suppose 5,000 are engaged in the agricultural implement industry. These

men are the best class of mechanics, I believe, that we have in any factories in Canada. This arrangement is going to mean that the development of the agricultural implement business in Canada will stop. We are not going on to develop the agricultural implement in Canada. The concerns I am connected with have found it necessary, on account of the agitation and the trouble which they think will come, to remove part of their works to the United States. They do not want to do that.

Mr. MILLER. May I be allowed a question? Did they remove any part of their Canadian works, or did they simply acquire works in the United States?

Mr. HARRIS. They find now, and have known for many years that, for their foreign trade, which is 50 per cent of their entire trade, they could manufacture in the United States cheaper than in Canada. They have preferred to manufacture in Canada, and, with the concessions that the government gave in the way of drawbacks of duties on raw material, they have up to the present time, been able to continue their industry in Canada. But my own conviction is very strong that from now on, the development of this particular industry will not take place in Canada, but will be on the other side of the line.

Mr. FIELDING. Did not they secure this plant in the United States before this treaty was negotiated?

Mr. HARRIS. They did. But they secured it because there had been so much agitation on account of the implement duty. I have no objection, if the implement duties are too high, that the government should lower them. If the duties are too high on anything let the government lower them. I do not believe in a protective tariff that will create conditions under which one man or group of men can get rich at the expense of the people. I do not care very much about discussing this question, but I thought I ought to put myself on record in connection with it in this debate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my people in Brantford are in a different position perhaps from those in almost any other constituency. We have, as I have stated, large implement industries; we have two flour mills; we have one large pork packing industry. On looking over the list of industries of the town, I find that nine of them are directly affected by this proposed change. Therefore, I do not think that you can expect them to look with a great deal of favour on this agreement. I have had a great deal to do with the getting of American concerns established in Canada. I have many friends in the United States, and these men, several of them, at my request, have come over and looked into the conditions existing here, and have established plants. I had a long letter from one of them early in November last, and I would like to read it, so that hon. members will know what opinion on this question is held by some of our American friends who at present have interests in Canada:

I read newspaper accounts and hear considerable talk in Brantford regarding the proposed revision of tariff between Canada and the United States. We are not students in political economy, but as manufacturers and employers of labour in Canada and also manufacturers of the same class of work in the United States it appears to us that it would be disastrous to our Canadian interests to make any change in the tariff. From Buffalo we can reach all the important points that the Brantford plant reaches for a less freight rate than from Brantford. We can also manufacture malleable iron very much cheaper per ton in Buffalo than in Brantford. The above are absolute facts relating to our business and it appears to us that should the tariff on malleable iron or agricultural implements be removed it would necessitate closing our Brantford plant and transferring the business to Buffalo.

Looking at the whole thing broadly Canada is where the United States was fifty years ago. The Canadian farmers can buy better implements much cheaper than the States farmer could when this country was at a corresponding period in their development, and they certainly can sell their products for more money, making a very attractive net income. On the other hand, if the manufacturing industries of Canada are given proper support, we feel that it would tend to increase the population and thereby increase the welfare of the country at large.

That is a sample of several letters I have had. This same party sent me a wire on the 27th of January, this, I think was the day after the announcement was made in this House of the proposed arrangement:

Kindly wire my expense your opinion as to the possibility of the proposed reciprocity agreement going into effect. We have an option to take over property in Canada for our business employing four hundred people. This option expires on Monday. Should not accept if duties going to be modified. The courtesy of your opinion will be greatly appreciated.

This plant, the purchase of which he had in prospect, was for the purpose of supplying implement manufacturers in Canada with parts of their raw material. I had to advise him that, on account of the reduction of duty from 20 per cent to 15 per cent, I thought the government, in justice to the implement manufacturers, would necessarily have to make reductions in the steel schedule, and, if they did that, he would have to consider it and deal with it himself. As a result, he gave up his option.

I think the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has stated that he does not intend to do anything with the duties on manufactured goods. I believe that is his firm intention, but I tell you that no power on earth can keep any government from giving the farmers, who are now going to have every vestige of protection taken away from them, their just claims, when they come down here and demand that every other interest be put on the same footing. It would not be fair, it would not be right. The farmers are not asking for this reduction in duty on their products. The very class of farmer whom we in Ontario, at any rate, think most of, the people who have been literally practising the doctrine which we have been spreading throughout this country that the man who will make two blades of grass grow where one grew before, is doing the most for agriculture in this country, come down here, and what do they demand? They do not come to ask for a reduction in the duties, but to ask the government to give them fair and moderate protection on their investment and on what they are producing. Now, my friend Eugene N. Foss is a manufacturer and a very capable, clever business man. He is now governor of Massachusetts. Mr. Foss and myself have discussed the question of his establishing a factory in Canada, at different times during the past ten years, I have done everything I could to get Mr. Foss interested in establishing in Canada a branch of their large works which are situated outside of Boston. I believe that Mr. Foss, at the present time, would not consider for one moment following out that advice, because he knows—and every American manufacturer knows—that the government having gone thus far, are bound to go further. And Mr. Foss has stated that:

The present tariff system has resulted in sending approximately $300,000,000 of American capital to Canada to build up branch industries which compete with American factories in foreign markets. It has resulted in stifling the growth of Massachusetts and kept us out of the business and commerce which belongs to us by every right. It has kept the great Canadian railroads from our ports.

That is exactly what I want the Canadian policy to do. I want the American manufacturers to be forced to establish plants on this side of the line and provide work for our Canadian workmen if they want to have the advantage of supplying our home markets.

Mr. BEST. Are there any producers in Canada to-day except the farmers who have to pay a duty on everything they consume, and have no protection whatever on what they produce? We have to pay a duty on everything. Is that right?

Mr. HARRIS. That is absolutely right, and that is the point I was trying to make. Now, I want to refer to one other memorial which was presented by the farmers' deputation in December last. I was acquainted with one member of that deputation, a gentleman who came from my own county, and I want to place on record my opinion of the memorial which he presented to the government on that occasion, in which he attempted to give the facts existing with regard to agriculture in Brant county. This is from Colonel Fraser:

Treating on the question of turnips, I have frequently seen paid in customs and freight dues nearly four dollars for every dollar paid the producer. This is only one of the many like instances I could enumerate. It is no wonder then that the farming interests in my district are depressed; that the bailiff's business is largely on the increase; that merchants are unable to collect their bills, and that the general conditions of the farmer call loudly and piteously for a change. The conditions as outlined in the contemplated changes of the tariff would, I believe, largely eliminate the existing conditions and place on a sound foundation our agricultural interests, on whose prosperity the condition of all classes so much depends.

As the government has apparently taken this statement as literally true, I want to say that it is not at all correct in regard to the county of Brant, and I think the Minister of Customs will bear me out in saying so. I do not think there is a farmer in the whole county of Brant that will subscribe to what is said there. Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I want to say that I have tried to impress upon the House the fact that we are all working together to build up a great nation. We want everything of the very best. We want our people equipped with the best educational knowledge; we want them to turn out the best goods of every kind. We want our farmers to be the best farmers; we want them to turn out their products in the best possible condition; we want them to pay more attention to quality than to anything else. If we can build up the country along those lines we shall succeed in making of Canada a great nation. But if we follow the policy of sending out of our country all its raw materials in the crudest possible condition we shall never succeed in building up a great nation.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), in speaking this afternoon, said that we were rushing in where angels feared to tread. I see in front of me many men who are filled with fear; I see two or three such men about me on this side of the House. But while the fear is very apparent, I have not discovered the angels among them.

They are filled with fear, and yet I find their fears do not run along the same line. For instance, my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Harris), who has just spoken, is filled with fear lest the manufacturers of agricultural implements are not getting enough protection. My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) is filled with fear to an equal degree, because he thinks the manufacturers of agricultural implements are getting too much protection on what they manufacture. Let us analyze the fears of these gentlemen, and see whether anybody in connection with this whole proposal has anything really to be afraid of. Sir, in speaking to-night, I purpose meeting the objections to this proposed trade agreement as I find them contained in the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), not because it was that hon. gentleman who made the speech, but because, after speaking for four hours and a half, he travelled over the whole ground, and made, I think, all the points that have been contained in the speeches of those who have followed him on the other side of the House in opposition to this agreement. I find it more convenient to take all the objections from the one speech than to take them from several speeches. The hon. member for North Toronto said in the first place:

The situation is one of extreme gravity. I may be wrong, but I have given a great deal of thought to this matter in the course of my political life, and the conviction that is within my heart is that we have never had in Canada any question quite so important as this present one—no issue upon which hang larger and greater consequences.

Sir, the hon. gentleman has had a longer political career than I have, and has had a somewhat remarkable political career. I am not willing to say with him that there never has been in Canada any question quite so important as this; I think there have been other questions of even greater importance. Yet I am willing to say with him that if this cannot properly be termed a question of extreme gravity, it may, indeed, be termed a question of great importance. It is a question so important to the people of Canada that I think we may well brush from our eyes the cobwebs of partisanship and refuse to allow any party feeling to warp our judgment on this matter, but simply consider the question from a large, broad and lofty national viewpoint. The hon. member for North Toronto began his speech by making some rather belittling remarks as to the hon. the Minister of Finance and the hon. the Minister of Customs. Now, Sir, if I thought that the member for North Toronto meant those remarks as a personal slight and a jeer, or as an insult to those two gentlemen I would not notice his remarks at all. But I do not think that his remarks were intended in any such way; I do not think that he intended to be personal in his remarks further than that he intended his statements as a logical argument upon this question upon the principle: Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? The hon. gentleman proceeded to argue that because this was a trade arrangement made by two estimable men, yet not by any extraordinary men, but two simple-minded men, it could not be an agreement that would be of advantage to Canada. The hon. gentleman said:

Two men started out of Ottawa, two very estimable men but not in any way extraordinary.

Again he said:

These two men, consulting with nobody, except with fourteen or thirteen other equally ordinary men—or I might say not more extraordinary men.

And again the hon. gentleman said:

Why, when this pact was made I can imagine the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice, two good men, two simple-minded men, two men of fair but limited knowledge, with two clerks with them, facing the trained men of business at Washington, going down there with fear and trembling, wondering if they could get a little bit of a slice so as to justify their going.

The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) makes use of language very similar when he says:

I do not believe that in the recent history of Canada anything has happened which has given to the thinking people of Canada so painful and so sudden a shock as the sudden realization that four or five gentlemen who, by reason of their ability, their years of service and their high position in their party, are in control of the affairs of the dominant political party, can suddenly, of their motion, without discussion, without debate, without the knowledge of the country, commit the country to a radical change of fiscal policy.

Now, Sir, the fact that the hon. member for North Toronto three times refers in his remarks to the lack of ability or of capacity upon the part of Canada's two commissioners shows that he was endeavouring to build up such a logical argument as I have stated. Mr. Chairman, I am not intending at this time to give my opinion as to the business ability of the Minister of Finance or of the Minister of Customs. I may say to the House that not long ago I was talking with one of the sanest, shrewdest, most successful, most influential business men of the city of Toronto, and that gentleman made the statement that he did not think that there is upon the American continent to-day another man so well informed upon the tariff question as the present Canadian Minister of Finance. I have said that this is not an opinion that I give as my own. It is the opinion I quote of a

man better able to judge than I, but this I do say and I say it without any intention of being offensive to any one, that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs were much better able in 1911 to negotiate such an arrangement as his than was the hon. member for North Toronto when in 1891 he endeavoured to make a similar arrangement with the people of the United States. When I say that I do not endeavour to compare the natural ability of the hon. member for North Toronto with the natural ability of the two gentlemen, members of this cabinet, to whom I have referred, I allow every man in this House, I allow every man without this House in the Dominion of Canada to form his own judgment and come to his own conclusion as to that. The men of Canada have formed their own judgment upon this question, and I am quite willing that that judgment should remain as it is and as it will be. But I do say that there is no place perhaps in the political or business life of Canada where a man can and naturally does aquire such a knowledge of tariff matters, and not only of tariff matters, but of the business affairs of Canada as the position which is now occupied by the Minister of Finance, and next to that the position which is occupied by the Minister of Customs. These hon. gentlemen are day by day and every day receiving through their mail communications from business men all over Canada, from ocean to ocean, engaged in every kind of business and in all this correspondence Canadian business men are revealing to the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs the innermost secrets, the requirements and necessities of their several businesses. Not only do they receive these communications through the mail, but they acquire information from the delegations of influential business men who wait upon them day after day. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs have upon several occasions gone through the length and breadth of Canada into all the business centres and have consulted the business men, including the farmers—whom I include as amongst the business men of Canada—as to the necessities, requirements and conditions of their businesses.

Mr. BLAIN. What year was that?

Mr. MILLER. Upon different occasions as my hon. friend knows. The hon. member for North Toronto speaks in terms unnecessarily contemptuous of two gentlemen that went with the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs to negotiate this bargain at Washington and to whom he refers as 'clerks.' Who were the two 'clerks' that went with these hon. gentlemen? The Commissioner of Customs, Mr. McDougald, who has been for many long years—for a longer period of years than the Liberal party has been in power—engaged in the Department of Customs where he has obtained a very expert knowledge of the business affairs and conditions of Canada. The other gentleman who was referred to as a clerk is Mr. Russell, who for many years was in the employment of the Manufacturers' Association of Canada, where he acquired expert knowledge——

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is mistaken. There is a Mr. Russell who is with the Manufacturers' Association. Mr. Russell to whom the hon. gentleman refers was for a quarter of a century in the customs service, and he has now been transferred to my department. He is not the gentleman who is connected with the Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. MILLER. Then, for 25 years he, with Mr. McDougald, has been engaged by this government as a trade expert. So, I say that no one could have found within the borders of this Dominion four men better able to go to Washington and negotiate such a bargain than the four who were selected. Messrs. Fielding and Paterson in 1911 had been nearly 15 years in their respective cabinet positions. In 1891, when he went on his mission to Washington, had been Minister of Finance for only three years. The hon. member for North Toronto says: How could these two men succeed facing the trained men of business at Washington? But, Sir, he does not name the trained men of business at Washington and I would ask him or any other hon. member on that side of the House to name the trained men of business at Washington who would be more capable of looking after the affairs of the United States in this arrangement than were our commissioners to look after the affairs of Canada. The hon. member for North Toronto contradicts himself in this part of his speech as he does in many other parts. He speaks somewhat belittleingly of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs, and the colleagues of these two hon. gentlemen in the cabinet when he says that they consulted with nobody except fourteen or thirteen other equally ordinary men. Then he goes on to prove that these men are not ordinary men, that they are not simple minded men, but that they are men of extraordinary business ability, and let me read to you the language by which he gives us the evidence of their ability. The hon. member for North Toronto in his speech says:

> It was significant that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, began his history at 1897——

The year when the Liberal government came into power and began to manage the affairs of this country.

—since then Canada has made great progress, signal progress, despite the burdensome load

it has had to carry in the shape of a rather poor administration.

The latter part of that remark is an opinion that we may accept or reject as we choose. In the first part of his statement the hon. member for North Toronto says that Canada since 1897 has made great progress, signal progress. This is a statement of a fact, and facts are stubborn things. The hon. member goes on further and says:

> There were no compelling conditions to force you on this question. What were they, if there were any? Production was good. Never in the history of Canada has its production, in all its varied interests, been larger or richer. No blight then had fallen on the productive powers of Canada, in any respect, owing to conditions which the government might remove. There was no lack of market for everything that Canada produced. There was quick sale, easy sale, no glut in the markets, no lying in our bins and cellars, no rotting in our fields. Everything that Canada produced, and she produced richly, found a market and a ready market. There was no compulsion in that respect, there was no lack of transport, everything ready for market had means of transport, there was no compelling condition which sent these gentlemen to Washington. The prices, too, were good, they were never better in Canada.

Sir, if this debate serves no other good purpose it will have served at least this purpose that it brings from the opposition the hon. member for North Toronto and every other hon. gentleman opposed to this agreement the greatest tribute to the business ability of the Laurier cabinet given to them in a long time. What does the member for North Toronto say? That from 1897 to 1911 production in Canada was good. The production of the field was good, the production of the factory was good the production of the mine, of the forest, of the sea, production all along the line, was good. Markets were good, prices were good. This government had found for every man with anything to sell a good market in which to sell at a good price. He says: That in 1911 after fourteen years of Liberal administration, there was no difficulty on the part of any man in getting what he had to sell to the markets for lack of transportation. The government had provided transportation by the improvements of canal systems, by causing to be built new railway lines. He says that after fourteen years of Liberal administration, there was absolutely nothing to find fault with, to grumble about, to condemn. The hon. member need not tell us in one breath that this cabinet was composed of simple minded and ordinary men and then recite such a statement as to the condition of affairs which this cabinet has brought about in the Dominion of Canada. That is a state of things that does not come by luck, it does not come as a mere accidental thing. The condition of affairs described by the hon. member for North Toronto is a condition that can only come as the result of the most excellent administration and business management. The hon. member makes this argument which has been made by every speaker since, that the foreman to-day is not in Canada, and that perhaps is one of the things which the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris) had in view when he said this agreement has hurt the pride of the people of Canada. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) speaks of the grievance of the fruit growers and the grievance of the grain growers and then he pictures these men as coming to the Prime Minister here, asking him to remedy their grievances and in reply the Prime Minister folds his arms and says:

> There is a different foreman in charge now; before this trade arrangement passed we could have given you a remedy, Canada could control her own, but to-day the foreman to whom you must plead is not Canada, with its 8,000,000, but the United States with its 93,000,000. There is the party to whom you must appeal, and if that predominant party does not agree to what you ask we can do nothing. I say that is rank injustice.

If that hon. member or any other member who makes that argument will think for a moment he will see that there is no rank injustice, he will understand in a moment that if any kind of trade agreement had to be made or was to be made between these two countries, when the commissioners had completed their work it must be set before the people of both countries as a completed arrangement. If that arrangement was open to change upon either side then if men in Canada having grievances, whether manufacturers or agriculturists, could come and have the agreement opened up in one place they could have it opened up in a hundred different places and there could be no finality and no agreement. If there is any humilitation on this side of the line, if a man coming to this government says: I want you to remedy this grievance, and if the reply is as it must be: We cannot remedy that grievance, this must go through as it is, or not at all, what must be the position of the American who goes to Mr. Taft and points out some grievance he wants remedied? What must be the position, what must always have been the position of Mr. Taft in this matter. He would have to fold his arms and would have to say to that United States citizen, according to the hon. member: There was a time before we began to negotiate when I could perhaps remedy your grievance, but not now, you are too late, and now I, the President of a republic of 90 million people, cannot change or alter one single jot in this arrangement until or unless I consult Sir Wilfrid Laurier, premier of the country to the north of us, with eight million inhabi-

tants. If there is humiliation on our side of the line surely there must be humiliation on the other. I do not think there is any humiliation at all, but if there is, it is as 93 to 8 greater to the United States government than to the government of Canada to-day.

What is the proposal we are discussing and what led to it? In 1846 the British government repealed its corn laws. In 1849 the British government repealed its navigation laws, and then American vessels were permitted to register in British ports, and American shipping was permitted to compete with colonial shipping for the carrying trade of Great Britain. This brought about a sad condition of things for a time in Canada. There was a general prevailing spirit of discontent, there were those in Canada who said that England was forsaking her colonies. If it is the duty of the daughter nation to be loyal to the mother land it is equally the duty of the mother land to be loyal to the daughter nation. There were people in Canada in 1846 and 1849, and the years immediately following who said that England was not being loyal to her daughter, her colony. England was not disloyal. England said to us at that time: We are not willing to sacrifice our greater interests for your smaller interests, but while we are bound to look after our own interests we are willing to allow you to look after your own interests, and England said to us that she would give us the right to trade where and with whom we liked, and with such a tariff imposed on our importations, as we chose to fix and to make.

In 1854, seeking to better our condition, we, through Lord Elgin, the then Governor General of Canada, made a treaty known as the Elgin-Marcy Treaty and let me call your attention to the fact that Lord Elgin the Governor General of Canada, acted as the British envoy and assisted Great Britain to make for us a treaty of reciprocity with the government of the United States. Lord Elgin at that time advised his home government that if we were not allowed to make such a treaty, he feared that there would be some danger of Canada manifesting a desire to be annexed to the United States. I would like to tell you something of the result of that treaty which existed from 1854 to 1866, and I will give you the testimony of Mr. Withrow, who writes a history of Canada. Mr. Withrow was the son of a successful Toronto contractor, a graduate of Toronto University, a man who travelled throughout the length and breadth of Canada, in England, on the continent of Europe, and in Asia, and a man of very broad information. In his history Mr. Withrow speaks of the treaty as follows:

It was signed on the 5th of June, 1854, by Lord Elgin and the Hon. W. L. Marcy, as representatives of their respective countries. It provided for the free interchange of the products of the sea, the soil, the forest, and the mine. The waters of the St. Lawrence, the St. John and the canals, and the inshore fisheries in the British waters, were conceded to the United States; and the navigation of Lake Michigan was thrown open to Canada. By the provisions of the treaty, it was to continue in force for ten years from March, 1855, and was then terminable on twelve months' notice from either party.

To the agricultural population of Canada, the treaty was attended with immense advantage, and gave an important stimulus to every branch of productive industry.

Mr. Withrow speaks again of the results of the treaty to Canada, and I like to give you his opinion, because it is not a political opinion. This is the language he uses:

Commercial reciprocity with the United States, when finally carried into effect, caused an immense development of international trade, and largely increased the value of every acre of land, of every bushel of wheat, and of every head of cattle in the country. A great impetus was also given to shipbuilding, to milling and manufacturing interests, to stock-raising, wool-growing, and cloth-weaving, to the construction of agricultural implements, and to every other branch of industry.

In another place Mr. Withrow says this of the results of the treaty:

The reciprocity treaty between the United States and Canada was now approaching the period of its expiration by effluxion of time. It had been of immense commercial advantage to both countries.

In 1866 the Elgin-Marcy Treaty was abrogated at the instance of the United States. There were minor reasons, but the chief reason for its termination was that the United States had in the meantime, accumulated an immense war debt; and as it was necessary for them to raise money in every possible way, they increased their general tariff and their inland revenue imposts, and they said that goods coming from Canada must help to pay the war debt as well as goods from every other source. What was the result to Canada of the abrogation of that treaty? Canadians then were stout-hearted men, men who had confidence in their ability as well as in their country, men who were not paralyzed with fear, men whose loyalty was not shaken; and they said: We will go on and develop our country in spite of the abrogation of this treaty, and they did. We have done so well, that the hon. leader of the opposition to-day, and every other man on his side of the House and their friends in the country are saying: 'Why do you not let well enough alone? Our position to-day is so good that there is really no reason why

we should seek to improve it.' The Prime Minister speaking yesterday of this argument, put our Conservative friends on the Chinese list, and reminded us that they had said in 1896: 'There is now no necessity of making any change; the conditions are all that we would have them to be, and if you make any change, you are likely to make a change for the worse.' In 1896 our Conservative friends said, let well enough alone; but the people of this country did not say that. They said: Let well enough alone may be the motto of the Conservative party for this year 1896, but it is not the motto of the people; our motto is, let there be greater growth, greater development, greater progress, greater prosperity; and they said: If let well enough alone is your motto, we will put into power in Canada, a party which has our motto. The people did put that party in power, and the growth and development and advancement of the country under that party has been well described by the hon. member for North Toronto. An hon. friend quoted to-day from a letter written by Sir William Van Horne. Let me quote from the same letter these words:

> We are in an enviable position. Does not common sense tell us to stay where we are, and let well enough alone?

That is the doctrine which Sir William Van Horne applies to the political situation. That is the argument of our hon. friends opposite. I have often heard my hon. friend from North Toronto say this, and it was well said, that the principles which actuate a man in the control of his private affairs ought to be the principle of the government in conducting the affairs of the country. What has actuated Sir William Van Horne in conducting his own business or in conducting the business of the great company of which he is a valuable official? In this letter he says: 'Does not common sense tell us to stay where we are?' Sir William Van Horne was a citizen of the United States. He did not say to himself, Let me stay where I am. He said, Let me go to Canada, and he came here, and he made a great deal of money in Canada, and I am free to say that he benefited Canada as well as himself. But he did not then say to himself, Let me stay where I am; but he went to Cuba, and with the hundreds of thousands of dollars which he made in Canada from the farmers and toilers of this country, he developed the island of Cuba and increased his own fortune; and as he basks under the palm trees of Cuba, he says to us, I am sick and ashamed, and tells us what we should do in the conducting of our political affairs. When Sir William Van Horne says, I am sick and ashamed, I remember that there is a sickness that sometimes comes to men from surfeiting in the good things of life. There is no other kind of sickness that I know of that a man should be more ashamed of. If Sir William Van Horne is surfeited with the good things of the United States, with the good things of Canada, and with the good things of Cuba, and is ashamed of his sickness he had better stay where he is. He was perfectly loyal when he left the United States to come to Canada; he was loyal when he left Canada to go to Cuba; but I do not think he is the man to say to us, stay where you are, be loyal and let things alone. The railway company of which Sir William Van Horne is an official, is before our Railway Committee session after session. His company has been doing well and showing large profits. It has been doing its share towards the development of Canada; but does Sir William Van Horne say to the Canadian Pacific Railway: You are doing well, just let well enough alone, do not attempt to make further progress. No, on the contrary he comes to this government for charters to extend the lines of that company in every direction so that it may grow and add to its business and its profits. If that is good business for a railway company, is it not equally good business for a government to conduct the affairs of the country along the same line?

Let me look at the history of the Conservative party, and its endeavours to make just such an agreement as is now proposed. In the library the other day I looked over some of the old newspaper files, and I turned to the Toronto 'Empire' of February, 1891. The 'Empire' was then the chief organ in Canada of the Liberal-Conservative party. The Conservative party had just determined to appeal to the country in a general election, and the Toronto 'Empire' was full of campaign literature and campaign articles. Turning to the 'Empire' of the 4th of February, I found an article on the front page that reads in part as follows:

> The 'Empire' is privileged to publish a copy of the despatch from His Excellency the Governor General to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, showing the nature of the government's proposals to the United States, and indicating the earnest desire of the administration for the development of trade between the United States and Canada.

This despatch is dated Government House, Ottawa 13th December, 1890, and the first clause of the government's proposal read as follows:

> Renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 with the modifications required by the altered circumstances of both countries and with the extensions deemed by the commission to be

in the interests of Canada and of the United States.

So that the Conservative party of that day, endeavouring to make a trade arrangement, realized that any agreement to be made must have advantages to the United States as well as to Canada. They realized that a treaty arrangement could not be a one sided one. The 'Empire' of that same day went on as follows:

The Dominion thereupon asked the imperial authorities to remind Mr. Blaine that Canada had always been ready for a fair reciprocal arrangement and had made repeated offers to that effect, which, however, had been ignored or refused by the United States.

In an editorial in the same issue the 'Empire' said:

There is no reason why a fair and honourable reciprocity, advantageous to both Canada and the United States, should not be the issue of such a discussion as is proposed.

The treaty might be fair and reasonable and yet be advantageous to both countries. They do not seem so willing to admit that to-day. The 'Empire' of the 7th February, 1891, gives a report of a meeting in Toronto at which Sir John Thompson, then Minister of Justice in the Conservative government, made a speech. He is quoted as saying:

A little over three years ago it transpired that negotiations were being entertained by the United States for the making of a treaty of reciprocity with the colony of Newfoundland. These negotiations have not yet ripened into a treaty, but they were proceeding upon lines which were not unlike, so far as they went, the lines which Canada would be willing to pursue in any negotiations with that country, and not, mind you, at the dictation of the British government, as has been asserted in the press opposed to us, but on our line.

Sir John Thompson was then not as superloyal as our Tory friends to-day are. He said that he was willing to negotiate—'and not mind you at the dictation of the British government, as has been asserted by the press opposed to us, but on our own lines.' We in Canada are running our own establishment, he said; we are not being dictated to by Great Britain, and we are negotiating on our own lines for ourselves, independent of Great Britain altogether. He proceeded further:

He said that Mr. Blain had intimated willingness to make a wide treaty for reciprocity and enter upon separate negotiations with Canada. That statement being made, we are bound to avail ourselves of that to extend our trade. We have never declared our willingness to trade with them. On the contrary, we are seeking extension of our trade in every direction.

Was Sir John Thompson disloyal in saying this? I submit he was not. That was a logical position to take and a logical argument. Sir John Thompson said we are seeking extensions of our trade in every direction, we are seeking to extend our trade with foreign nations long distances away, then why, in the name of common sense, should we not endeavour to extend our trade in the United States? That speech of Sir John Thompson, was delivered in the loyal, the ultra and patriotic city of Toronto. I did not read that he had brick bats thrown at him or eggs or that he was even hissed on that occasion or that our Conservative friends in Toronto accused him of disloyalty. I ask my hon. friends whether on that occasion Sir John Thompson was a simple-minded, ordinary and unpatriotic man.

If my hon. friends would turn up the Toronto 'Empire' of the 11th February, 1891, they would find an article with large heavy black headlines. Let me read them:

Canada's tenth fair offer. A brief history of reciprocity since 1865. Canada always willing; the United States always turning a deaf ear.

Listen to this if you will:

Nine out of ten offers made since 1865 came from Conservative ministries.

Here is the boast made by the leading Conservative paper in 1891 that whereas the Liberals on one occasion had offered to make a reciprocity treaty with the United States, the Conservative party on nine different occasions had tried to make such a treaty. Then the 'Empire' went to work and tabulated the offers made in these ten different times to the United States. The first was in 1865 when Sir John Macdonald, and the Hon. George Brown went to England to seek the aid of the British government, and when Lord John Russell, the British Prime Minister, approached Mr. Adams the United States minister at London, and Mr. Adams said that he was not authorized to give any assurance on behalf of the United States. Thus in 1865 these gentlemen approached the British government to get such a treaty arrangement as we are endeavouring to have enacted. Was the old hero of the Conservative party, who said: 'A British subject I was born and a British subject I will die,' disloyal on that occasion? He was not then accused of being disloyal to Canada and Great Britain.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the policy of the hon. gentleman's party in 1891?

Mr. MILLER. I am quite willing to discuss that, but I think it is of small importance what it was. In 1866 the 'Empire' tells us that the Canadian government sent in January, M. M. Howland, Henry, Galt

and Smith to Washington to negotiate such a treaty as we now have, but they were not successful. In 1868, the year after confederation, a standing offer was inserted in our customs tariff of a reciprocity arrangement, to be proclaimed by order in council on the United States concurring. I ask what mandate had the Conservative party then to make that standing offer in their customs tariff. That offer had not been discussed at any general election.

In 1869 Sir George Cartier and Mr. Macdougall, two members of the Conservative government, being in England, urged the British government to try to obtain a treaty of reciprocity, and in June of that same year Sir John Rose, the Conservative Minister of Finance, was sent to Washington, and he met with no success. Was Sir John Rose sent single-handed to Washington to negotiate such a treaty—was he a less 'ordinary' man than my two hon. friends of the present cabinet? Was he a 'simple-minded' and only very 'ordinary' man? Was he a disloyal man? And were Cartier and Macdougall, the two members of the government, who, in England, tried to get the British Government to make such a treaty, disloyal to Canada or to Britain and Britain's flag? And had Cartier and Macdougall any mandate from the Canadian people when, in 1869, they sent Sir John Rose to Washington? In 1871 Sir John Macdonald, the old hero of the Conservative party, when negotiating the Washington treaty, offered to exchange the rights of the fisheries for reciprocal trade arrangement, but the American commissioners refused to negotiate. That was after a general election, but the people had not discussed the question on the hustings. In 1873, a further offer was made by a Conservative government. On this occasion boards of trade in Canada and in the United States had passed resolutions favouring a reciprocity agreement, and then the Conservative government passed a resolution in favour of such an agreement, and the 'Empire' refers us to the Canadian Sessional Papers, No. 40, of 1873 to prove what it states. In 1874 a Liberal government under Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, sent Hon. George Brown to Washington to negotiate such a treaty. He succeeded. The American Congress passed the treaty, but the American Senate refused to ratify it. In 1879, in adopting the National Policy, the Conservative government of Canada placed, for a second time, upon the statute-books of Canada a standing offer of reciprocity with the United States in natural products whenever the United States declared for a similar reciprocity. Now, what were the conditions of that time? There had been a general election in 1878. And what was discussed at that election, and what did the Conservatives under Sir John A. Macdonald lay down as their platform to be carried out if returned to power? What was discussed in that election was not a proposal to reduce the tariff, but to increase the tariff. But Sir John Macdonald prior to the election discussed the proposal to increase the tariff, and the first thing he did, after the election without a mandate from the people, was to make a standing offer to the United States to reduce our tariff, in an endeavour to make such an arrangement as we are making to-day. Was he disloyal in 1871, when he made, or in 1878, when he repeated, his offer? In 1888, when the fisheries dispute was under discussion in Washington, Sir Charles Tupper, the old Cumberland war horse, another hero of the Conservative party, desired to settle this matter on the basis of a reciprocal trade treaty. But the American plenipotentiaries refused. Had Sir Charles Tupper any mandate from the Canadian people in 1888 for such an arrangement? Had this matter been discussed in the election campaign? Not at all. Well, was Sir Charles Tupper disloyal, when, in 1888, he proposed such an arrangement as this? I have never heard it so stated. Then, in 1891, the tenth offer was made, this time by Sir John Macdonald again. He again offered to make a reciprocity arrangement, and representatives were sent in that year to Washington, and went again in the following year, 1892. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was one of those who went to Washington in 1891. If hon. members will refer to 'Hansard' of 1891, page 59, they will read the remarks of the hon. member as he tells of the desire of the Conservative government of that year to make a reciprocity treaty with the United States. And if they will turn to 'Hansard' of 1892, pages 330-1-2, they will read the account that was given by the hon. member for North Toronto of his journey to Washington, of what he sought to accomplish there, and they will read this statement of the hon. member, that he regretted that they were not able to make such an arrangement. The hon. member for North Toronto, who, as Finance Minister of Canada in 1891, had endeavoured to make a reciprocity treaty with the United States, and who in 1892 regretted that he had not been able to make such a treaty, in 1911 wrote an article to the 'Canadian Century.' That article appears in the issue of 18th February last, and in it the hon. member states that the present proposal will be the enemy of interprovincial trade. Now, I ask this question: If this arrangement will be the enemy of interprovincial trade in 1911, would it not much more have been the enemy of interprovincial trade in 1891? In 1911 we have railway communication, we have river and canal communication, between the several provinces of Canada that we had not in 1891. We have facilities for

carrying on interprovincial trade to-day that we had not then, and I repeat that if there is any danger of this arrangement being the enemy of interprovincial trade in this present year, it would have been twenty times more the enemy of interprovincial trade twenty years ago, when the hon. member for North Toronto endeavoured to make such an arrangement.

The argument has been made in this House before that the Conservative party from 1866 to 1891, and up to 1894, were willing to make such an arrangement with the people of the United States. That argument has been met with the statement that conditions have changed in Canada since 1891, but only in this way—every change in conditions indicates that, if such an arrangement as this would have been profitable to Canada in 1891, it will be much more profiable to Canada in 1911. There is not one single argument based upon the fear of annexation or upon the plea of loyalty that will apply to-day that would not have equally applied in 1891. There is not a single economic argument that could be applied as against this arrangement that would not have applied with even greater force to the proposed arrangement in 1891. It is not enough for my hon. friends who oppose the agreement to say that conditions have changed since 1891; they must show what are the changes and must show that these changes make an arrangement injurious to Canada in 1911 that would have been beneficial to Canada in 1891. They have not even attempted to do that, and they cannot possibly do it. And, let me say in passing, I am very glad indeed that conditions are as good in Canada as they are. While we are willing to trade with the people of the United States to-day, and to enter into this proposed agreement, I am very glad, as a Canadian citizen, to know that we do not have to go to the people of the United States, and do not go to the people of the United States, as suppliants; we do not go as a matter of necessity; we do not go asking for alms or charity; but we go to them as man to man. We meet them as they have come to us, business man to business man, to make, if we can, a trade arrangement that will be to our mutual advantage. If we cannot make such an arrangement with our neighbours, if the United States refuse to make such a bargain with us, then we will not feel ourselves crippled, or feel ourselves paralyzed. We will say, we might have got along better with this agreement, but still we can go on and develop our country and our interests; even without such an agreement we can make this a great nation.

Now, Sir, I call your attention to the manner in which the member for North Toronto complains of the ill-treatment which we have received from time to time from the people of the United States; and this is not only the argument of one gentleman, it is the argument of every gentleman who has followed him in this debate on the other side of the House. The hon. gentleman says in his speech:

> It was the conquest of Canada aimed at in 1775; it was the conquest of Canada aimed at in the years around 1812, and since; it was the conquest of Canada and its incorporation with the United States aimed at by the methods I have spoken of in respect to our trade and fisheries; and the dominant spirit in the United States that is pushing reciprocity through to a successful enactment is not economic, it is political. It is still the conquest of Canada. But it is conquest of Canada by peaceful means and large gifts.

The hon. gentleman says again:

> In all this trouble and toil, when was the hand of the United States extended to us with helpful aid? Not in one single case.

Sir, in answer to that question of the hon. member for North Toronto I ask him another question; I say, when was the occasion, when was the time, that the people of Canada asked the United States to extend to them a helpful hand? I say not in one single case; and I am glad that the time never was when Canadians were so lacking in spirit, when Canadians were so lacking in confidence in their own ability, so lacking in confidence in their own country, that they went to the United States as beggars and asked them to hold out to us a helpful hand. Sir, the United States, through all these years, has been busy, as it had a right to be busy, in developing their own country, as we have been busy in developing our country. What is the good of any man to-day rising in this House to complain of the ill-treatment that he fancies we have received from the United States in 1775? The people who endeavoured the conquest of Canada in 1775 are dead to-day, they got their answer when they endeavoured to conquer Canada in 1775. The people who endeavoured to make trouble for us in 1812 got their reply, and they are dead. Why then endeavour to reopen old sores? Why then endeavour to visit the sins of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children. There are men who never forget an injury, there are men who never overlook a mistake, but these are not the best men. The member for North Toronto endeavours to incite and provoke the feeling of the people of Canada against the people of the United States by a comparison of trade, and he says:

> And there was, in the third place, the wide spread dissatisfaction with the condition of things imposed upon us by the United States of America in accepting a $104,000,000 free list

from us and giving us but a $33,000,000 one in return, in buying from us a paltry $10,000,000 worth and of selling to us $223,000,000 worth; of meeting a Canadian tariff of 26 per cent by a United States tariff of 41½ per cent. There was a feeling in the country that that was not a neighbourly thing for them to do, not fair business treatment, not what we would expect from a great and rich and powerful neighbour. These were the three things that were mooted as grievances in the country.

Sir, we make our tariff and the United States makes its tariff. We impose upon our people a burden of 26 per cent, the government of the United States impose upon its people a burden of 41½ per cent, and that is what the people of the United States are complaining of to-day, that they have been carrying a burden too great for them to bear. That is what has put the Republican party out of power in the United States, and brought into power the Democratic party. Sir, if the United States, through all these long years, have been patient enough to bear the burden of 41½ per cent, while our people were only bearing a burden of 26 per cent, that is a matter for the people of the United States to regulate, as they are doing it to-day. It is perfectly true that we sold to the United States only $100,000,000 worth of goods per annum, while they have been selling us goods to the amount of $223,000,000 per annum. Is there any fair and just cause for complaint in that? When you analyse the figures what do they mean? They mean simply this, that every Canadian citizen, upon an average, sold Canadian goods to the United States to the amount of $12.50 apiece, but that every American sold only $2.48 worth of American goods to the people of Canada; in other words, that the Canadians sold between five and six times as much Canadian goods per head to the people of the United States as they had sold to us.

But then we are met with this argument: Mr. Taft seeks relief from a nasty position, Mr. Taft is in a rather bad predicament in the United States. Why relieve Mr. Taft? Why should we, the Canadian people, relieve Mr. Taft from the nasty position in which he finds himself? They would not trade with us when we wanted to trade with them, now let us refuse to negotiate with them. Sir, I say that that is nonsense, I say that that is the talk of children, not the talk of business men. We are used to hearing a child, with frowning eye and with pouting lip, say: You would not play with me, now I will not play with you. But that is not the talk of a business man. Suppose I desire to buy my neighbour's farm. I feel that if I bought that farm from my neighbour, I could use it to advantage. I go to the old man and make him a good offer for his farm, he refuses to sell. I go to him a second, third, fourth and fifth time, and he refuses to sell. The old man passes away, his son inherits the farm. I go to him and make him an offer the sixth, seventh, eighth or ninth time, and he refuses those offers. I then say, I will not go back to that man again. I would like to have his farm, it would be profitable for me to have it, but he and his father before him, have refused nine offers, ten offers, I will not go back to him. But that man passes away, and a grandson inherits the farm. Then he comes to me and he says. Now I have not the same ideas that my father had and my grandfather had, I have not the same intentions or inclinations, I am willing to sell to you my farm, I would like to sell it to you. Now if I am a fool, I will say to that man, No, I tried to trade with your father, I tried to do business with your grandfather, and they refused to do business with me, now I will not do any business with you. But if I am a wise man, I will not talk like that, I will say: Now I am glad that conditions have changed, I am glad this young man looks upon the matter differently from what his father and grandfather did. If I can buy this farm now at a fair price, if I can make a reasonable bargain, I have now a good opportunity, and I will do so. That is the manner I think that we as business men should adopt in regard to this matter. We should not be children, we should approach the people of the United States as we are doing, as man to man, in a business manner; and realizing that if we are to make a bargain with the people of the United States, it must be a bargain that will be an advantage to them as well as to us. No one can make a trade that will be a lasting arrangement unless it contains mutual advantage. This is true of school boys when they swap their jack knives; each one must hope to get an advantage from the trade or he would not make the trade, and as it is true of school boys swapping their jack knives, so it is equally true of nations when they undertake to make international treaties. Now, I have reached a point in my speech where I can conveniently stop and as it as after eleven o'clock I beg to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House. He said: Before the adjournment I desire to say that there was an understanding that on Friday my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) would make a statement upon matters connected with his department. He de-

sires to vary that now and I therefore beg to say that on Friday my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) will make a statement concerning his department and the Minister of the Interior will postpone his statement until Monday. I would be very glad if hon. gentlemen who are interested in those two departments would be kind enough to observe the change.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.30 o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 9, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

FREE MAIL DELIVERY.

* Mr. MONK:

1. Under what conditions does the Post Office Department grant free delivery of mail matter in towns and other localities?
2. What localities in the province of Quebec at present conform to these conditions and enjoy free delivery of mail matter?
3. Has the department granted free delivery in any locality which does not conform to conditions it has established? If so, in what cases?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Free delivery is established in places where the population is 12,000, and the revenue is $20,000.
2. Montreal, Quebec, Sherbrooke.
3. Yes. Free delivery has been established at St. Hyacinthe, Quebec, Three Rivers, Quebec, and Hull, Quebec.

WEST INDIES STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. CROSBY:

1. What arrangements are being made, if any, for steamship communication between Halifax and the West Indies?
2. As the present contract expires shortly, when will the tenders be asked for the new service?
3. What specifications will be placed before the public regarding boats for the service?
4. What will their passenger accommodation and freight capacity require to be, and what will be the speed required of the boats?
5. Has the government decided whether we are to have a weekly or tri-weekly service instead of the present service?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1 and 2. The government is awaiting a call for tenders which the British government, who will pay half the subsidy, has informed the Canadian government will be issued simultaneously in the United Kingdom, Canada, and the British West Indies.

3 and 4. Adequate passenger and freight accommodation will be required, and tenders, including speed, will be considered upon their respective merits.

5. Alternative tenders will be asked as to frequency of the proposed new service.

ESCOTT POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. Who is the present postmaster at Escott, in the county of Leeds, province of Ontario?
2. What was the date of his appointment?
3. Who was the postmaster at the said office up to the appointment of the present incumbent, and how long had he occupied the position?
4. Was the retiring postmaster dismissed, or for what reason was he discontinued?
5. Under whose representations, and at whose instance was he so retired?
6. Had any complaint as to incompetency to discharge the duties of the said office been made against the retiring postmaster or his assistant? If so, what was the nature of such complaint, and by whom was it made?
7. Is the government aware that the postmaster who has been retired is said to be an old man, a cripple, and a man who was in need of the income derived from the position he occupied?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Mr. F. T. Hutchison.
2. January 27, 1911.
3. Mr. George Dowsley, since December 1, 1891.

4, 5 and 6. It having been brought to the attention of the department that the postmaster was not giving his personal attention to the duties of the office, inquiry was made in the matter, and the inspector reported that the postmaster had not attended to the duties of the office for a long period. He farmed the office out to several persons in succession, and it was learned that the person then in charge of the office was obliged to vacate the premises. As the present location of the office was considered to be wholly satisfactory and very convenient, and it would not be in the public interest to have it changed, and as the postmaster was unable to give any attention to the duties of the office, it was deemed advisable to place the office in charge of some one who would keep it in the same premises and give it his personal attention.

7. The department has recently been informed that this is the case.

IMPORTS OF MEATS, CHEESE AND BUTTER.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. How many barrels, boxes or packages of pork, beef, mutton, lamb and cheese have been imported into Canada during the months of October, November and December, 1910, and for the months of January and February, 1911?
2. What was the weight and value thereof, and the countries from which the same was imported?
3. What was the number of pounds of butter and number of dozens of eggs, and the

value thereof, and the countries imported from, for the month of February, 1911?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The department has no record of the number of barrels, boxes or packages of pork, beef, &c., imported, the quantity in 'pounds' simply being shown.

2. The quantity and value of pork, beef, mutton, lamb and cheese imported into Canada, by countries, during the months of October, November, December and January was as follows:

BACON AND HAMS, SHOULDERS AND SIDES.

—	Country.	Pounds.	Value.
			$
October, 1910...	Great Britain...	24	5
	United States...	812,893	139,483
	China	271	15
	Hong Kong.....	100	8
November, 1910.	Great Britain...	420	90
	United States...	299,258	54,312
	Belgium	35	12
	Hong Kong.....	455	23
December, 1910.	Great Britain...	74	18
	United States...	234,408	39,716
	New Zealand...	20,304	2,894
	Hong Kong.....	741	50
January, 1911...	Great Britain...	56	13
	United States. .	223,392	34,240
	Hong Kong.....	515	28
	Japan	62	4

BEEF, SALTED, IN BARRELS.

October, 1910....	United States...	247,361	17,511
November, 1910.	United States...	271,468	18,933
December, 1910	United States ..	134,092	8,636
	Newfoundland...	1,255	151
January, 1911...	Great Britain....	7,902	702
	United States....	92,944	6,255

MUTTON AND LAMB, FRESH.

October, 1910....	United States....	76,027	7,046
	Australia.....	217,266	15,766
November, 1910	United States....	33,760	3,251
	Australia.....	163,909	12,341
December, 1910..	United States....	71,720	6,063
	Australia.....	179,470	11,880
January, 1911...	United States....	54,665	5,027
	Australia.....	157,927	10,371

PORK, BARRELLED, IN BRINE.

October, 1910...	Great Britain. ..	2,568	304
	United States...	1,121,100	114,523
	China...	66	4
November, 1910.	United States. ..	824,265	85,189
	Hong Kong.. ..	1,855	131
December, 1910	United States...	467,820	45,582
	Newfoundland ..	2,916	322
	China.....	291	25
	Hong Kong.....	3,499	246
January, 1911...	Great Britain....	45,000	5,919
	United States...	852,135	83,072
	Hong Kong.....	302	19

OTHER MEATS, FRESH.

—	Country.	Pounds.	Value.
			$
October, 1910...	United States...	59,596	7,774
	Australia.....	6,480	146
November, 1910.	United States...	27,019	4,028
December, 1910.	United States...	42,350	5,303
	Australia.	800	97
January, 1911...	United States...	29,397	4,526
	Australia.....	11,902	595

OTHER MEATS, SALTED.

October, 1910. .	United States...	58,941	8,191
	Hong Kong.....	4,831	323
	China.....	866	57
November, 1910.	United States...	22,701	3,187
	Italy..... ..	631	179
	France	220	81
	China.	1,481	105
	Hong Kong.....	950	66
December, 1910.	Great Britain....	554	144
	United States...	25,590	3,645
	Hong Kong.....	3,071	240
	Newfoundland ..	900	93
January, 1910...	Great Britain....	36,800	2,228
	United States...	22,538	3,037
	Hong Kong.....	200	10
	China	200	12

CHEESE.

October, 1910...	Great Britain...	8,967	1,774
	United States...	21,716	4,234
	France.....	15,879	3,158
	Italy.....	72,709	16,378
	Belgium	14,489	210
	Switzerland.....	30,197	5,254
	Holland.....	2,400	397
	Germany.....	1,960	391
November, 1910.	Great Britain....	10,161	2,276
	United States...	19,539	3,708
	France	22,482	4,754
	Italy.....	23,224	4,320
	Switzerland.....	36,317	6,755
	Germany.... .	18,449	3,141
	Belgium	963	123
December, 1910.	Great Britain-...	5,184	1,300
	United States...	20,274	3,961
	France	44,559	12,173
	Italy.....	66,775	8,878
	Austria-Hungary	3,439	427
	Turkey in Asia..	850	40
	Switzerland.....	31,873	5,717
	New Zealand....	260	32
	Holland.....	3,543	443
January, 1911...	Great Britain....	979	254
	United States...	18,261	3,418
	France.....	1,810	517
	Italy.....	18,280	3,453
	Turkey in Asia..	538	42
	Switzerland	33,519	6,238

NOTE—Figures for the month of February will not be available for ten days.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds).

METEGHAN RIVER FORESHORE LOTS.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Have any grants of foreshore lots at Meteghan river, Digby county, been made by the government since 1896?
2. If so, when and to whom were such grants made, what prices were paid, respectively, and what were the dimensions of the respective lots?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

BRIER ISLAND LIGHT.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Has any application been received from the keeper of the Brier island light for the erection of a new light?
2. If so, when was such application received, what steps have been taken in the matter, and what is the intention of the department as to the erection of a new house?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1 and 2. Light keepers, Brier island, under date 3rd April, 1905, asked permission to occupy dwelling erected for fog alarm engineer, and failing that, he requested repairs to old dwelling. An application was received through Mr. A. J. S. Copp, M.P., from keeper, dated 17th March, 1906, for repairs to old dwelling. Repairs were effected. Under date 12th February, 1911, the agent of the Marine Department, Halifax, recommended that a new dwelling be erected for the light keeper. This matter is receiving consideration.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. What was the salary paid to the lightkeeper at Brier island at the time of his appointment in 1901?
2 What increase has since been made, if any, when, and what salary is he now paid?
3. When was the last general increase in the salaries paid to lightkeepers, and what is the intention of the government as to a further increase in said salaries?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. $400 per annum.
2. Increase of $60 from April 1, 1908. Present salary $460 per annum.
3. Increase dated from April 1, 1908. It is the intention to increase lightkeepers' salaries generally.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MR. GERMAN.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). Before the orders of the day are called I wish to make a statement explanatory of the vote that was taken last night on the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the opposition on going into Committee of Ways and Means. When you Mr. Speaker, left the Chair at six o'clock the position of things was such, that as I apprehend every hon. member of this House had no idea that the vote would be taken immediately after your taking the chair after the dinner hour, at least I, with several others, had no such idea. I reached the House about twenty minutes past eight, and came to the door just as you, Sir, had finished putting the question, and being too late to vote on the question I followed the usual rule, and did not attempt to enter the Chamber. But I wish to place myself on record, Mr. Speaker, that had I been here I would have voted for the amendment of the leader of the opposition, and if it were possible I would like my vote so recorded. I think it is due to myself to make this statement, and I am glad to have an opportunity of doing so.

APPOINTMENT OF COLOURED PERSONS TO CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. DANIEL. There is a statement in this morning's paper to the effect that a young coloured man who had passed first on the list for a certain position in the naval service, was, on making his appearance to take his position, not allowed to do so. The article is headed: 'Negro did not get the job;' is colour line drawn in naval department; officials deny there is any discrimination, but man qualified is transferred elsewhere.' There are in the article other statements giving certificates of character to this young man. It says:

R. B. Nelles, secretary of the Y.M.C.A., has a high opinion of young Simpson. I cannot see any reason for refusing him, he said, as I think him an exceptionally capable young man and fit to associate with any one. He has a room here and is an exemplary fellow.

I wish the Minister of Naval Affairs to state whether objection has been taken to this young man on account of his colour.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the first time the matter has been brought to my attention, and I know nothing about it. Had my hon. friend given me notice of the question I would have made inquiries.

Mr. DANIEL. I thought the minister might have seen it in the morning paper.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to another case where a coloured gentleman who was at the head of the examination list for the Census Department, instead of being put in that position was given an inferior position by the Minister of Agriculture, looking after the black Minorca hens on the farm. I trust the Prime Minister will not allow that kind of thing to spread throughout the departments.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I never heard of it.

RECIPROCITY—STATISTICAL INFORMATION.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the orders of the day are called I wish to mention to the Prime Minister that very important and valuable statistics have been brought down to the Senate of the United States, compiled I believe by the Statistical Department or the Tariff Board, and that we seem to be entirely without similar information in this House. I have not had an opportunity of looking over all of this pamphlet which I received only this morning, but it seems to give a great deal of information as to industrial conditions, as to wages, and more than that as to the price of commodities in both countries. I would ask whether or not any information of a similar character is available here, and if so, whether it is the intention of the government to lay it on the table of the House?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not seen the pamphlet in question. The United States government has a tariff board which is at all times gathering information more or less relating to tariffs. There is no similar organization here. Whatever information has been available in reference to the reciprocity matter has already been placed before the House.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There has been none.

Mr. FIELDING. I differ from my hon. friend on that; we are each entitled to our opinion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps I have overlooked it, but I would ask whether any information has been submitted, with regard to wages, price of commodities and things of that kind.

Mr. FIELDING. One hon. gentleman in debating the matter in the House referred to information to some extent of that character which will be found in the book of the Minister of Labour which is accessible to us all. The question of prices was dealt with rather fully and statistics brought down by the Minister of Agriculture. There is no other information available.

BRITISH NATIONAL SONGS.

Mr. HUGHES. I understand that a gentleman named Armstrong is a member of the commission on technical education which is now in the city. I wish to ask if any inquiry was made as to the stand taken by Mr. Armstrong in the west a short time ago in relating to the singing of British songs in the schools. Did any one catechise this gentleman as to what he meant by his statement in that regard.

Mr. REID (Grenville).

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So far as I know, nobody has catechised Mr. Armstrong as to the opinions he expressed in the west or elsewhere, nor do I believe that it is a matter on which he should be catechised. Mr. Armstrong is an independent citizen, he happens at present to be a member of a commission and I do not think we would have reason to question him as to his private views.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Were the remarks made by him when he was discharging his duty as commissioner, or were they made by him outside altogether of his official functions? That is an important consideration, The Prime Minister says that, being a citizen of this country, he has a right to express his opinion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is entirely correct, but the situation may be altered a little if he expresses those opinions in the course of his duties as a commissioner. I would like to know if the Prime Minister has any information as to that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no information as to either that or the other fact. I shall have the matter looked into.

Mr. HUGHES. I asked a question at the time. It was in the official discharge of his duty. He had a number of gentlemen before him, and it was he who volunteered the statement that he did not want the intrusion of any British songs on these dear, good people from the United States. I subsequently ascertained that the people from the United States had never directly or indirectly objected to the British songs, but that Mr. Armstrong had objected, and had raised the point that British songs like 'Rule Britannia' should not be sung, but that they might sing Canadian songs. A gentleman like that is not fit for a commission.

Mr. MACDONALD. I happen to know the Hon. Mr. Armstrong, the gentleman referred to. I know that the sentiments attributed to him in that newspaper report are entirely unworthy of the sentiments he entertains. I had an opportunity of speaking to him, and he stated that the newspaper report was absolutely untrue.

Mr. HUGHES. Why did he not contradict it?

Mr. SPEAKER. The point cannot be discussed now.

Mr. HUGHES. I am asking a question.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Probably he did not think it worth while.

APPOINTMENT OF CENSUS OFFICIALS.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the policy of the Department of Agriculture in respect to the selection of census commissioners and enumerators, and on whose recommendation are these appointments made?

Mr. FISHER. The policy is to secure the appointment of efficient, trustworthy people and to get such information as will lead to such appointments. The appointments are made on the recommendation of the minister, based on information acquired by him.

WAYS AND MEANS—INFORMATION RE RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I wish to revert to the question of information respecting these tariff resolutions. The Minister of Finance brought down a little pamphlet showing the alterations that would be made if this agreement went through, but outside of that there is practically no information that we can get unless we go to the several blue-books that are brought before this House annually. What is the result? The result is that members on both sides of the House derive their information from blue-books, and contradictory statements are consequently made, so that the public are not sure who is right. Why should we not have supplied by the government full and definite information such as the House at Washington had when these matters were placed before them? The refusal of the Minister of Finance to furnish such a statement convinces me that the minister does not want to give the public the information necessary for them to judge whether or not this is a correct bargain. Why should the minister try to blindfold the people, or not to give information? In making his announcement, the minister did not inform us as to the other favoured nation countries that would enjoy the benefit of this agreement, but when the member for South Ontario asked what other countries would be affected the answer was such that the people could read it either one way or another, and a newspaper in eastern Canada quoted that statement to show that statements made in this House that other countries would have the benefit of this arrangement were not true. We must see the effect of every change in each item on the different parts of the country. The Minister of Finance deliberately, and, I might say, if it were within parliamentary rules, wilfully tried to keep information back to prevent us properly enlightening the people of this country. I, as a member of this House, demand as a right that we should receive this information. I think we are entitled to it, and if the minister wants to get these resolutions through in any kind of reasonable time, if he will give this information he will get them through a great deal quicker than by holding back this information. We should have the amount of imports and exports of each of these items, and we should also have the exports from other countries, with the rates of duties, prices, &c. If the minister thinks that he can drive these resolutions through by blindfolding the people he is making an awful mistake. I am going to get this information; if we cannot get it one way we will have to keep at it until we do. The minister must give us the information in his possession, and if he will not give it in pamphlet form, so that we can read it intelligently, he will have to give it in the House. That is what he is paid for by the people of the country, and he has to do it. I will do my duty in seeing that he does do it.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The Prime Minister, in making his speech two days ago, referred to the fact that we, by this bargain that has been made by the United States, have admitted some countries under some old treaties. He made very light of these old treaties. He did not inform the House that by this bargain he admitted Great Britain and the British possessions as well as these foreign countries into this market, and that by this arrangement he had lowered the protection to the farmers on the great part of their products. He has not brought down any information to us, but I have asked a few questions on the Order Paper, and I wish to read a list of some of the articles produced in this country that have been brought in even with the present rate of duty, which the minister wipes out altogether on some lines and reduces on others. I asked the following questions:

1. How many barrels, boxes or packages of pork, beef, mutton, lamb and cheese have been imported into Canada during the months of October, November and December, 1910, and for the months of January and February, 1911?

2. What was the weight and value thereof, and the countries from which the same were imported?

3. What was the number of pounds of butter and number of dozen of eggs, and the value thereof, and the countries imported from, for the month of February, 1911?

The minister gave an answer covering all these months except February, the figures for which he says will not be available for ten days, but we have been given some figures, and by these I find that in October, 1910, there was imported into Canada of pork, beef, mutton, cheese:

	Lbs.
From Great Britain..	24
United States..	812,893
China..	271
Hong Kong..	100

In November, 1910:

	Lbs.
From Great Britain	420
United States	299,258
Belgium	35
Hong Kong	455

I want to pick out a few of the principal items. Take mutton and lamb, in October, 1910, the United States sent us 76,027 lbs. and Australia 217,266 lbs. Australia is one of the countries which, under this proposed agreement, will get the benefit of the reduced tariff; and yet, in the face of the high tariff at present existing, that country sent into Canada in October, 1910, 217,000 lbs. of mutton lamb, in December, 1910, 179,470 lbs., in November 1910, 163,909 lbs., in December, 1910, 179,470 lbs, and in January, 1911, 157,927 lbs. But these products are now to be allowed in at reduced duty to the detriment of Canadian farmers.

Take pork barrelled, in October, 1910, the United States sent into Canada 1,121,100 lbs., China 66 lbs.; in November, 1910, the United States sent 824,265 lbs., in December, 1910, 467,820 lbs., Newfoundland 2,916 lbs., China 291, and Hong Kong 3,499 lbs. These are all to be allowed in at a reduced tariff, under this proposed treaty, to the great injury of the farmers of this country.

Take cheese, another one of the most important products of the farmers of this country. The imports of this into Canada was as follows in October, 1910:

	Lbs.
Great Britain	8,967
United States	21,716
France	15,879
Italy	72,709
Belgium	1,489
Switzerland	30,197
Holland	2,400
Germany	1,960

These were the imports during October last, yet the right hon. the Prime Minister with a wave of the hand, says that these countries export nothing to Canada of the articles mentioned in the schedule of this agreement. Why, here we have a list from the Customs Department as long as your arm of the articles which have come into Canada from these countries even in face of the high duties; and under this proposed agreement they will come in free, by virtue of the favoured nation clause, from all these countries, as well as from the United States. Take our imports in November, 1910. In the month we imported as follows:

	Lbs.
From Great Britain	10,161
United States	19,539
France	22,482
Italy	23,224
Switzerland	36,317
Germany	18,449
Belgium	963

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds).

And in December we imported:

	Lbs.
From Great Britain	5,184
United States	20,274
France	44,559
Italy	66,775
Aust.-Hungary	3,439
Turkey in Asia	850
Switzerland	31,873
New Zealand	260
Holland	3,543

Yet the Prime Minister says that these do not amount to anything. These were allowed into Canada under the present tariff, but after this proposed arrangement comes into force they will be let in practically free. Then take our imports in January, 1911, of cheese:

	Lbs.
From Great Britain	979
United States	18,261
France	1,810
Italy	18,280
Switzerland	33,519
Turkey in Asia	538

The products of all these countries are henceforth to be allowed into Canada free because we are to get a free market with 90,000,000 people, and these 90,000,000 people are to get a free market with 8,000,000, but they have three times the quantity of goods to export that we have. Yet the right hon. the Prime Minister tells us that the shipments from these countries I have mentioned will not amount to anything under the favoured nation clause.

Mr. PATERSON. Give the values. You will find them in the list.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I have not added up the totals. But let me just give one value, namely pork, $114,523.

Mr. PATERSON. From what country?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The United States.

Mr. PATERSON. That alters the case.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The total amounts to over $1,000,000, but I have not had time to add them up.

Mr. PATERSON. Of that amount, how much would come in under the favoured nation clause?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The United States is made a favoured nation as well as the others. Before to-day these people had to pay a duty on this pork, yet in the face of that duty they sent it into Canada to the injury of our farmers, and under this agreement they will send in considerably more, and my hon. friend will find how the farmers will resent this policy at the next elections.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH UNITED STATES.

House again in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLER. When the committee adjourned last night I was making the argument that an arrangement, to be of lasting benefit and permanent, must be a bargain that will give advantages to both sides. Let me give one or two instances to show how the benefits, under the proposed agreement, will accrue both to the United States and Canada. Some time ago I read an address to the right hon. the Prime Minister in pamphlet form against this proposed arrangement, and in that address I noticed particularly some words spoken by Mr. Wm. White, vice-president of the Canadian Pacific railway. Mr. White said:

That the Canadian Pacific railway has had to purchase in Winnipeg for their dining cars chickens from Chicago, and were also importing cream from the United States.

I suppose it is fair to presume that if the Canadian Pacific railway had to buy poultry and cream for use in Winnipeg from the United States, other residents of Winnipeg had to do likewise. This we can readily understand because we know that the farmers around Winnipeg are not engaged in raising dairy products, but rather in growing grain and feeding stock. Had there been no duty, the Winnipeg people would have been able to get their cream and poultry from the United States at so much less. But, Sir, at the very time when the people in Winnipeg were finding it to their advantage to buy poultry and cream in the United States, the farmers of Ontario and Quebec were selling their cream in large quantities to the people of the United States just across the border. The people of the province of Quebec sold in the United States last year, even with a small duty in the way, cream to the value of nearly $1,000,000; and the dairymen of Ontario shipped cream to the United States last year to the value of between $500,000 and $1,000,000. Then, the removal of the duty on this item of cream would be to the advantage of the United States farmers who sell cream and also to the advantage of the Canadian farmers who sell cream as well as to the Canadian and American consumers of this article. Let me mention another similar case . I have here a brief account, which appeared in the Montreal 'Gazette' February 4 last, of a meeting of the Boston Fruit and Produce Exchange, held the day before. It says:

The members of the Boston Fruit and Produce Exchange voted to petition the Massachusetts senators and representatives in Congress to support to-day the Canadian reciprocity agreement. A resolution was adopted declaring that the members heartily commend the terms of the agreement. The resolution points out that thousands of barrels of apples are yearly shipped from Canada to Europe, and expresses the belief that if free trade is established Canadian producers will ship their apples to the middle west, leaving a large portion of the foreign trade to New England farmers.

This is a declaration by the practical fruit growers of the eastern states, that, if this agreement were in force, they would find a better market for their apples, without the competition of Canadian fruit growers, in the markets of Europe, and that the Canadian apple grower would find a market for his fruit in the middle states, thus benefiting the producers of apples in both places, and not raising the price to consumers in either country, but probably having the contrary effect of reducing the prices. The hon. member for North Toronto argued, and several other hon. members have made the same argument, that the reciprocity secured under this agreement will be largely a sectional, occasional reciprocity. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) instanced hay, as an illustration. He said when, in case of drought or for other cause, hay was a short crop in the United States, the Canadian crop of hay would find a market across the line. But he said that if, under such circumstances, the United States required our hay, they would buy it and pay the duty. But he pointed out—and to some extent he was right—that, under this agreement, we not only obtained a market in the United States, but that we give a market in Canada to the people of the United States. This arrangement, in exceptional years and under exceptional circumstances, will have the tendency to regulate prices and to prevent the prices being exorbitant in any part of either country. For instance, I remember, and other members of the House I am sure will not have forgotten, that in 1895 and 1896, in the western part of Ontario, and also extending into the Kingston district and other parts of eastern Ontario, long-continued dry weather caused hay and straw to be very short crops. If, in these two years, we had had no duty upon any hay coming into Ontario from the United States, it would have been a very great benefit to the men who owned cattle on this side of the line at a time when many cattle perished in Canada because of lack of food. The hon. member for North Toronto argued, and others have followed him in this argument also, that the advantage we shall obtain will be a fitful and constantly-changing advantage. Let me read what the hon. gentleman said as to this:

Reciprocity, I think, has this as a prime condition—that it shall be between two countries, each producing a surplus, but a surplus in a different line of articles, and each wanting articles of which the other's surplus is made up. More than that, for ideal reciprocity, this should not be a mere occasional surplus, but should be the result of fixed conditions of climate, soil, and so on, that will make the surplus permanent. Two countries that show ideal conditions of reciprocity in trade would be the West India islands and Canada. The West Indies produce a surplus of tropical fruits, of which we produce none. But they produce absolutely no dairy products, none of the food products of the temperate zone, of which we produce a great surplus. These are examples of two countries between which a reciprocity trade arrangement could be made with great profit. In the same way, reciprocity between us and Great Britain is possible in lines or articles which will readily suggest themselves to the minds of hon. members. But in the case of the arrangement we are now discussing, you are trying to establish reciprocity between two countries, each of which has a surplus, and a surplus of exactly the same products. With the exception of cheese and fish, the United States of America has a surplus of every article which goes from Canada, under this arrangement, into the United States. And not a slim surplus, but in every respect a substantial surplus, and in some respects a very large surplus.

The argument, then, is that in Canada our farmers export to Britain products of the farm; the farmers of the United States export the same thing to the same market and, as they are growers of like produce, and exporters to the same market, this arrangement cannot be of any permanent and steady advantage to Canada. Sir, that is not the case. I will admit, as everybody must admit, that at the present time, the United States is exporting large quantities of certain lines of farm produce. But I argue—and I can substantiate my argument—that the surplus of the United States is very rapidly decreasing, and it will not be very long until that country has no surplus of farm produce to export. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) helped me in substantiating this argument. He quoted from the speech of Congressman McCall, who introduced this resolution in the United States Congress, as saying:

> The Canadian surplus of wheat is steadily increasing; ours is steadily diminishing.

That is the fact as to wheat, and it is equally true as to almost every other farm product that the United States is to-day exporting. Let me quote some figures in proof of what I say. I will not go further back than the year 1906, but I give the figures from and including that year, showing the United States exports of farm produce in certain lines:

	1906.	1907.	1908.	1909.
	$	$	$	$
Cattle	42,081,170	34,577,392	29,339,134	18,046,976
Hogs	630,998	309,440	307,202	144,605
Sheep	804,090	750,242	589,285	365,155
Fresh beef	24,310,038	26,367,287	20,339,377	12,698,594
Canned beef	6,430,446	1,615,808	2,467,895	1,645,822
Salted and pickled beef	4,697,742	3,740,212	3,213,480	3,438,048
Otherwise cured beef	22,063	107,956	106,470	34,319
Fresh pork	1,261,412	1,143,886	1,551,450	938,025
Butter	4,922,913	2,429,489	1,407,962	1,268,210

My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and, I think, also my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) argued that, while the United States was not exporting as much in live cattle to-day as it did a few years ago, it was exporting chilled and frozen meat in larger quantities than formerly. But the figures prove exactly the contrary. But, Mr. Chairman, if we desired any further evidence as to the falling off in the exports of farm products from the United States, let me refer you to the British Journal of the Board of Agriculture. Speaking of the matter of bacon, this report says that there was a great falling off in the export of bacon from the United States to Britain in the year 1910. There was exported in that year only 1,307,000 hundred weight, as compared with 2,858,000 hundred weight in 1908. Speaking of the matter of cattle, the above report says:

> The past year has seen a further decline in the number of live cattle imported into the United Kingdom, the number received being less than in any year since 1877. Only two countries (apart from the Channel islands) participate in this trade, namely, the United States and Canada, and the diminution in the export is no doubt attributable to the increased demand for cattle in the United States.

Then as to the matter of cheese just referred to by the hon. member for Leeds, this journal speaking of the imports of this item, says:

The supply of cheese showed a small increase, Canada maintaining its position as the principal exporter. An increase is noticeable in the receipts from New Zealand, while those from the United States have now become of little importance.

Speaking again of flour, this British journal says:

The receipts of flour were less than in 1909, owing to a further falling off from the United States.

Then speaking of the British imports of oats, the journal says:

Germany furnishes 2,822,000 hundredweight, while the imports from the United States were insignificant.

So we see from this British authority that the imports of Britain of farm products from the United States is very rapidly decreasing. Let me quote from another authority, I quote this from an address delivered by Professor Cyril Hopkins of the University of Illinois. This address was delivered by Professor Hopkins on the 15th of June last, to an association of bankers in the state of Illinois. Professor Hopkins, speaking of the very matter to which I am referring, the rapidly decreasing export and the rapidly decreasing production of food stuffs in the United States, says this:

If we take two five year averages in relation to our exportation of corn and wheat, the two greatest sources of food stuffs in the United States, taking the average for the last five years in the old country, and compare that with the average of the last five years up to the present time, we have figures that are pretty reliable, and exportation products are weighed, and not guessed at, as you know. The products that go out of the country are determined with a high degree of accuracy. The report on crop statistics within the United States is an estimate, but the exportation is not an estimate, it is weighed product. We find by comparing those two five years averages that the exportation of wheat from this country decreased from 37 per cent to 17 per cent of our total production, over a ten year period. We find that the exportation of corn decreased from 9 per cent to 3 per cent of our total production during the same period. Now, those two sets of statistics ought to mean a good deal to us. Our population has been doubling every thirty years for the last century, and the increase is being maintained at nearly the same rate, so far as we can learn yet. And our exportation has decreased until at the present time we export almost no food stuffs compared with what we produce in America.

Mr. William C. Brown, president of the New York Central lines, in an address delivered to the Railway Business Association on the 10th of last November, said:

If our decrease in exportation continues, and if our increased consumption continues, as compared with our production, before the middle of the next decade the great exporting grain elevators in the sea-board cities will stand empty, and this country, like those of the old world, will be looking for a place to buy the necessities of life.

Now, Sir, these figures mean something to us, as they mean something to the people of the United States. They mean to us that Canada will have an increasing market for her farm products in the United States as the years go by. These figures mean not only that we will have an increased demand for our farm products in the United States, but they mean that the arrangement we are now entering into will be a permanent arrangement. For, Sir, as the years go by, and the United States are less able to produce within their territory the food with which to feed their own people, they will not be so unwise as to cancel an arrangement that enables them to buy food for their people that they will be unable to produce themselves.

Sir, if we will refer to the very able speech made in this House a few evenings ago by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), we will find that we are just beginning to cultivate the soil of Canada. We will find that there is only a small fractional part of the fertile lands of our northwestern country that has yet been disturbed by the plough. In the years shortly to come we will be producing in Canada a hundred times more farm products than we are producing to-day. But that is not the condition in the United States. Professor Van Heis, of the University of Wisconsin, has recently written a book upon the conservation of the natural resources of the United States; and Professor Van Heis writes as follows:

It is not so many years since we heard the song 'Uncle Sam is rich enough to give us all a farm.' The better part of the public domain has now passed to private parties, and during the closing years of the nineteenth century the land hunger of hundreds of thousands of the citizens of the United States was for the first time unsatisfied.

The hon. member for North Toronto in discussing the matter of natural resources felt justified—and I will not say that he was wrong—in considering the people that are to live in this country a thousand years hence. If any hon. member of this House, in considering the question of the preservation of our resources, is wise in considering the people who shall live in this country a thousand years hence, then surely we are not less wise in considering what shall be our condition ten or fifteen years hence. It is a matter of importance to secure a trade with the United States that will be of great benefit to us at once and of immensely greater benefit to us in ten or fifteen years hence.

Mr. BLAIN. Has my hon. friend the figures of the United States production of wheat in 1908, 1909 and 1910 before him?

Mr. MILLER. No, I have not, but I have given to my hon. friend and the members of the committee the figures of the exports. I have given them the statement that their surplus is decreasing very rapidly year after year.

Mr. BLAIN. The production of wheat in the United States in 1909 was 713,000,000 bushels and in 1908, 648,000,000 bushels, an increase in one year of 65,000,000 bushels.

Mr. MILLER. Yes, but if my hon. friend will take a number of years he will find that the production of wheat in the United States has not been increasing although an increase may be shown by taking an exceptional year. I have pointed out that in one or two other instances the hon. member for North Toronto contradicted his own argument. Let me give the members of the committee a further contradiction, and a very distinct contradiction by that hon. gentleman. He has argued that as Canada is exporting farm products and as the United States is exporting farm products the people of the United States will not require the products of Canadian farms. Then the hon. member for North Toronto in the same speech quotes the following language from President Taft. He says:

> And President Taft, in his message to the United States Congress, says that what the United States must set itself to do is to increase its exports on the line of manufactured goods. That is its future. It cannot expect to make large exportations of food and other products. What we want, he says, is raw material close at hand; what we want is cheap foodstuffs so far as we can get them from the northern country in order that we may be better provided and furnished for this increased product and increased export of the industries of this country, in which our future lies in our record of the world trade.

If any hon. member of this House, whether upon my own side or the other assures me that the United States will not want to buy our farm products, but on the other hand, quotes to me the words of President Taft who says that the people of the United States will want to buy our farm products, I prefer to take the statement, and the opinion of the President of the United States. But, then, Mr. Chairman, there is the mournful argument of Canada becoming the backyard of the United States. I quote from the Toronto 'News' the following clipping from a speech of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). The Toronto 'News' gives prominence to this statement of the hon. member. It is printed in large black type and the item is headed 'Backyard of Chicago:'

> I cannot tell you how I feel about this country being made the backyard of the city of Chicago—Hon. Clifford Sifton.

Sir, I happen to own a little backyard behind my own residence, and if somebody will find in that back yard a gold mine or a diamond mine that will make me rich I will not be particular if you call it a backyard or what you call it. That argument has been made by a great many persons. The states of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri and the other western and middle western states were once in the same way the backyard of the Atlantic manufacturing states of the American union. But while they were in the same sense the backyard of the manufacturing states of the union they grew farm products which they shipped and sold to the manufacturing states of the union, and with what result? While they were thus the backyard of the manufacturing states of the union, the land in these states to which I have referred, which was worth $5 or $6 per acre forty or fifty years ago, is worth to-day $100 or $200 an acre simply for agricultural purposes. You may call the western plains of Canada, you may call the farms of Quebec, of Ontario, of the maritime provinces, backyards if you like, but if you can make the value of these backyards $100 or $200 per acre for growing food products that shall be sent to the very same markets to which these western states that I have spoken of have sold their farm products, if the result will be the same—and who will say that it will not be—then I say that the backyard argument has no force at all. Sir, I have said that these states of Illinois, Indiana, and other western and middle western states became prosperous and their lands increased in value while they grew food products for the manufacturing states. But while they were growing these food products they became manufacturing states as well, and they built up within their territory such cities as the very city mentioned by the hon. member for Brandon, the city of Chicago, a great manufacturing city, St. Paul, Minneapolis, Omaha, and all the other large manufacturing cities that are now situated in what was once a purely agricultural district of the United States. The same thing will be true of the western plains of Canada, and the same thing will be true, even more largely than it is true to-day, that as the farmers of the several provinces of Canada prosper, grow wealthy and add to the value of their soil, by cultivation, as their prosperity increases, as the value of their property increases, and as the population of these districts increase they will build up flourishing manufacturing cities and centres, and will not deserve, as they do not

now deserve, the term of backyard to the United States.

I am told that under this agreement the railway interests will suffer. Well, Sir, I take it that the railways of Canada were built for men, and not men for the railways. If either has to suffer, Canadian railways or Canadian men, then I prefer to let the railways suffer, but I do not think there is any evidence at all that the Canadian railways, upon which we have spent a great deal of money, which have done a useful work for Canada, and which are doing it well, will suffer as a result of this agreement. My hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Neely), in a speech which he made in this House, pointed to the fact, as other hon. gentlemen have since done, that the Canadian Pacific Railway stock is soaring to-day, that Canadian Pacific railway is worth $25 per share more than it was when we began to discuss this resolution. What does that mean? It means that Canadian business men, that United States business men, that the business men of the British Empire and the business men of Holland, in all of which countries Canadian Pacific Railway stock is held, have not one single bit of confidence in that argument, and do not attach any importance to the statement that Canadian railway interests will suffer by this proposal. My hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) quoted the opinion of Sir Donald Mann as to the effect of it upon the large railway line in which he is interested. We have had a woeful letter from Sir William Van Horne.

Mr. BRADBURY. Does the hon. gentleman say that Canadian Pacific Railway stock has advanced $25 per share since we started the discussion of this question?

Mr. MILLER. That is what I did say. I think that Canadian Pacific railway, when this resolution was first spoken of, was about 185; to-day it is worth 214.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would like to say to the hon. gentleman that he is entirely mistaken.

Mr. MILLER. I will not dispute with the hon. gentleman as to the exact figures, but he will admit that Canadian Pacific railway stock has very rapidly increased in value since the resolution was introduced into this House.

Mr. LALOR. That is hedging the question.

Mr. MILLER. I have referred to the dcleful letter of Sir Wm. Van Horne, and in contradistinction to that let me quote what was said by Mr. Thomas Skinner, the English director of the Canadian Pacific railway, as published in the Montreal 'Gazette' of the 4th of February:

Thomas Skinner, the English director of the Canadian Pacific railway, in an interview confesses that he views the agreement with mixed feelings. If ratified, he said, the agreement would have a disturbing effect on the Transcontinental railway, but the growth and development of the northwestern provinces of Canada were so great and rapid that he had no misgivings that this would more than meet the change arising from the agreement. On the whole, Mr. Skinner thought this agreement advantageous to Canada, and though politically somewhat dangerous he was perfectly confident of Canada's loyalty to the mother country.

Mr. James J. Hill was speaking a few months ago as to the present condition of United States railways, and he said it would take an immediate cash expenditure of six billion dollars to put the American railways in such shape as that they could properly carry the traffic there is for them to carry. And such will be the condition of Canadian railways. As Mr. Skinner has said, with the development of our western country, all our present existing railways would be overtaxed and we would have to have new railway lines. It has been urged by some, and I think it was stated in the letter of Sir Wm. Van Horne, that Mr. Hill's roads have now their noses resting on the international boundary line ready to cross into Canada and take Canadian trade to the south. But I would ask Sir Wm. Van Horne at how many places does the Canadian Pacific railway cross the international line for the purpose of carrying trade from Canada into the United States? Hon. members on the other side, and opponents of this measure in the country have a great deal of concern as to our natural resources. The member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says:

That is the policy shining out in every line and article of this proposed agreement. The United States knows what it is after. With a tariff wall against the world, desiring to preserve its own unused natural resources so far as it can, dipping into the natural resources of Canada so far as it may be able to, fortifying itself by the conservation of its own and by the destruction of ours, making itself the great manufacturing country of the world and increasing its wealth and its power in that way.

Sir, the hon. member for North Toronto was wise enough not to argue that we in Canada have any control whatever over the United States tariff. For many years rough sawn lumber has been admitted free of duty from the United States into Canada, and I do not know that we ever had a custom tariff on lumber entering this Dominion. Every member of this House must realize that the United States have quite as good a right to place lumber on their free list as we have to keep it on our free list, and if the United States have the right to place lumber on their free list then they have the right to place on that free list

every other natural product we have in Canada. But the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) made this argument. He said:

If this agreement goes into force, a year from now this government may find, and the Conservation Commission may advise this government that certain of our natural resources should not be exported except under such and such conditions, or that they ought not to be exported at all, or that such of them as are made should be made under regulations and made in this country alone. As we are now we have a perfect right to pass that legislation; we have given bonds to nobody.

That is a perfectly fair statement of the case; that while this parliament has no right whatever to interfere with the tariff of the United States we have the power, and if we choose to exercise it the right to impose export duties or to prevent or impede export of any of our natural resources. But while we have that power and right I will ask the member for North Toronto and every other member on that side of the House whether they think they would now, or in one year, or fifty years hence, advise the Canadian government to take that action. Sir, that is a game at which two can play. I do not think it wise for us to provoke such a war as that. If the government of the United States, of their own initiative, should prevent the export of their raw products it would be our part as men to meet them and checkmate them, and act as independently as they; but, Sir, the United States are not making any attempt to pass any such legislation, or to in any such way restrict the export of their natural resources. I have quoted from the work of Prof. Van Heiss on the conservation of the natural resources of the United States, and in that work he advises that it might be best for the United States to prohibit the export of many of their minerals especially, and other of their raw materials. And what would be the consequence? As I go through my own province of Ontario I find Ontario builders using Georgia pine. I have no doubt we could get along without that particular kind of lumber, but our builders use it because they find it convenient and profitable to use it. Canadian furniture manufacturers use large quantities of oak imported from the United States and not grown in Canada.

Last summer I was at Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, in the very large works of the Iron and Steel Company there. I saw their vessels bringing in United States ore which they mixed with Canadian ore to produce a better product. Their vessels were also bringing in immense quantities of United States coal, not obtainable in Ontario. How would this company, paying wages to many hundreds of workmen in Ontario, and other similar Canadian concerns exist with the United States prohibiting the export of its raw products? I go through the cement factories in the province of Ontario and I find them using United States coal and United States coke. I ask the members of this House who have knowledge of the subject how they think these Ontario cement companies could continue their business if they were deprived of the use of that coal and coke? In different parts of Canada there are large cotton factories, and we cannot grow cotton in any part of Canada, and if the United States prohibited the export of cotton these mills would have to shut down. Last night my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Lloyd Harris) said it ought not to be the policy of Canada to permit the export of unfinished products, but here are several instances in which the United States does permit the export from its territory to ours of raw products, so that we may make the finished article. Also, in the case of imported corn from the United States; the hon. member (Mr. Lloyd Harris) would not permit the Canadian farmer to sell his low grade wheat or barley, but would compel him, by legislation, to feed it to his stock on the farm. But the Canadian farmer to-day is importing corn grown in the States, just because the Canadian farmer finds it many times the cheapest food he can feed to his animals. The natural resource of which we are in the greatest danger of being deprived is our timber, and I would call attention to the fact that in 1899, three years after the Laurier administration assumed the care of the business affairs of Canada, they established a forestry branch, and through our Canadian forestry branch we are now encouraging the planting and preventing the annual loss of more timber than we are likely each year to export to the United States. Let me point to another contradiction in the speech of the hon. member to whom I have so often referred. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), after pointing out that the Canadian government is thus encouraging the depleting of our national resources, then argues that the United States would have reduced their tariff any way whether we had taken any action or not. He says:

That insurgent force that swept the Republicans out of power was pledged to a diminution of the tariff especially on food stuffs. The Republican party in that position, the Democratic party were pledged to a revision downward of the tariff especially on food stuffs. It was known by all men that the coming Congress soon to go into power would deal with that matter and it was known that it would deal with it in the line of taking off and diminishing duties especially upon natural resources and food stuffs. No one can deny that.

If no one can deny that, and no one has denied that the United States would have

so reduced or taken off the duties, then how can any man blame this government for what it is said the United States would have done anyway? I do not know whether the United States would or would not have done so, but that is the argument that is made by our friends on the other side and they cannot argue along both lines. We have heard a good deal of the word trustees and our friends opposite have argued that we, the people of this day, and especially the government of this day are the trustees for the Canadian people, and that as trustees we ought to preserve to the people of Canada the natural resources of our own Dominion. Sir, if we are trustees in 1911 for the people who shall live in Canada a thousand years from now, was not the hon. member for North Toronto equally a trustee of the Canadian people in 1891, was not Sir John Macdonald equally a trustee of the Canadian people in 1891, and was not Sir John Macdonald equally a trustee of the Canadian people in 1871, when he proposed just such an agreement as this? And Sir, will it make any difference to the people who live in Canada one thousand years from now whether such a bargain as this was made in 1911 or in 1891?

I have spoken of members blaming the government. It is the business of the opposition to blame the government, and they are very diligent in exercising that function. The leader of the opposition, in the speech which he made on the 26th of January, blamed the government, and particularly the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Customs, for what he termed their surrender last year, in 1910. The language of the leader of the opposition was as follows:

> The negotiations, in short, (that is the negotiations of this date) are a sequel to the surrender which this government made last year. I am, at the same time, of the opinion that if they had resisted firmly the government of the United States would never have imposed this maximum tariff against Canada.

That is the opinion of the leader of the opposition. It is the opinion of a political partisan, as we are all political partisans. If I expressed a contrary opinion that would also be the opinion of a partisan. But as to the negotiations in question let me quote the opinion of a man who is not a partisan; I refer to a work recently published by Professor T. W. Taussig, Henry Lee, professor of economics in Harward University, entitled: 'The Tariff History of the United States'. Professor Taussig, speaking of these very negotiations, says:

> Negotiations with Germany and France led to some relaxations of their duties and regulations as to American products; and, in true mercantile spirit, these were held forth as great gains to American industry, and inferentially as causes of detriment to the foreign countries concerned. Negotiations with Canada led to but the slightest concessions. That country refused, as already stated, to modify her regulations as to wood pulp, or to make any changes of moment in her general tariff system. Some minor changes were secured, which enabled the administration to make a respectable show of having gained something in the way of lower duties; and a tariff war, which at one time seemed probable, was averted.

The statement of Professor Taussig exactly agrees with the statement of the Minister of Finance that President Taft was friendly to Canada, that he did not desire to impose the maximum tariff, that under the circumstances there was nothing else left for him to do, and that a tariff war was inevitable unless we afforded President Taft some shadow of an excuse that might enable him to avert that tariff war and by making slight concessions, termed by Professor Taussig minor concessions, we made changes that did no harm to any man in Canada, that did no good to any man in the United States, so far as the economic aspect was concerned, but that gave President Taft the excuse he desired to avert a tariff war, which I am sure every man in Canada, whatever his politics, would say, would have been unwise and would have been a calamity.

Now, Sir, I come to the attitude towards this proposal of our Canadian manufacturers. The manufacturers of Canada are making a very strong appeal to-day. They made a very strong appeal to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and we found that appeal in the Montreal 'Star' a few weeks ago. That article which first appeared as a paid advertisement in the Montreal 'Star' has since then appeared as a paid advertisement in many other newspapers. We have had articles in the Canadian 'Century', and articles clipped from the Canadian 'Century' have appeared in the local press from one end of this Dominion to the other, also as paid advertisements. The Toronto 'News' has contained editorials and other articles in opposition to the treaty and let me read a part of a circular dated February 8, that was recently sent to an Ontario manufacturer from the office of the Toronto 'News:'

> We are devoting considerable space daily, both in our news columns and editorially, to this question, and we have taken the liberty of placing your name on our mailing sheets for one month. No charge will be made for the paper, but we hope you will be able to find time to read it each day.

I was lately in an Ontario factory, and in the office of that factory I saw several hundred pamphlets, neatly and attractively bound, containing speeches in opposition to this proposal, delivered by Mr. Russell. These were sent out by hundreds not only to this factory but, I suppose, to every factory in Canada for free distribution among the workmen in the factories. By these

means and by expending many, many thousands of dollars in printer's ink, and paid advertisements, the opponents of this proposed agreement have sought to create and have for a little while created a public opinion in opposition to this proposed arrangement. Let me say that this public opinion that has been created by the expending of so many dollars in printer's ink and newspaper advertising is but a temporary public opinion, it is frothy and on the surface and will not have any lasting effect in influencing the judgment of the Canadian people.

Now, Sir, I have not the slightest prejudice against Canadian manufacturers. We have in Canada great natural resources. We have great forest wealth, we have great mineral wealth, and there is no country in the world with greater water-powers. But we have something better than forests and mines and water-powers, we have men of manufacturing skill and ability, of business ability and of commercial enterprise. We have men of inventive genius, and, I am glad to say, of large capital, and there is no reason why Canada should not become a great manufacturing nation. My hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) I think it was, said yesterday that no one could intelligently argue this matter without putting the manufacturers on one side and the farmers on the other. In that I do not agree with him. In my opinion, if this arrangement will benefit the farmers, it will also benefit our manufacturers. I have no patience at all with those who call manufacturers thieves and robbers, who say that they are parasites preying upon the people. I respect a man, be he manufacturer or farmer, who is doing an honest day's work for an honest day's pay, and helping to build up this country. Some manufacturers are charged with being selfish and no doubt they are, just as are some of our farmers, and some of our members of parliament; and it may be that the manufacturers, through the manufacturers' association, occasionally give prominence to their selfish instinct. But while we require revenues for the building up of our great public enterprises—for the building of the Hudson Bay railway, the Georgian Bay canal, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Welland canal, for the extension and improvement of our rural postal system, for everything necessary to develop this great country—while we require revenues for these purposes, I believe it will be the will of the Canadian people, for many generations at least, that a large part of this money shall be raised by means of a customs duty. While this is the case, we ought to regulate our tariff and collect our duties in such a manner as will afford reasonable protection to the manufacturers and other industries throughout the limits of our Dominion. But where or how, under this proposed arrangement are manufacturers hit? If I refer again to the Toronto 'News,' and its report of the speech of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), and if I were to accept his statement, I might be led to conclude that our manufacturers are being hit. Well, I have great respect for the hon. gentleman, and that respect is not diminished because he has chosen to leave his party on this occasion. That is the right of every one sitting on either side of the House. I remember the time when, in his palmy days, the hon. gentleman had a good deal of influence in Canada; I remember when the name of Sifton was one to conjure with, but I do not agree in everything he said a few evenings ago. I find in the Toronto 'News' this quotatioin from his speech:

> Let me enumerate what I think will be a few of those effects. Some industries will be destroyed, there can be no doubt about that. What reason can be given for drawing your pen through an item of the tariff and shutting up an industry which is not accused of combining as against consumers, which is not accused of charging illicit prices or of any other evils; what reason can there be for selecting that industry and wiping it out of existence I cannot see. I am bound to say that it does not appeal to my common sense.

In reply to this, I will say that had my hon. friend made his customary use of his common sense, he would not have indulged in any such language. He said that some industries will be destroyed. What industries? What reason had he for stating this? He asked what reason can be given for wiping an industry out of existence? Well, I cannot see that any industry will be wiped out of existence under this arrangement. What manufacturing or other industry will even have its profits lessened by this proposed arrangement?

Mr. BLAIN. What about the salt industry?

Mr. MILLER. That is not a fresh question nor is it a large industry. The manufacturers themselves do not go nearly so far as my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) did. I have referred to the appeal to Sir Wilfrid Laurier which appeared some time ago in the Montreal 'Star.' In that appeal the 'Star' says:

> So they disarmed suspicion by not betraying any great greed in 'taking,' and then deftly secured the assent of our representatives to a 'gift' of such far-reaching effects that it engulfs our commercial independenec and endangers our national existence.

Then the 'Star' says in that appeal:

> Oh! but the tariff on manufactured goods remains, it may be said, for the present it does.

The manufacturers therefore, admit that they have not been hurt and the tariff has not been changed in any way to do them injury. Evidently, the troubles that afflict our manufacturing friends are not real but imaginary. I do not believe that our Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has the slightest intention of making any bargain that will operate to the detriment of any manufacturing concern in this Dominion. I believe further that hon. members on this side would not support the government in any attempt to do material injury to Canadian manufacturers. In my opinion the manufacturers of Canada will be helped by this agreement. They will be helped in this way. As you help the farmers, as you more thickly populate our western country, as you give the farmers better prices and better markets for this produce, you make them better purchasers of manufactured products. In helping the farmer, you enable him to buy more manufactured goods and of better quality and pay better prices.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) referring to the American newspapers said:

To-day, when I read the American papers and scan the American speeches, and look at the American arguments, I do not find that they are saying very much as to the employment of American capital in the establishing of American industries in Canada. In the past and present condition of things we have noticed that as a factor, and a very important one, in the development of this country. It is stated, and I think without doubt, that at least $226,000,000 have been transferred in equipment and plant from factories in the United States towards the establishment of branch factories in the Dominion.

My hon. friend did not of course find it possible to read all the American newspapers, and I would draw his attention to the South Bend 'Tribune,' published in South Bend, Indiana, on the 30th of January last. This gives an account of an interview with Mr. Oliver, who is at the head of the largest plough works in the wide world:

According to Mr. Oliver, the reciprocity measure introduced in Congress last Thursday does not affect his concern to such an extent that he should show more than passing interest in the legislation and consequently the plans of the Oliver industry relative to Hamilton will not be changed in the slightest degree. Should the measure as now constituted become a law the duty on ploughs would be lessened only from two and one-half to five per cent, the intention being to reduce the tariff from 17½ and 20 per cent to 15 per cent. This charge it appears is too small to warrant the Olivers altering their plans at Hamilton.

'The reciprocity treaty does not affect us,' said Mr. Oliver, 'and there is absolutely no truth sent out in the report from Ottawa that we have ordered work stopped on our Hamilton plant. We will go ahead with all our plans in the spring and rush our factory to completion. The proposed change in the tariff on ploughs is so small as not to affect us.'

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLER. I agree with every member of this House and every citizen of Canada that we like to see American capital brought in to establish industries in this country. But, if I am to make a choice as between a large factory built in Canada with United States capital, and a large factory built in Canada with Canadian capital, I will every time choose the latter. And why? Because every manufacturing establishment is built to secure to the owners a net profit. In the case of a factory backed by American capital it is true, money from outside will be spent in erecting the building and paying wages, but the net profit from that American institution will be taken to the United States to further develop that country, while in the case of the factory built with Canadian capital, the net profit will remain in Canada for the development of our own country.

Sir, on a recent visit to my own Ontario town of Hanover, I found that the Knechtel Furniture Co., was about to construct a new factory to build a new line of goods. I was informed also that the Spiesz Furniture Co. was preparing to build, next year, a large addition to its present works. The Hanover Specialty Works are making plans for a large extension of their plant. And it was rumoured on the street, whether truly or not, I do not know, that Mr. Ball, who was my opponent in the last election and will be my opponent in the next election should I run again, is intending to build next summer a large addition to his factory. In Neustadt, another town in my riding, six miles south of Hanover, a large chair factory that is in operation there intends to construct a large addition to its works. Also the Durham Furniture Co. in South Grey intend greatly extending their works next year. And this sort of thing is not confined to the towns of South Grey alone, but applies to every other manufacturing town in the province of Ontario.

Mr. BLAIN. If I may be permitted, would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) state whether the manufacturers he has referred to are in favour of this trade arrangement or not?

Mr. MILLER. I will come to that, and I will tell my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) exactly what they say about it, most of them. What does this development of manufac-

turers show? Whatever may be the effect upon United States manufacturers, the Ontario manufacturers who fully understand the situation, are not alarmed by this agreement, nor do they believe that it will cripple their business or lessen their profits. But there are other factories in Canada that will be helped by this agreement. I refer to the barns, the stables and the silos of the Canadian farmers. I refer to the tile-draining that is to be put down by the Canadian farmers. I say that the Canadian farm is a Canadian manufactory and is manufacturing products that bring greater wealth to the Dominion than do even the products of the factories which we usually call factories.

Is it true that United States manufacturers are in doubt to-day about coming to Canada to start branch factories here? If they are timid, why are they timid? The blame is not to the government, the blame is not to the friends of this measure; but the blame is to the opponents of this measure who are creating a panic by their unfounded cries and unreasoning alarms; these are the men who are keeping American capitalists from investing their money in this country.

Speaking of the Oliver Plough Works brings me especially to the matter of agricultural implements, concerning which we heard a great deal from the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris) last night. Now, I would like to know where our hon. friends on the other side really stand as to this matter of agricultural implements?

Mr. LALOR. Where do you stand on that question?

Mr. MILLER. I am always willing to tell the hon. member where I stand. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) speaking in this House on the 26th January, and referring to the reductions proposed to be made on agricultural implements, said that he did not believe the change proposed would yield the slightest iota of relief to any farming population in this country. At that time, he appeared to think the occasion demanded relief, but said that the reduction of two and a half per cent and five per cent was not sufficient relief. I remember when, a couple of years ago, the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner), a Conservative, introduced a resolution in this House to reduce the tariff on agricultural implements to ten per cent. But my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, who to-day tells us that a reduction of two and one half per cent and five per cent following a similar reduction made two or three years ago, will not give sufficient relief, when the hon. member for Souris, two years ago, moved his resolution to reduce the duty to 10 per cent, voted against that resolution. If he thinks two and half per cent to five per cent repeated is not sufficient reduction, and if he thought that the 10 per cent reduction proposed by the hon. member for Souris is too much, I would like to know where he stands.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would like to know how the hon. member himself voted on that resolution.

Mr. MILLER. I will tell my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) frankly that I voted the same way as his leader (Mr. Borden, Halifax) did, and I would so vote again. If hon. members ask how I voted, and what I think of the duty. I reply that I think exactly as the 'Farmers Advocate' does upon this subject. The 'Farmers Advocate' is, perhaps, the leading farm journal published in Canada. It welcomed some reduction in the duty on farm implements, but said in an article on this very subject: It is hardly fair to single out any one industry for sacrifice. And with that I quite agree. I quite agree in the policy of a reasonable reduction, but I do not think it would be right to single out that interest and make a sacrifice of it. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris) last night, said: If this government is to be opposed to manufacturing in Canada, I will have to remove myself from Canada.

Well, the hon. gentleman need not remove himself, even though the company to which he belonged a little while ago did remove a large part of its capital from Canada to the State of New York. The Massey-Harris Company, of which my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Harris), for whom I have great respect, is a member, has made a very large amount of money in manufacturing in Canada a very good class of agricultural implements. With the money they made from Canadian farmers they recently purchased in Batavia, New York, a plant that cost them, I think, something more than a million dollars—several millions, I am informed. That was before this proposal had been made, before my hon. friends the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs had gone to Washington, or had thought of going to Washington. I think that the government of Canada had a fair warrant and a good reason for making a slight reduction in the duty on agricultural implements when they saw the evidences that appeared about them on every hand. If a Brantford agricultural implement manufacturing concern can take its capital and compete in the United States against its United States rivals, without even one per cent of protection, surely they can compete, as Mr. Oliver says, they can in Canada, with a protection of fifteen per cent. Then let me

say that in the very city from which the hon. member for Brantford comes, the Cockshutt firm, manufacturing ploughs, have for some time been sending Canadian ploughs into the United States and selling them at a profit in large numbers, in spite of the duty they have to pay.

Sir, I do not know where the opposition stands in the matter of agricultural implements and the duty thereon. I do know what the government has done. The government reduced the duty from two and a half to five per cent two or three years ago, and they have reduced the duty again this year, or will by this proposal, a further two and a half to five per cent. If any one were to ask me what is the position of the Hon. Mr. Borden on this question I would say: Well, I do not know. If a manufacturer asked me if I thought that Mr. Borden would be an advocate of a greater reduction, I would say: Well, by his speeches in the House I would think that he would. But if a farmer should ask me what Mr. Borden would have done, I would say: Well, by the vote he gave upon the resolution of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, I would think that he would be opposed to any reduction. I do not know, I am sure, where he is, because he seems to speak in one way and vote another.

Let me now touch upon the question of loyalty. The poet Cowper, in his poem, I believe it is in 'The Task,' says:

> Patriots are grown too shrewd to be sincere,
> And we too wise to trust them.

Dr. Johnston said: 'Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel.' Sir, I do not believe that all are insincere scoundrels, who, in this day, are crying loyalty and waving the flag, but some of them are. I say there are men who are loyal to-day for financial gain, that there are other men to-day who are loyal for political profit and advantage, and I say further, that there is another class of men who are loyal to-day, really and sincerely loyal, but who are nervous and frightened by the panic that our friends of the opposition endeavour to create. I say further that he who will readily wave his country's flag for material gain, or for political advantage, will not always be the last to trample it in the dust for a like consideration. Let us not make too cheap the flag for which our fathers fought, some of them, and for which we would be willing to fight again. We are all loyal on both sides of the House, Grits and Tories in Canada are loyal, and let us not talk or speak otherwise. Sir, the agriculturists in Canada—and my hon. friend from Lambton, if he were here, would agree with this—know that some years ago the British government imposed on Canadian cattle what is called the embargo. We know that the British government years ago, by that embargo, barred out live cattle. They did it to protect their own agriculturists, and they maintained it to protect the British farmer and the British breeder of livestock. Sir, we do not quarrel with them; we do not say that the people of Britain are not loyal because they do that; but we do say that if the government of Britain seeks to protect its cattle raisers and cattle breeders by imposing and maintaining that embargo, they are far too fair and generous, and far too sensible, to blame the Canadian government for endeavouring to protect the interests of Canadian farmers as they do under this agreement. My hon. friend opposite asked me about the manufacturers in my own town. Let me read him a letter from a German Canadian manufacturer in the riding of North Waterloo. This man says:

> I still have confidence that the future of this great country of ours is safe in the hands of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his followers at Ottawa, and I believe the Liberals of North Waterloo—which is a large manufacturing district—feel the same as I do, that the reciprocity agreement with the United States will be a good thing for Canada as a whole. I do not for a moment believe in the blue ruin cry, and that Canada, by entering into a freer trade arrangement with our cousins to the south of us, will in the end become part of that country. The German-Canadians of North Waterloo will remain loyal to the British Empire no matter if we have free trade with the United States or a high tariff wall. Annexation has nothing whatever to do with this undertaking.

Sir, I commend these words of a German Canadian, whose fathers and forefathers spoke not the English language; I commend the loyalty of this German Canadian to my friends of the opposition, of British parentage, whose fathers came from the old land. The letter of this German Canadian expresses, I believe, the sentiments and the feelings of German Canadians generally, and I say that the loyalty of this German puts to shame the fears and anxieties of our British Canadian friends on the other side of this House. I see before me on the opposition benches men who are engaged in agriculture, men who are engaged in businesses of different kinds, and I ask if there is one of them who will to-day admit and confess that if he sells in the United States market an article for which he can find there a higher price than he could anywhere else, will that make him less loyal? Will it make him feel like severing the ties that bind him to the British flag? If any hon. gentleman opposite can purchase an article he desires in the United States market to better advantage than he can purchase it in any other market, will it make him less loyal? If there is such a member on the opposite benches, I would like him to stand up for

a moment that we may gaze upon him, and see what manner of man he is. Not one Conservative in this House, not one opponent of this agreement in this House, will make any such admission as that. I say ask them how these men dare to insult the people they represent, how they dare insult the people of their constituencies, by thinking for a moment, by saying with their tongue, that the men whom they represent are less loyal than they themselves?

Sir, I say that this trade arrangement will help the farmers of Canada, and with this argument I close my speech. The opponents of this measure say that the hon. the Minister of Finance and the hon. the Minister of Customs ought to have shown in greater detail what will be the results of the working out of this proposed agreement. It is impossible to give statistics that any one can say will turn out to be correct, because this agreement will affect different parts of Canada in different ways, and it will affect Canada differently in different years and under different circumstances. We are like a man who is looking out for an opening for his business. He goes to a place where everything would indicate that there is a good opening. He cannot tell what his first year's sales will be, and what his second year's sales will be; but he says: The conditions appear to be good, and I know that I can do a good business here, and here is where I am going to locate.

Now I know that the hon. member for North Toronto, when he was Finance Minister entertained the House and the country oftentimes with very neatly compiled and tabulated figures which he called statistics. They might better oftentimes have been called guesses and my hon. friend was frequently a bad guesser. My hon. friends opposite, say that this agreement will not benefit the farmers, but I say, Sir, that it is worth noting that there is not a Canadian farm paper published in any province in Canada that is devoted to the interests of agriculture, that is not upholding this agreement, and is not in favour of its being completed. The hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames) says that you cannot protect the manufacturers of this country and not protect the farmers, that if you do not protect the farmers, they will demand, and you will have to yield to their demand, that every vestige of protection be taken from the manufacturer. I can understand that you can protect the Canadian manufacturer to some extent and to a great extent, it may be, but I say that a protective tariff upon food stuff would be just as much use to the Canadian farmer as a coon skin coat would be to the hon. member for St. Antoine on a July day with the thermometer at a hundred in the shade.

This agreement will give to the Canadian farmer additional markets. It will not deprive him of one single market that he has to-day. We grant subsidies to-day to steamship lines running to every distant part of the globe, and if we do all that, surely we cannot justify it and refuse to make every effort to trade with our nearest neighbours. Let me read to you—and I will not weary you with long figures—a statement of the subsidies we are paying to-day to assist steamship lines running to these several different countries:

France, at the rate of $100,000 per annum for 18 voyages, not to exceed $133,333.33	$100,000 00
New Zealand	50,000 00
Australia	180,509 00
Mexico (T. H. Worsnop)	50,000 00
Mexico (Elder, Demspter & Co.)	125,000 00
China and Japan	48,666 66
South Africa	146,000 00
West Indies and South America	79,500 00
Cuba	25,000 00
Jamaica	13,800 00
Newfoundland (Reid, Newfoundland Co'y)	18,000 00
Newfoundland (Pickford & Black)	4,000 00
Victoria (San Francisco)	3,000 00

Making a total in steamship subsidies to countries other than Great Britain of $843,475 a year. In addition to these annual subsidies to steamship lines, we have trade commissioners in the Argentine Republic, Australia, British West Indies, China, Cuba, France, Germany, Holland, Japan, Mexico, Newfoundland, New Zealand, and South Africa and Canadian commercial agents in Jamaica, Trinidad, Bahamas, Colombia and Norway. In addition to paying the salaries of these trade commissioners and commercial agents and the expenses of their offices, we also, through the Department of Agriculture, maintain at very great expense, Canadian exhibits wherever there is a large world exhibition in any part of the globe. We have had exhibits in Japan, Belgium, Italy, Scotland and other countries. Not one single member of this House has made any objection to the payment of these steamship subsidies, not one member of this House has made any objection to the establishing of these commercial agencies, not one member of this House has made any objection to the expenditure for the making of Canadian exhibits. The hon. member for Brandon was a member of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's cabinet when these steamship subsidies were agreed to, when these paid agencies were established, and yet the hon. member for Brandon, while he was a cabinet minister and since he was a cabinet minister, has made no ob-

jection whatever to any of these expenditures. Now, Sir, if it be common sense, if it be good business to pay out these tremendous sums of money for steamship subsidies, for trade agencies and to maintain Canadian exhibits in different parts of the world, why in the name of common sense is it not good business, is it not good economy, is it not good politics, to make every possible effort, although without that large expenditure, to trade with our nearest neighbours, especially as our nearest neighbours are a very populous and wealthy people, who can afford to buy and pay good prices for that which we produce and that which we have to sell?

I have said that this agreement will benefit the farmers. My hon. friends opposite endeavoured to make a point against my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) yesterday, by saying that he had referred to the grain growers and the fruit growers of Canada as wolves. He did nothing of the kind. Sir, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister saw wolves nearer to him than the fruit growers or the grain growers of the west. He saw wolves sitting on the opposition benches and their wails and cries and howlings have been heard now for many, many weeks.

An hon. MEMBER. A few over there, too.

Mr. MILLER. Well no, there are no wolves, but there are for the moment, some two or three sheep in wolves' clothing. I have said that the proposed trade arrangement will increase the price of wheat to the farmer in the west. That has been denied and it has been argued the other way. A few years ago a personal friend of mine, who was in the employ of the Customs Department, had just come down from doing duty along the southern line of Saskatchewan and the international line between Manitoba and the United States. That gentleman told me when he came back to Ontario, that a great many Canadian farmers living near enough to the American line, were smuggling their wheat from Canada, and selling it to the United States elevators in Dakota. Why? —not because the price of wheat was quoted higher on the American market than on the Canadian, but because dishonest Canadian elevator men were falsely grading their wheat and the Canadian prairie farmer was obliged to sell wheat that was really No. 1 at the price of No. 2 or 3 because it was given a lower grade by the elevator man, while by smuggling his wheat across the line the Canadian farmer escaped the false grading and got 10 or 12 cents a bushel more for his wheat on the American side than he could get on the Canadian side. I leave it to hon. members from the west to say whether or not this practice has been pursued by the elevator combine.

The hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal, said that this agreement would destroy the identity of our exports. It will not destroy the identity of our exports. The hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal, is a manufacturer of boots and shoes. He knows that there are some men, whether they are right or wrong, who prefer an American shoe to a Canadian shoe, but they will not buy an American shoe, simply because they know it is an American shoe. They realize that there are good American shoes and there are very inferior American shoes. The Canadian buyer, who wants an American shoe, wants one with a brand or name on, that he knows is the brand or name of a superior shoe. So, if any of my friends desire a bottle of English pickles, it will not be enough to know that it is an English pickle; they want to know if it has the label of Crosse & Blackwell, which is an assurance that it is a superior article. The Canadian shipper of superior Canadian product gets a good price in the British market, because of the individual brand that his produce bears when he exports it.

It is said that this arrangement will destroy the market of the Ontario and Quebec horse breeder in the Canadian west. Well, I do not believe that. At present, and may be for a few years to come, the Ontario and Quebec horse breeders will have a market in the Canadian west, but how long will that continue? We know there is no country in the world better adapted for the raising of horses than the prairies of the west, and we know that the farmers there are paying a great deal of attention to the industry, and it will only be a few years when the Canadian west will have horses to sell rather than horses to buy. And then, how important will it be to the horse breeders of Ontario and Quebec, and of Canada generally to have the advantage of the tremendous markets afforded by the large cities of the United States. This arrangement will benefit the raiser of Canadian cattle and Canadian lambs. It will also benefit the man who raises barley in Canada. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) and the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Lloyd Harris) told us that the Canadian farmer ought not to sell his barley and low grade wheat, but rather feed it to his stock. Well, while these two gentlemen may be good business men and while the one may be a clever manufacturer and the other a clever lawyer, I think it would be better for them not to oblige the Canadian farmer by legislation to do anything he does not wish to do with the pro-

duce he raises. I think we may give the Canadian farmer credit for having enough intelligence to know whether it would be better for him to sell his grain or to feed it. I would remind these two hon. gentlemen that possibly the Canadian farmer would have enough business ability and intelligence to realize that it is to his profit to sell his barley, and to buy American corn with the money he gets, and feed his animals just as well with the corn, and have a good cash balance left in his pockets besides. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) spoke of the purchase by Canada of United States cheese, and he pointed out that Canada buys cheese from Britain and some of the countries of continental Europe, but the hon. gentleman knows that the cheese bought by Canada is not similar to the cheese that Canada produces.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I do not know anything of the kind, and neither do you.

Mr. MILLER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) will go to the dinner table of the House of Commons restaurant and ask for some of the cheese of continental Europe he will learn something that for many years he has neglected to learn. A prominent business man of Brockville told me the other day that a farmer of the county of Leeds came to his office and said: I have been all my life a Conservative, but do you see yonder across the St. Lawrence river the American town of Morristown, from that town runs a cold storage train every day down to New York city and that train carries cheese, and butter, and milk, and cream, fruit, and meat. All the products of my farm would be worth more money to me loaded on that cold storage train (if there were no duty in the way) than they would be in any part of the world. And this farmer said: Sir Edmund Walker through his banking institution may take in hundreds of thousands of dollars of the hard earned money of the farmers and other toilers of Canada, and upon one-third of it pay no interest, and on the other two-thirds pay three per cent interest, and he can take that money down to the same city of New York and lend it to United States stock speculators at the rate of 25 cents per annum, so that his banking institution may pay a dividend of 16 per cent per year, and Sir Edmund Walker will still be a loyal Canadian and lecture me upon my lack of loyalty, but if I send a calf across the St. Lawrence river and sell it in Morristown for $6 more than I can get for it in Brockville I am accused of disrupting the British Empire.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Name that gentleman.

Mr. MILLER. I do not choose to name him.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). He is an imaginary man.

Mr. MILLER. Not at all. I will tell my hon. friend in private who the prominent business man is, and I will tell him further that before he left the office that farmer said: I will never cast another Tory vote while I live.

Mr. STANFIELD. What bank in Canada pays 16 per cent?

Mr. MILLER. That is the story as this man told it to me, but my hon. friend can look at the report of the bank with which Sir Edmund Walker is connected and he will probably find that if it does not pay 16 per cent it earns 16 per cent. Now, in discussing the fruit question, I shall refer principally to apples, which taking the Dominion over is the fruit of greatest value and greatest profit. In the Portland 'Oregonian' of the 4th of February, these figures are given by Mr. E. H. Shepard, a man of experience, the editor of 'Better Fruit', a paper which is published on the Pacific coast:

A few statistics which are pertinent and to the point are given below; statistics from the year 1896 to date, covering the United States apple crop:

Year.	Barrels.
1895	60,540,000
1896	69,070,000
1897	41,556,000
1898	28,570,000
1899	37,560,000
1900	47,960,000
1901	26,970,000
1902	47,652,000
1903	45,000,000
1904	45,300,000
1905	23,500,000
1906	38,000,000
1907	29,069,000
1908	25,500,000
1909	25,415,000
1910 (estimated)	23,825,000

Does this look like over-production?

Bear in mind that with the decreasing apple crop, and this decrease is principally in the east and west, there is an increasing population, and President Kerr of the Oregon Agricultural College in an address last year at the Commercial Club in Portland, made the following statement, and I am sure I quote him correctly: 'During the last 30 years the consumption of fruit has increased five times as rapidly as the population of the United States.'

Here we have the population of the United States increasing very rapidly, but notwithstanding, the product of apples in 1896 was 60,000,000 barrels, and in the year 1909 it was only 25,000,000 barrels. In view of this increased population and decreased production of apples surely the people of the United States will consume their own product and buy many many millions of barrels of apples from Canada as well. I have quoted an opinion from British Co-

lumbia, but let me quote an opinion from my own county of Grey, and particularly that part of it represented by my hon. friend from East Grey.

Mr. BURRELL. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say he quoted an opinion from British Columbia?

Mr. MILLER. I quoted from the Portland 'Oregonian,' I thank my hon. friend for the correction. In the Toronto 'Globe' of February the 11th, Mr. G. J. Mitchell, general manager of the Georgian Bay Fruit Growers of Clarksburg, Ontario, writes a letter in which he refers to something that had been said by Mr. E. D. Smith, of Winona, and in that letter Mr. Mitchell says:

Mr. Smith also stated that the fruit-growers of Canada were a unit in regard to the opposition of the proposed new tariff. When he says that, he is either not candid or he does not know it all. Now in regard to apples: generally speaking, the best apple men are favourable to the tariff. In view of the proposed changes there is more interest taken in the apple industry in this Georgian Bay section than for many years. Hundreds of acres will be planted with varieties specially suited to both the western and American markets. We ourselves have in view the planting of five hundred acres. When I say I am satisfied with the tariff proposals, I am voicing the sentiments of a great many apple-growers, representing many thousand acres of orchards.

J. G. MITCHELL,
General Manager.

The Georgian Bay Fruit-growers, Clarksburg, Ont., Feb. 11.

If our Canadian farmers complain of this proposal let me read you the opinion of an American farmer. I take this from the Ottawa 'Citizen' of February 14. This is the opinion of Mr. Bachelder, Master of the United States Grange. The article with its headlines is as follows:

FARMER MADE THE SCAPEGOAT.

Master of United States Grange Objects to the Agreement.

Low Price of Land in Canada Quoted as Reason.

Tariff of 25 per cent was Moderate Enough.

(Canadian Press Despatch.)

Concord, N.H., Feb. 14.—The proposed Canadian agreement is attacked in a letter sent yesterday to Secretary of the Agriculture, James Wilson, by ex-Governor James J. Bachelder, of this city, National Master of the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, and chairman of the legislative committee of that organization. The letter is in reply to a communication favouring the agreement sent by Secretary Wilson to Mr. Bachelder on February 9. Mr. Bachelder declares that the agreement is unfair to the farmers of the United States who 'ask for nothing but a square deal—equal protection for all classes and interests.'

'We can only conclude,' said Mr. Bachelder in his letter, 'that you have been deceived by the special interests, which have cunningly plotted to allay the country-wide clamour for an honest revision of the tariff by making the farmer the scapegoat for the sins of the high protection system.' * * * * * *

'You know that the price of land is much lower in Canada than in the United States,' he continued. 'You know that the wages of Canadian farm labour are much lower than we have to pay. You know that the Canadian farmer buys his manufactured articles cheaper because his tariff duties on foreign goods are lower. You know that the farm lands of Canada are mostly virgin soil, requiring no fertilizer, while our lands have been cropped so long that we must use immense quantities of fertilizer. Yet knowing all this you would strike down the very moderate tariff, averaging about 25 per cent, which they now receive, without giving them the benefit of any real reduction of duties on manufactures.'

So while our friends endeavour to persuade the Canadian farmers that they will get the worst of it by this arrangement the Master of the United States Grange assured the United States farmers, and I think with a good deal of reason, that they have ground to fear the competition of the Canadian farmer who farms at so much greater advantage.

Sir, I believe that this agreement will promote immigration to the Canadian west; I believe that it will add, as Dr. Withrow said the reciprocity treaty did from 1854 to 1866, to the value of every acre of farm land in Canada. Sir, if that is the case the Canadian farmers will be more prosperous, and I say it is time they should prosper. Who, Sir, is the Canadian farmer? He is a man who toils with his muscle, and also with his brain. The farmer to-day is not only a muscle worker, but he is, and must be, to be successful, a business man and a scientist, and if this gives to the Canadian farmer a greater degree of prosperity it will enable him the better to furnish his own home, it will enable him to better provide his wife with the help she requires, it will enable him to purchase books and newspapers for his fireside, more than that, it will enable him to give to the teacher in the rural sections, and to the ministers of different denominations who preach in the country pulpits better salaries, and they ought to have better salaries. It will enable the Canadian farmer to give to his hired man twelve months employment where now perhaps he can give him only eight months, and to give him better wages. It will enable him to build better roads, to better equip his public schools and as the Canadian farmer prospers, so do we all prosper; as the Canadian farmer increases in his prosperity so does the Canadian manufacturer, and as the Canadian manufacturer increases in his prosperity so he is better able to pay a higher wage to the

man who toils and labours in his factory. If a Canadian farmer once in a while be enabled in this day to ride in his automobile as the Canadian manufacturer frequently and habitually does, why need we all gaze in astonishment as though we were gazing on an eclipse of the sun, and by the way it seems to have come to this that the man in the automobile, the man who dwells in the palatial summer cottage, is arraying himself on one side while the remaining Canadian citizens are arrayed on the other. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) objected to this. I say it is not the government who are making this division, it is the man who rides in the automobile, who dwells in the palatial summer cottage, who by his lack of common sense is creating that division to-day.

Sir, the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster)——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MILLER. Then I will delay what I have to say and give my friends time to get their breath. I say this is an agreement that can at any time be cancelled. We may try this agreement for one year or for five years, and if it does not work to our satisfaction there is nothing that binds us to continue it. The Canadian government have not signed or sealed any agreement, nor has any member of that government, and that is probably the reason why Mr. Harry Corby who lately was a Conservative member in this House, and is to-day a contributor to the funds of the Conservative party, says that he believes this proposal is a good thing and something that we ought to try.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Have you authority for that?

Mr. LANCASTER. Does he know more about the funds of the Conservative party than he does about the funds of the Fielding testimonial?

Mr. MILLER. I have stated what I believe to be the truth, and the hon. members have not denied it. This is also perhaps why Mr. Haultain, leader of the opposition in Saskatchewan, says he agrees that this agreement should be passed and will give it hearty support.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I have reason to believe that Mr. Corby never made that statement. I am told he denied it and if Mr. Northrup was in the House he would say the same thing in stronger language.

Mr. MILLER. When the member for East Hastings is in the House he will have an opportunity of giving what information he possesses. I say there is not a thing in this agreement that will compel any citizen of Canada to sell one dollar's worth in the United States market that he can sell to better advantage in any other market or that will compel any Canadian to buy in the American market anything that he can buy to better advantage in another market. The hon. member for North Toronto says:

> We shamed the croaker and the pessimist and the coward into silence, and then recreated him into a good citizen at the glowing fires of optimism and of hope.

I say he did not properly do his work because the croaker continues to croak, and the pessimist and coward refuse to remain silent. But I say that in spite of the croaking of the croaker and the loud wails of the coward and the pessimist, fires of optimism and hope still continue to glow in this Dominion of Canada. I have been accused sometimes of throwing bouquets to the Prime Minister. Well, no one can state the truth regarding the career of the right hon. gentleman without throwing what my hon. friends opposite term bouquets. But I am now going to present him with a bouquet made up of flowers that are not mine, but that were grown in the hot house of the opponents of this measure at their own expense. I take these flowers, which I am about to make into a bouquet, from the appeal to Sir Wilfrid Laurier which appeared as a paid advertisement in the columns of the Montreal 'Star.' In that appeal, I find this rhetorical bouquet, for which their good money was paid:

> But there is no flattery in saying that the Premier is one of three or four great Canadians. He is a constructive statesman with the long vision, the deep insight and the steadfast courage that marks the rare race of nation-builders.

I have said that these flowers are not of my growing but none the less I recognize their appropriateness. But these people have not always had that measure of faith in the Prime Minister. There have been many times when they doubted his wisdom and denied his courage and ability; yet now, after 14 years of his administration, during which their doubts have been proven unfounded and their charges unjust, they thus praise him. Let my hon. friends opposite keep the faith in the Prime Minister and his colleagues which by this language they show they have and they will have had up to the present and which is depicted in the language I quoted last night from the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). In his eloquent peroration my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) spoke as follows:

> This land is ours, we have made it, we and our fathers—please God we will keep it for our children and our children's children, to the remotest generation. We have not wrought so in order to bestow a great gift

upon a rich nation, we are wrought to build ourselves a national home with a fireside and altars of our own for ourselves and for those who come after us in this great far-thrown country that God has given to us for our own.

I agree in every word thus spoken, but I say that if this agreement will help up more quickly and thoroughly to build up our national home, if it will help our manufacturers, farmers and toilers of every kind and class to greater prosperity and luxury, if it will give them a greater sense of content and brighter hopes for the future, as they gather about those altars and firesides then I say it will have my hearty support, and I believe that when it comes into effect and we begin to experience its benefits, even the doubting Thomases of to-day will be brought to realize how unjust was their opposition and ill-founded their pessimistic predictions.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend overlooked my question which he promised to apswer. He was dealing with the manufacturers of canned fruits.

Mr. MILLER. I am glad my hon. friend has reminded me of this omission. Well, I went into the office of one of these manufacturers and he said to me: I have not had the opportunity to study this whole question, but when I heard the opponents of this agreement use the silly loyalty and annexation cry, I made up my mind that if they had any good argument they could use, they would not resort to any such a silly cry as that.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay) I do not propose, Mr. Chairman, to follow my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller), in all his wanderings. My hon. friend told the House that on this side they were all sheep, and in so doing he reminded one of that famous text about the sheep that had gone astray. Nor do I think it necessary that I should follow him throughout his arguments because if they are all based on the same foundations as two or three statements he made in the course of his speech, referring to the Canadian Pacific Railway stock, he said it has gone up $25 per share from the beginning of this discussion to the present. they are built on false foundations. Well, as a matter of actual fact, the price on January 26 was 209 and on March 8 it was 213¾ and it had touched 214, so that its greatest variation was four points.

Mr. MILLER. I did not refer to January 26 but to the time when the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs went to Washington.

Mr. GOODEVE. Again my hon. friend said that the banks were paying 16 per cent, but I have not heard of any bank in Canada paying 16 per cent. He further read from an authority which he said was in British Columbia, but when questioned by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell), he said it was from Port land, Oregon.

Mr. MILLER. In fairness to myself I should remind my hon. friend that at the beginning of the quotation from that paper, I said it was from Portland, Oregon. I did inadvertently afterwards say it was from British Columbia, but I did not make any endeavour to deceive anybody.

Mr. GOODEVE. Well, I have just taken these three instances so that the House will have an idea how much weight it should attach to the argument we have had during the last three hours and a half.

I do not propose either to follow the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Templeman) through all the details of his argument. He brought down quite a sheet of recommendations from the various liberal associations in British Columbia regarding this agreement to which we need not attach much weight. One from the Agent General in London of the British Columbia government, Mr. James Turner. The hon. minister quoted from a letter which Mr. Turner has written with reference to the effect this proposed pact would have on the fruit industry of British Columbia. I tried to find the newspaper from which my hon. friend quoted but found it removed from the files in the library. But taking the quotation as correct, all I can say is that the comment made by Mr. Turner in London was what one would expect under the circumstances. Mr. Turner was representing British Columbia, and he felt that it would not be fitting for him to state that the fruit industry of that province was not able to compete with that industry in any other part of the globe, so he endeavoured to make the best of the situation. But looking after the files of the standard of empire, I found another opinion of our agent general in London, and this is what he said in effect:

> There is not the slightest doubt that the ultimate effect will be to divert the great bulk of Canada's food supplies to the United States, and that he believes that the preferential scheme, as outlined by Mr. Chamberlain, is the only possible way to overcome the serious effect of the new agreement on Canadian relations with the mother country.

It is my intention very briefly to discuss what, in my opinion, are some of the reasons which have brought about this ill-considered, unexpected and almost complete reversal of the fiscal policy of Canada, which we have had during the past 45 years. It is true that from time to time there have been requests for readjustment

and alterations in its fiscal arrangement. It is true that, owing to the rapid increase and growth of our western provinces, certain abuses have developed in the marketing of their products, both grain and wheat. But I venture to suggest, in regard to the latter, that, if prompt action had been taken when these were first brought to the attention of the government, by the enactment of strict regulations, rigidly enforced, in regard to grain elevators, and the establishment of public abattoirs, or the encouragement of private abattoirs under strict government inspection, and the extension of cold storage and refrigeration, these abuses might have been remedied. In 1891 the Liberal-Conservative party made its last appeal for reciprocity, and in 1897-8 the Liberal party, through the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), as clearly demonstrated by the hon. member from North Toronto, declared that they, too, were done with it. Allow me to again refer to his words. In 1898 he said:

> Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians, beginning with myself would have given many things to obtain the American market, but thank heaven these days are past and over.

Ten years afterwards, at the Imperial Conference in London, he made this statement:

> There was a time when we were wanting reciprocity with the United States, but our efforts and our offers were put aside and negatived. We have said good-bye to that trade, and we now put all our hopes on the British trade.

And, later, in 1909, in the House of Commons, the right hon. gentleman said:

> Canada has opened her doors to Great Britain in the hope that she would ultimately receive similar preferential treatment from the mother country.

I am bound, therefore, to agree with those who take the position that the people of Canada as a whole had declared against reciprocity, and that there has been no mandate from them since to reopen the question. Then, what was it that brought about this sudden change in policy? It is true that there was a growing feeling of uneasiness in the minds of the people of Canada regarding the large and ever increasing expenditure; a feeling of uneasiness over the wanton waste and extravagance in those expenditures; a feeling of uneasiness over the exposures of maladministration that were taking place in one department after another—the Marine and Fisheries, Militia, Public Works, Railways and Canals, Printing Bureau, &c. All of this was brought into life and action when the Naval Bill of last session was forced upon the people, a Bill by which a heavy burden was placed upon the country with no compensating advantages.

The trained ear of the right hon. leader of the government was first to hear the storm-waves rising on the Atlantic, a storm which the First Minister feared would, with ever-increasing strength and vigour, sweep across this country from Halifax to Vancouver, until it broke upon the Pacific, sweeping from power the men who failed to hear his voice. Something must be done and done quickly. A hurry call was issued. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) were ordered to pack their grips and hurry off to Washington and bring back something that would distract the attention of the people. They went, all their movements wrapped in secrecy. After the curiosity of the country had been properly and duly aroused, back they came. The stage was set, the galleries crowded, the claquers in the rear ready to applaud. At the proper moment the Minister of Finance makes a dramatic entrance. He lays his Pandora box carefully on his desk; amidst an expectant silence the spring is touched. The trojan horse springs out and all his followers clap their hands and laugh. Now, says the Finance Minister, see what I have brought for each of you: For the maritime provinces free fish and potatoes; for Quebec, free hay; for Ontario, well, you may not be quite pleased, but really I did not hurt your manufacturers as much as I might have done, that is, not yet, and look! I got for you free cream—and you can keep the skimmed milk. For the prairies—now, I know you will be good; I knocked a little red paint off your mowers and binders and gave you free wheat and free livestock. For British Columbia, ah, well, you see you would not be good, and sent five bad Tories down here to worry us. And we had to give something, so we just gave them your fruit lands. They don't amount to much anyway. Their crop is only valued at $2,500,000 for 1910. We tried to give them your pulp lands, too, but that bad man, McBride, won't let us.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is a serious question and I would like to deal with it for a few moments from a broad national standpoint. In doing so, I would take my text from the words spoken by President Taft in delivering his message: 'They (Canada) are coming to the parting of the ways.' This is not the first time that we have come to the parting of the ways. We came to the parting of the ways in the long fight for confederation in 1840 to 1867, when the best men of both parties laid party affiliations aside and fought for what they believed to be in the best interests of national life. There were men then, as now, who opposed confederation. Some who would

have preferred annexation, commercial union, call it what you will, but the broader minds triumphed, and confederation became an established fact in 1867. It was just a year previously that the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 was abrogated. No one will attempt to deny that at that time it spread consternation throughout all Canada, and it is for that reason that so many on the government side argue that the desire for renewal of that bargain is general. I would like, therefore, to consider for a moment. the then conditions.

In 1866, Canada was composed of a number of scattered and disconnected provinces. The maritime provinces were not connected with Quebec and Ontario until the completion of the Intercolonial railway. Our present great west was then only isolated settlement on the Red river and Pacific coasts, totally unconnected and separated by what was then considered a great barren land. British Columbia in addition, was separated by the great range of mountains. When in 1853, the railways of Upper and Lower Canada were amalgamated under the name of the Grand Trunk Railway, it was not to carry traffic to Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, but to Portland, Maine. The Welland canal had not been enlarged and could only take vessels of four hundred tons. Railway and canal traffic in Upper Canada and the western states drifted naturally to New York and Boston. The home market, owing to long distance and comparatively slow means of communication, seemed impracticable. During the latter part of the treaty of 1854 to 1866, from a succession of unusual causes, among them the Crimean War and the War of Secession, accompanied as they were by the stoppage and devastation of agricultural industry in the United States, gave an unusual demand and high prices for the products of this country, but with the settlement of these disturbing causes, and the renewal of her industries there arose in the United States a demand for its abrogation. Did they consider Canada for a moment in the matter? No, the treaty was abrogated. It was largely because of the abrogation of that treaty that the Imperial Loan Act was passed, whereby the British people advanced £3,000,000 to complete the building of the Intercolonial road. But after the building of that road, we find the trade of western Canada and of the western states flowed not to the maritime provinces but to the ports of the United States. I would like to quote from Sir George Ross to show the position of affairs at that time and also how he regarded this matter. Here is what he said before the Canadian Club in the city of Toronto:

In 1866, when the old treaty was repealed, we were poor in banking capital, in skilled labour, in agriculture and in manufactures. A treaty then would have afforded some relief—to-day conditions are different—different because the repeal of the treaty removed every prop on which we had formerly leaned and the true temper of our Anglo-Saxon spirit was roused to action. I think no country in the world affords a better illustration of public spirit than Canada when the United States in 1866 flung our poverty in our faces and told us our only choice was starvation or annexation.

That was the attitude of the United States at that time. But while we were developing these scattered provinces and endeavouring to bind them together by this road, let me ask the leader of the government: Was it the Yankee dollar or was it the British shilling, was it the Munroe doctrine or was it the Union Jack, that was protecting our trade while we were taking the surplus agricultural products of this country across the water? That is the question for the House to consider at this time. We have expended enormous sums of money and we have assumed very heavy obligations in building up these trade routes east and west. To-morrow, if this agreement goes through, the trade routes will be north and south. I only partially agree with those who say that the natural trade route is north and south. If by trade they mean local trade, then that is correct; but if they mean the broad national trade of the empire, then I say the natural trend is east and west. The trade of the future is going to be on the Pacific with these great Oriental countries, Asia, India, Japan and Australia. And where does Canada stand in the route between those countries and Europe? I say that Canada is the very heart and nerve centre of that trade. Vancouver is the first point reached and the last point touched on going to or coming from Australia, China, Japan, India, and it is through Canada that European trade ought and must go. Shall we then, by our own act, transfer this trade from Halifax, St. John, Montreal, Winnipeg, Vancouver, and Prince Rupert, to New York and Boston, to Minneapolis and Chicago, to Seattle and San Francisco ? We have during all these years been building up that trade, and to-day we have those magnificent steamers, the 'Empresses' of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, bringing that trade through the Port of Vancouver and to the port of Montreal. I ask you then, are we voluntarily going to turn that trade north and south? That is the question that is before the House at this time. Are we going to force an entire change of that trade now going from east and west, to north and south? Mr. Chairman, there was another time when Canada

came to the parting of the ways, and with your permission I would go back and review one or two other incidents in order that you may better understand the attitude of the two parties. In 1870 when the question of taking British Columbia into the confederation arose in order that we might have this outport on the Pacific which some men to-day are endeavouring to force into a closer relationship with the nation to the south, the same men then said that the cost of securing the trade of British Columbia for Canada would be too great, that the province was not worth it. British Columbia was then separated from the rest of the confederation by at least two thousand miles of unknown territory, then, largely a wilderness. There were a few isolated settlements here and there along the Red river. There was between the east and west the Rocky Mountain range. On the Pacific coast there were a few settlements. One of the conditions under which British Columbia agreed to enter into the confederation was the building of a transcontinental railway. It was absolutely essential, if she was to trade with the rest of Canada, that that undertaking should be completed. When the hon. the Minister of Mines (Mr. Templeman) was speaking the other day, almost his first words were that he remembered the time when there was no trade east and west with the province of British Columbia, but when all the trade—'all the trade,' and he repeated it—was north and south, and he seemed to be proud of it. Well, Sir, there were men in those days as there are men to-day, who were turning away from the promised land, and looking back to the flesh pots of Egypt, men who preferred to trade north and south rather than east and west. There were men in those days, on that side of the House, who said the task was too great for the people of Canada to undertake. They said: Even though we succeed in this vast undertaking the results will not be worth the while. They said British Columbia was nothing but a sea of mountains.

But, Sir, we are glad to say that the same spirit of Anglo-Saxonism, the same spirit of British statesmanship, that animated the Liberal-Conservative party of that day when they gathered together to bring about confederation, that same spirit animates the Liberal Conservative party to-day. The building of that road was indeed a huge and difficult task. You must remember that not only had we to build the road, but we had first to take population into that wilderness before any natural products could be secured to bring out on the road. But there were men then, as there are now, who were ready to undertake the task; they knew that if they sowed in the evening they would reap a harvest in the morning. But there were other men who said: You have burdened this country with an enormous debt, you are assuming large obligations, but you are not getting the results which you expected. And so we find these same hon. gentlemen to-day, opposite always ready to complain, always ready to find fault. But at the same time we find also the broad-minded men of Canada coming to the fore. Now the time came that one of those crises that come to all nations, came to Canada, as it has come to every nation in the world, when there was a world-wide depression in trade, when we found our farmers working unprofitably early and late, when we found these scattered villages along the frontier of this enormous territory for four thousand miles, when we found many of our mechanics without work. Then the same men who were trying to build up Canada stepped into the breach and they said: If we are to become successful in building up a nation we must round out the country, we must build up our industries and our factories; and so they fought the great fight we are fighting to-day, and they adopted the principle of a National Policy. How did they do it? By one or two men in a dogmatic way bringing down a resolution and asking this House to support it, without consulting the people at all? No, but they formulated a National Policy, which was discussed freely and frankly in the House; it was discussed on every platform in Canada, it was discussed in every newspaper in Canada, and finally they issued a manifesto to the people of Canada, relying on their sound sense and good judgment, and the result was that they were returned to power on the great question of a National Policy. Sir, that day there came a change into the affairs of this great Dominion of ours. The small and scattered villages lying along our shores grew from villages into towns, and from towns into cities. Everywhere we saw the smoke and steam of industry and heard the sound of the hammer. We gradually evolved a home market for our people, and those farmers who heretofore had been complaining, and justly so, of lack of a market commenced to sell their home products to the artisans, labourers and mechanics in these growing towns. The result is that gradually but steadily they removed the mortgages from their farms and there grew up confidence in the power of the people of Canada. They felt that this was the policy for them, that no longer would they look to the nation of the south, that they were able, as their fathers had been before them, as the great pioneers and colonizers of the world, to build up their own national life and so they continued along that line.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GOODEVE. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I had briefly traced the history of this country from the date of the union of the scattered provinces under one political constitution. I had mentioned the taking in of the outposts on the Pacific coast and the binding together of these provinces from Nova Scotia to Vancouver by a great transcontinental railway. In each of the three great crises of our history since then there rose up broad-minded Canadians, men who put principles above partyism, men who were prepared to sever their party ties and affiliations in order that they might do what they believed to be in the best interests of true Canadian nationalism. I am glad to learn that at the present hour, when we have arrived at another crisis in our history, there are still great Canadians, men in all walks of life, who are prepared to look on this question from a broad national standpoint, men who are prepared to absolve themselves from their party allegiance to further what they believe to be the welfare of our country. I have said that I would deal with this question from the point of view of the statement made by the President of the United States, and in order that we may understand what President Taft meant by that statement I shall read it, with its context, and I shall also read the opinions of other men who are in a position to speak on this subject. President Taft said:

> The identity of interests of two peoples linked together by race, language, political institutions and geographical proximity offers the foundation. The Dominion has greatly prospered; it has an active, aggressive and intelligent people. They are coming to the parting of the ways. They must soon decide whether they are to regard themselves as isolated permanently from our markets by a perpetual wall or whether we are to be commercial friends.

In connection with those words of the president in his message, let me read the opinions of others who are in a position to interpret the meaning of these words and the meaning of this reciprocity pact with the United States. Mr. McCall, Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, said:

> The benefits to us would be enormous, if we could sweep away all tariffs between the two countries. It would have the effect on our trade of another Louisiana purchase.

Again, in the closing paragraph of his report:

> The Bill takes a long step towards establishing for this continent and North America a policy of unrestricted trade and commerce.

157½

Senator Sherman made use of these words:

> Now, Mr. President, taking a broader view of the question, I submit if the time has not come when the people of the United States and Canada should take a broader view of their relations to each other than has heretofore seemed practicable.
>
> Since the conquest of Canada by Great Britain in 1763, she has been a conclusive warning that we cannot be at peace with each other except by political as well as commercial union. Canada should have followed the fortunes of the colonies in the American revolution. The way to union with Canada is not by hostile legislation, not by acts of retaliation, but by friendly overtures. This union is one of events that must inevitably come in the future. The true policy of this government then is to tender freedom in trade and intercourse, and to make this tender in such a friendly way that it shall be an overture to the people of Canada to become a part of this nation.

Lord Milner said:

> Nothing one says can make things any better. It is idle to shut our eyes to the fact that the proposed treaty, like that already concluded with France, must tend to diminish British preference, and is, to that extent, detrimental to the policy of closer union.

Lord Strathcona, one of Canada's greatest statesmen, made use of these words:

> The Canadian ministers allowed themselves to be hypnotized by the brilliance of the American offer and have fallen into a trap. Imperial preference is more urgent than ever.

Mr. FIELDING. Would my hon. friend give me his authority for that quotation?

Mr. GOODEVE. It is a cable in the Canadian press despatch, dated London, February 3.

Mr. FIELDING. I am quite sure Lord Strathcona would not use these words.

Mr. GOODEVE. Well, there is the press despatch. The Minister of Finance seems to object to my quoting these words, but there are many equally strong and even stronger statements on the subject.

Mr. FIELDING. I was not objecting to my hon. friend reading it; I merely interfered, as I thought, on behalf of Lord Strathcona, who, I think, has been misunderstood. That was my only object.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The sentiment is all right anyway.

Mr. GOODEVE. In the 'Congressional Record,' one of the senators from Wisconsin is reported to have said:

> There is not a citizen of the United States who would raise his voice against the admission of Canada to the Union, thus bringing about almost the identical conditions to be achieved by this treaty.

Can anything be more emphatic; could anything be stronger as to this man's idea of the meaning of the treaty? I have quoted the remarks of a western senator, and I now take the following extract from the speech of Mr. Young, of New York, an eastern senator:

Fifty years hence the population of the United States will probably be 200,000,000 and the American people will cross the border in steadily increasing numbers, so that the population of the Dominion is likely to be made up largely of Americans, possibly a majority, and who can tell what may come through the friendly relationship with the mother country of both the United States and Canada? It seems as though in the course of time—it may be 50 years, it may be 100 years, but ultimately—that the American continent will be one people, living under one flag, and by her influence, bring about amity throughout the world which is the desire of all thinking, God-fearing men.

There is another opinion as to what this reciprocity treaty will lead to. I will now quote a man, who, under the peculiar constitution of the United States, occupies an almost similar position to that of the Premier of Canada. I refer to the Speaker of the new House of Representatives, Mr. Champ Clarke. It is true that Mr. Clarke has been cited before, but we cannot impress on the minds of the people of Canada too often what he says was intended by this reciprocity pact. Mr. Clarke spoke, not in a joking way, I assure you, but as a shrewd, capable, careful legislator, a man who occupies the highest position in the American Congress:

I look forward to the time when the American flag will fly over every square foot of British North America up to the North Pole. The people of Canada are of our blood and our language. If the treaty of 1854 never had been abrogated, our countries would be much further advanced than now towards this end.

In that particular I agree with Mr. Champ Clarke, and you will remember that I have already said that in my opinion the abolition of that treaty was a blessing in disguise and has done much towards the upbuilding of the great country we have to-day. Mr. Martin, of South Dakota, interrupted and said:

Will the gentleman favour the abrogation of our tariff law entirely so far as Canada is concerned, and make free trade on all products?

Mr. Clarke—By taking Canada in to become a part of the United States—Yes.

Then Mr. Norris, of Nebraska, asked: As I understand it, the gentleman favours the Bill for at least one reason, that it will have a tendency in the end to bring Canada into the union?

Mr. Clarke replied—Yes, I have no doubt about that.

Now mark, the statement is here made that he favoured the Bill for one reason, and what is the one all-compelling reason that influences this man, who occupies such a high position in the United States, viz., to bring Canada into the American Union? His one all-prevailing reason is that it will have a tendency to, in the end, bring Canada into the American Union. Now, Mr. Chairman, if that should be the result of this treaty, and honestly and sincerely I fear that is its tendency, then I would like to ask every Canadian throughout the Dominion if they are in favour of such a thing? In that connection I would like to cite a statement which has not yet been published, and which should have the greatest possible weight with this government, with the Finance Minister, and with the Minister of Customs. It is the statement of a man who was a Liberal and a free trader, a man who did more than any one man in the great British Empire for the building up of that empire, a man who almost unaided and alone has brought an entire Dominion under the Union Jack. I refer to the late Cecil J. Rhodes, of South Africa. The words of Mr. Rhodes are almost prophetic. When I read them a few months ago I never expected they would apply as they do on the present occasion; I never looked forward to the time, and I hoped I never should see it, when these words would have the bearing on our country's position that this pact gives to them. On the 8th of May, 1891, Mr. Rhodes wrote a letter to Sir John A. Macdonald, and in it he said:

Dear Sir,—I wish to write and congratulate you on winning the elections in Canada. I read your manifesto, and I could understand the issue. If I might express a wish, it would be that we could meet before stern fate claims us. I might write pages, but I feel I know you and your politics as if we had been friends for years.

The whole thing lies in the question:

And note this:

Can we invent some tie with our mother country that will prevent separation? It must be a practical one, for future generations will not be born in England. The curse is that English politicians cannot see the future. They think they will always be the manufacturing mart of the world, but do not understand what protection coupled with reciprocal relations means. I have taken the liberty of writing to you, and if you honour me with an answer I will write again.

Yours,
C. J. RHODES.

It is a marvellous thing and it appealed to me as a young Canadian. Fancy those prophetic words, and think of a man who has done so much for the empire. He asks! Can we invent some tie with our mother country that will prevent separation; it must be a practical one. Now take the explanation given by Rhodes himself of what he meant by a practical one. He says

that he is both a free trader and a Liberal and he presses this not only in his words but in the message he gives. He says he is inclosing a cheque for £5,000 to assist the Liberals in the election at that particular time. He says further:

The labour question is an important one, but deeper than the labour question is that of the market for the products of labour, and as your local productions can only support about six millions of people, the balance depends upon the trade of the world. . . . .

If you had had statesmen you would at the present moment be commercially at war with the United States, and would have boycotted their raw products until they came to their senses.

I ask the House, is that not a marvellous prophetic utterance. He says:

If you had had statesmen you would have boycotted their raw products until they came to their senses, and I say this because I am a free trader.

Later on he says:

I am horrified by Morley's speech on Egypt

You know what that speech was, Morley was willing to let Egypt go, he was not willing to shoulder the burdens of the empire. And see what this great statesman says:

If you think your party hopeless, keep the money, but give it to some charity you approve of. It would be an awful thing to give my money to breaking up the empire.

Mr. Chairman, I fear, and I say it in all sincerity, that we have reached that point to-night that was certainly the position when the commercial war was brought on in 1891. This letter was written in the fiscal year 1891 and those were the words of this statesman. He made these remarks after discussing the whole question, he feared it might mean the breaking up of the empire and he said: It would be an awful thing if I should be a party to the breaking up of the empire.

I appeal to you and to every member of this House having the interest of Canada at heart, looking back at her history for the last 150 years, realizing the difficulties we have come through, that we should be careful before casting our vote on a question of this nature. Who of us has not stood on the ocean shore? We have watched the waves as they come and go, coming in nearer, nearer and again receding and it has been difficult for us to say at times whether the water was rising or receding. Thus it has been with the history of Canada. There have been times in the history of Canada when the tide of trade, the tide of commerce and the tide of prosperity has risen and come near, and again there have been times of trade depression when the tide seemed to recede, and finally, like these waves of the ocean, have come in those mighty waves of prosperity until we of all nations of the world have been prosperous. Our banks, our saving banks, our trade, our commerce, our workmen, our artisans, everybody has been successful and prosperous and just when this tide of prosperity is at its very height, like a bolt from the blue, without mandate, without consultation with the people, without consideration of the requirements of this country of ours, without asking or seeking that they might be guided in this great undertaking, in the reversal of this policy, they have cast this bolt, upseting, endangering and interfering unless we check it now, retarding the wonderful development that we have made up to the present time.

I have endeavoured very broadly to lay down the foundations from which we are to discuss this question, and I would like to discuss one or two of its economic phases. Before I do so, will you permit me to puncture three or four of the free trade air bubbles of my hon. friend from Red Deer? The first argument he advanced will be found at page 4239 of 'Hansard.' When he was describing the wonderful prosperity and progress of the manufacturers of Great Britain, he took as his best illustration of that progress the great manufacturing establishment of Lever Brothers, the head of the Sunlight Soap works. He said they had built up such a great industry in this line that it was one of the largest in the world, and he attributed that result to free trade; but he ended by saying that they had branch factories in the United States, in Germany, in France, in Switzerland, in Belgium, in Australia and in Canada. Did the hon. member stop to say why they have factories in all these highly protected countries? Would they have built a branch factory in Canada had it not been for the duty and the protective tariff on soaps in this country? That little factory here in Canada to distribute this great product employs several hundred hands, who in turn make a home market for the very agriculturists to whom my friends were referring. We have the home market of the masons, the bricklayers, the carpenters, who erected these buildings. We have the home market of the mechanics, who built and installed the machinery in that factory. Carried to its logical conclusion, all of that trade, all of that home market would be still in Great Britain had it not been for the protective policy adopted in Canada in 1878. What would we have had? The farmers for whom he was speaking, would have simply had the price of their wheat less the cost of carrying in competition with the surplus wheat of the entire world and the British

workmen would have formed the home market for the products of the British agriculturists and thus we break the first free trade bubble of my hon. friend.

I now come to the second argument. He referred to intensive farming. He referred many times according to the habit of hon. gentlemen opposite, to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I find, however, that they invariably fail to answer the arguments advanced by that hon. gentleman, and it was so in this case.

Here is what he says at page 4240 of 'Hansard:'

Intensive farming was subject which I had hardly expected to hear my hon. friend from North Toronto growing eloquent upon. He did, however, seem to hint that intensive farming would be hurt by this reciprocity arrangement. He did not give any facts to support that idea.

Then he goes on to quote Cobden as usual, and he ends up as follows:

In free trade Britain to-day—if I am wrong, the Minister of Agriculture will correct me—33 bushels of wheat to the acre are grown on the average; in protected America the average is 14 bushels to the acre, and in Canada, with our virgin soil, it is only 17 bushels. What is the matter. I ask my protectionist friends, with little Britain as a country where intensive farming is carried on under free trade?

And my hon. friends opposite actually cheered him. I would ask any man is there absolutely any argument in all this, anything but a mere statement of fact, a mere statement of the fact that in Dakota they raise 14 bushels of wheat to the acre, and in our Canadian Northwest 17 bushels to the acre while in Great Britain they raise 33 bushels per acre? But let me give the argument which my hon. friend failed to make. If there be any logical deduction to be made from these facts it is this. It is that the Dakota farmer has robbed his soil of its fertility and destroyed its value and that the Canadian farmer in our Northwest is rapidly following in his footsteps, whereas the farmers of Great Britain, by keeping their by-products at home and feeding them to their stock, have enriched and increased a hundred-fold the value of their land. That was the argument made by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and that is the argument which my free trade friend (Mr. Clarke) failed to see. And so I have pricked another of these airy bubbles.

But a little later at page 4246 of 'Hansard' my hon. friend said:

This empire has grown up on the basis of absolute freedom of its component parts. Would you have us repeat the experiment that Great Britain tried with her American colonies and which lost them to the empire? Was it not this very mistake of mixing up trade relations with politics? Was it not that which led George Washington——

My hon. friend is fond of quoting Cobden and these other men who are long past and gone.

—to advise his countrymen so earnestly not to become entangled with the politics of foreign nations? Now, the rule in Britain is to make her own tariffs, and what is good for Britain is good enough for Canada.

And again we heard the cheers of my hon. friends opposite. Why, if there is anything in it, that is the very argument we have been endeavouring to put forth on this side of the House ever since the day this proposed treaty was brought down. We have been urging that we should make our own tariff, free from the politics of the United States, free from their influence, and free from any complications with that country which must eventually lead to trouble and disorder.

Again we break the third bubble of my hon. friend the free trader.

As a fourth argument he said:

What are the facts? Mr. Cobden, in a speech which he delivered after the repeal of the corn laws, drew attention to the fact that the most notable thing after the repeal of those laws was the improvement of agriculture in Great Britain.

Well, it is one thing to make an assertion and another to prove it. Let us see if there was any improvement in agriculture in Great Britain. I have here extracts from an expert report on the agricultural conditions in Great Britain. They are in newspaper form and not tabulated, but I shall give some of the results:

In 1873 Great Britain had 3,670,259 acres under wheat. Whereas in 1908 she had only 1,664,860 acres under wheat. During the same period her acreage under barley has shrunk by 750,119 acres; that under beans has shrunk by 401,203 acres; that under peas has decreased by 156,824 acres; that under potatoes has declined by 264,598 acres; that under turnips has shrunk by 641,850 acres.

During the last fifty years the number of agricultural labourers in the United Kingdom has decreased by more than a million.

Ireland's acreage under wheat has shrunk from 743,871 acres in 1847 to 43,600 acres in 1909. Ireland's agricultural labourers decreased from 850,100 in 1851 to 212,200 in 1901.

The agricultural area of Germany is only about one-third larger than is the agriculture area of the United Kingdom. Yet for every single sack of bread corn, produced in Great Britain, Germany produces ten sacks for every ton of potatoes produced in Great Britain, Germany raises seven tons; for every pig raised in Great Britain Germany raises six pigs. Free trade has ruined the agriculture of Great Britain and especially that of Ireland.

Free Trade Accused.

Since the introduction of free trade, about twelve million British people, a population

larger than that of Scotland, Ireland and Wales combined, have left the United Kingdom. The population of Ireland, which came to almost nine millions when free trade was introduced in 1846, has declined to about 4,300,000 at the present moment. Many of the British manufacturing industries have experienced a similar decline. Between 1851 and 1904 the workers employed in the British silk industries have decreased from 130,723 to 30,184.

And note this:

On the other hand in the United States, under protection the workers employed in the silk trade have increased from 1,723 in 1850 to 79,601 in 1905.

Thus in the United States, under its high protective system which my hon. friend so strongly condemns, the silk industry made marvellous progress. This was a new industry in the United States. Britain had had a long start, Britain had her silk mills well established and was supplying the markets of the world, yet the workers employed in the British silk industries had decreased from 130,000 to 30,000. On the other hand the workers in the silk mills in the United States had increased in numbers from 1,743 in 1850 to 79,601 in 1906. I do not think I need labour that argument any further. These are authentic statistics showing the results of free trade in Great Britain; and as one hon. member on the other side pointed out the other evening, there is probably no country in the world where there are more people living upon charity than in the United Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland.

I want to give another evidence to my hon. friend because I want to prove very fully this particular argument I am making:

A Gratifying Comparison.

In ten years from 1898 to 1908, the commerce of Canada has increased 88·14 per cent, and that is a greater increase than any other country in the world with the exception of the Argentine Republic, which shows an increase of 164 per cent. The increase in the commerce of the United States for the same period was 55·19 per cent, while that of Great Britain was 37·81 per cent.

I think that is a conclusive proof that the bubble I have referred to, bubble No. 4, is completely exploded.

He made one other argument, and it also was based on what had been said by my hon. friend from North Toronto. He made quite a pretty figure on the 'preference wax doll.' Well, the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) has so effectually melted this wax doll that there is not even the smell left—so it is not necessary to deal with that argument further. Having dealt with the only points he has made, I will now leave him in his lonely furrow, and pass on to the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell). That hon. gentleman went out of his way to scold the banks for paying the farmers only three per cent interest, forgetting that this was brought about by the government he supports reducing the interest paid in the government savings banks on July 1st, 1897, from 3½ per cent to 3 per cent. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) quoted many statistics in regard to his own province. But, when questioned by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) he did not seem to be quite sure of what his statistics meant. I would only remark to the hon. member for Carleton that I know of no two things on which so many false doctrines are built up as the misuse of statistics and the misuse of the scriptures. Let me give one illustration. The hon. gentleman took the trade returns in potatoes, which, he said, was one of the important points—and hon. members will recollect that I pointed out that the hon. Minister of Finance had brought back free potatoes for the maritime provinces. And, after quoting certain figures, the hon. member for Carleton said, 'This is a complete history from the Canadian standpoint, of the exportation of potatoes to the United States up to 1910.' Now, I took the trouble to hunt up the figures of the imports of potatoes into Canada from the United States for six of the years covered by the quotation of the hon. member for Carleton. In his discussion of the matter, the hon. gentleman said that there had been only one year during his lifetime when potatoes had been lower in the United States than in the maritime provinces. Now, I have put the figures as given by the hon. member and printed in 'Hansard' alongside the figures of the Trade and Navigation Returns showing the imports of potatoes for these six years. And I find the remarkable fact that, for four of the years that the hon. gentleman himself selected, we imported more potatoes into the Dominion of Canada than we exported. In other words, we are throwing open the market of Canada to the United States, and no doubt the whole country will realize before they get through with it that this Canadian market in agricultural products has been exposed to competition from every agricultural country in the world. Here are the figures:

Year.	Potatoes exported to the United States. Value.	Potatoes imported from United States. Value.
1905..	$ 18,301	$179,853
1906..	128,363	131,891
1907 (9 months only)..	4,250	72,284
1908..	15,459	203,018
1909..	251,907	129,001
1910..	345,903	182,160

What does this prove? It proves simply the doctrine we laid down in the beginning: that there are bound to be times, along the border of four thousand miles long, when their local fluctuations will cause the advantage to be now on this side and now on that. What, then, is the argument that follows? Why, it is that we must deal with these questions from the broad national standpoint, considering, not local conditions, but the good of Canada as a whole. It is absurd to deal with a question of this nature along narrow lines. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) read to-day in this House a statement which completely refuted the allegations with regard to the prices of butter and other agricultural products. I intend to deal with that more fully a little later on. In dealing with this question of the importation into Canada of agricultural products from the United States, I would like to quote a gentleman who, in 1903, was secretary of the Minnesota branch of the National Reciprocity League. He made an exhaustive study as an expert on behalf of this league, taking evidence on the whole question. Let me give some of the facts he gathered:

Our farmers should understand that in opening up our markets to Canada's natural products, we are also getting a big market there for our natural products. We hear very much about how the agreement is inimical to the interests of the barley raisers, but our attention has not been called to the fact that last year we exported 164,000 bushels of barley to Canada and paid thereon a duty of 15 cents a bushel. Canada removes this duty under agreement. Last year our farmers shipped 7,680 tons of hay to Canada——

This is the very argument the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) was trying to make this afternoon, and here is the expert answer:

—and somebody paid a duty of $15,360 on that hay. Last year Canada bought 215,000 bushels of potatoes from us, and a duty of $43,000 was paid thereon. Of other fresh vegetables, Canada bought from us last year $652,000 worth, and had to pay on them tariff taxes of $195,000. Of apples alone——

This is another argument of my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B.:

—Canada bought last year from us 59,071 barrels, and the duty thereon was $24,000.

These apples will come in absolutely free under this arrangement, and then where will this market be to which my hon. friend refers?

Canada bought from us last year several thousand head of cattle, 121,000 horses, 104,000 sheep and 24,000 other live animals, and a vast quantity of poultry, the total duties levied on which amounted to $175,000. All of these now go on the free list, and the Canadian market for them is to be as untrammelled as the market in any part of the United States.

While meats are not placed on the free list, the reductions offered by Canada are so sweeping that there must inevitably be an immense increase in our exports of such products to Canada.

Then he goes on giving statistics. We have had so many statistics read in this House that I dislike to weary the House by reading any more; yet it is necessary to do so in order to make clear our arguments. He says:

What this means to our market for meats can be inferred from the fact that last year the imports of these articles from the United States into Canada were so enormous that the total duty collected by the Canadian government amounted to more than $600,000. The amount of the duty Canada remits on these products—based on last year's figures—will be almost $400,000. Last year Canada imported 750,000 dozen eggs from the United States, and paid a duty of $23,000 thereon. Eggs go on the free list now.

So I could go on all through the list of agricultural imports into Canada. Thus we see how strongly this arrangement is going to work against the interests of the agricultural classes of Canada. Now let me for a moment refer to the trip west of the right hon. the leader of the government. He spoke at Nelson, British Columbia, in the district of Kootenay, my constituency, and was reported in the Daily 'News'. Speaking of myself he said: 'He is a Tory, that is all the reproach I have to make against him, but it is a very serious reproach'. Well, I am glad I do not look upon it as such. He went on to say:

May I be pardoned if I go one step farther and say that in other respects the people of this section of British Columbia did not consult their best interests. Why how old is this city? Ten, fifteen years at most. This town owes its existence largely and its prosperity certainly to the policy of the government, which by the grace of God and the will of the Canadian people has been at the head of affairs for the last fourteen years at Ottawa. How so? Well sir, three things have characterized the policy of this government. Transportation, immigration and their fiscal policy. In all these things I claim that the policy of the government has largely contributed, not only to the existence but still more to the prosperity of this city and all the cities of the Kootenay valley.

Here the leader of the government makes the claim of building up all the cities of the province of British Columbia. He also claims credit for his fiscal policy. Now, I want to show the right hon. gentleman what the people of Nelson think of this marvellous fiscal policy of his, which he claims has built up the entire province of British Columbia. The night this treaty was announced by the press despatches, the people of Nelson, not waiting to write, realiz-

ing the gravity of the situation as it would affect that district, immediately called a meeting of all classes of the community, regardless of politics. The fruit growers of that district met and passed this resolution, which they sent by telegram:

A meeting of fruit growers this district here to-day, following resolution unanimously passed: Whereas the fruit growers of the Kootenay have invested heavily in developing orchards, relying upon the government of Canada to maintain existing tariff conditions as affecting their products, or in case of any modification affecting fruit to benefit to an equal rate by modification of the tariff on other articles affecting the cost of production of fruit; and, whereas the cost of production in this district is increased by the fact that labour and all supplies are higher by reason of a generally productive tariff and of the distance from eastern Canadian manufacturing centres than it would otherwise be; and, whereas, the industry being as yet in the early stages of development in this district, the costs are higher than in the older established districts in Washington and Oregon, from where the fruit comes into competition with ours, while there is nothing in the proposed reciprocal arrangement to reduce the cost of production; and, whereas, the proposed reciprocity arrangement with the United States would remove the protection which we now enjoy and would doubtless lower the net profit (taking as an instance on our apples by the amount of the present duty, viz., 13 cents per box); and, whereas, our orchards have been planted with varieties more suitable to the Canadian markets, which are our best market, under our tariff system, and it would be impossible for us to take advantage of the market for special varieties of fruit in the eastern cities of the United States which would be opened to us by the reciprocity arrangement, without in most cases sacrificing existing orchards and developing new ones; and, whereas, we do not consider it wise or safe to develop orchards requiring years of labour and large expenditure, depending upon a condition which might be terminated at any time by a foreign power; and, whereas——

Now note this, because I consider it is an absolutely proper and common sense way of looking at the question. This is not a pro forma resolution passed to bolster up the government, it is a declaration of men whose very bread and butter are at stake. And what do they say:

—there is no compensating benefit to us in the proposed reciprocity arrangement, and the result will be injurious and unjust to us; therefore, be it resolved that we, the fruit growers of the Kootenay in mass meeting assembled, do protest against the proposed reciprocity arrangement as regards fruit being put into force, and do respectfully request the government of Canada not to make such reciprocal arrangements regarding fruit at this time.

Have wired this to Minister of Customs, kindly hand on our behalf copies to Finance Minister, Senators Templeman and Bostock and Burrell; other resolutions by mail.

I immediately had copies of this resolution made and forwarded to the parties mentioned, from whom I received replies saying they had received it. Now, Sir, look for a moment at this remarkable situation. These men, whose means of livelihood were absolutely threatened, wired down to their representative, as they had a just right to do, asking me to endeavour to protect their interests. And what was the result? Why, if I am to take the answer of the leader of the government to the fruit growers of Niagara district: 'It is too late'. Did you ever hear of such a thing, Mr. Chairman, at any time of your life? I ask you if that is a constitutional method of procedure? No one can be heard. Who are the people of this country? They are not the government. As I said before, the government stands for the whole people, it means the people in this democratic country of ours, and no two men, and no set of men, have any right to put the country into this position. Having forwarded their message to the gentlemen they mentioned, I was forced to write back to them: 'I am utterly helpless in the situation'. I appeal to you, I appeal to any one in this House, if that is a democratic form of government. Now we have two additional resolutions which were forwarded to me by mail, and here is one:

Moved by N. Wolverton, seconded by C. F. McHardy,

Whereas various fruit pests exist in the United States of which we are fortunately free, and,

Whereas the diseased and hence inferior fruit from the United States is our worst competitor,

Therefore be it resolved that this assembly of fruit growers of the Kootenays earnestly petition for such a rigid inspection of imported fruit as exclude all defective fruit.

Now let me explain that to the Minister of Finance who negotiated this treaty. We have in the province of British Columbia fruit inspectors on whom we spend large sums of money annually. I have seen in my own town, box after box of apples that came from Washington and Oregon, burnt by the fruit inspector because of their diseased condition. This is what makes every British Columbian proud of the fruit industry of that province, the superior quality of our fruit to that grown south of the line. I myself have walked, ridden and driven hundreds of miles through the beautiful valleys in the very district here referred to. The Prime Minister himself went through that region, and in beautiful language described its beauties and wonders. Yet he comes down here, and with one fell blow is about to destroy the livelihood of those people.

What is the position? I have gone there and I have driven through those remarkable orchards. One thing that strikes a man from the older settled parts of Can-

ada or the United States is the absolute freedom from disease of our fruit there. It is marvellous to see the thin skin of the fruit. Any man who has been accustomed to the older orchards will be immediately struck with the marvellous freedom from disease of any kind when he sees the pear, plum or apple trees there. The skin of the peaches is absolutely transparent, the fruit is perfect to look upon, and yet I regret to think that fruit is to be allowed to go and come by the removal of this tariff. I see my friends smiling. Of course, we can continue to have our inspectors there and we shall continue to have them, but I say that it is the part of this Dominion government to assist us with regard to that question. Now, Sir, I would like to read another resolution passed by a board of trade—a public, non-political body —with regard to the effect of this treaty. In passing, let me say that it is a remarkable thing that the Minister of Inland Revenue, in reading those resolutions in favour of this proposal, which he had to admit, in answer to a question from this side of the House, were all from Liberal associations, failed to read this resolution. We have been inquiring day after day and the government are failing to bring down information with regard to the other side of the question.

Mr. FIELDING. Has not the information that my hon. friend quoted been brought down? The papers which he states he has, have been brought down.

Mr. GOODEVE. I have not seen them yet, but this resolution was not quoted by the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend says information has not been brought down. He was good enough to send me a resolution received from his constituents and if that is not in the return before the House, and if he does find it is not there, then it is a mistake, and I will see that it is corrected.

Mr. GOODEVE. Then, I will gladly apologize to the Minister of Finance, because I wish to make no unfair statements My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) informs me that the resolution was brought down two days ago, although it was received over a month ago. Now, I will read the resolution of the Nelson Board of Trade:

Moved by F. A. Starkey, seconded by W. B. Farris, that in the opinion of this meeting the proposed reciprocal tariff between Canada and the United States is one of the most important questions that has come before the people of Canada, and in view of the fact that British Columbia has the prospects of great future industries in fruit-growing, mining and lumbering and that sufficient time has not been given the people of this province to carefully consider all phases of this great question and they are not in a position to know what effect such a tariff would have on the industries of British Columbia, therefore, the government should give further time to the consideration of this question, and that a special investigation should be made as to the effect that this tariff, if passed, will have upon the future development of British Columbia. Carried.

I would like to know how hon. gentlemen feel with regard to the resolution they voted down yesterday in which we asked, in the very language of this resolution, for more time to consider the question. I have another resolution which was wired to me by the Creston Board of Trade. Creston, in my opinion, is quite equal to the celebrated Okanagan Valley. It is at the head of Kootenay lake and they have made a wonderful success of the cultivation of fruit at that place. I know in one instance personal to myself, of a man who squatted there without a dollar and who took off, in 1908, $1,275 per acre in strawberries and, in 1909, $1,400 per acre. I think this is one of the best parts of British Columbia. Here is a resolution from their Board of Trade:

Creston, B.C., Feb. 2, 1911.

A. S. Goodeve, M.P., Ottawa,—Following resolution passed by this Board. Kindly pass on to Messrs. Burrell and Bostock: Whereas proposed reciprocity agreement introduced by Mr. Fielding will inflict severe blow to fruit and lumbering interests of province without giving any equivalent, and whereas the fruit industry is in its infancy and requires fostering, and whereas fostering these industries of vital importance to welfare province, and whereas proposed agreement would imperil capital investment of those interested in this industry, now be it resolved that this Board strongly condemn proposed agreement as far as applied these industries.

CRESTON BOARD OF TRADE.

I have here a personal letter from a fruit grower, Michael Phillips. He sends me a long letter in which he sets forth similar reasons why this proposal should not be adopted. I have also a resolution from the Victoria Incorporated Co-operative Fruit Growers' Association, Limited, which reads as follows:

That we, the directors of the Victoria Incorporated Co-operative Fruit Growers Association, Limited, hereby view with alarm the contemplated removal of the duty on American fruits, as explained in the daily press, under the proposed reciprocity agreement between the Canadian and American governments, and believe that such abolition of the tariff on fruits will greatly retard and depreciate, if not utterly destroy, the fruit-growing industry in British Columbia.

I have a similar resolution from the Central Farmers' Institute, a public non-political body representing the whole province,

the resolution having been sent here by the deputy minister of the province. It is as follows:

Resolved, that the Central Farmers' Institute views with alarm a movement recently advanced by the grain growers of the prairies for reciprocity in natural products with the United States, as such an adjustment of the tariff would be of material disadvantage to the horticultural industry of this province, and this meeting is strongly of the opinion that not only should no reduction of duty on fruit be permitted by the Dominion government, but that immediate steps should be taken to place our duty on a parity with that of the United States, which in several instances is considerably higher on various kinds of fruit than ours.

Further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the hon. Minister of Customs, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. R. L. Borden, and the several representatives of British Columbia and constituencies in the Dominion House of Commons and members of the Senate from this province. Carried.

I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant,

WM. E. SCOTT,
Deputy Minister.

I have also a resolution which I think has already been put in by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo, from Nanaimo. Now then, I just wish to say a word or two, because this aspect of the question has been fully and fairly dealt with by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo. The right hon. leader of the government took credit for building up and developing this particular district; yet, by the carrying on of this pact they will retard to a very great extent its further development. I do not wish to be placed on record as saying that we will be utterly ruined, because I believe that the free spirit of these western Anglo-Saxon people will rise above every difficulty and obstruction, but I do claim that the Dominion government should not do anything that will retard in the slightest degree the development of this great industry in that district.

That particular district needs special nursing, for the reason that these are small valleys scattered along a series of very beautiful lakes, and there being the difficulty of getting a very large acreage in one district the transportation problem becomes acute. There is also the fact to be found in all new countries that it is difficult for the people to get together to find a particular kind of fruit that is best located for a particular district, and along that line the provincial government is spending a large sum of money. They have established numerous experimental stations which become necessary because the conditions of soil and climate vary very materially within a short distance owing to air currents and the influence of the varying altitudes. All these are difficulties which call for special sympathy, special aid, and special assistance but instead of rendering us that sympathy we have received no consideration from this government. I shall not labour that argument because it is very ably presented to the House by my colleague (Mr. Burrell), and I shall briefly sum up the reasons against this arrangement, taking as my basis the many resolutions that have been received, which on examination will be found to be not exaggerated in any way.

This arrangement will be most detrimental to the agricultural interests of our province, and will be a disastrous blow to the fruit growing industry if carried into effect.

1. The result of prices obtained by fruit growers for the past four year's crop has shown very small profit over the cost of production, owning to keen competition from the American States. 2. Western American growers can secure their labour for orchard work fully 25 to 30 per cent cheaper. The cost of material, fruit boxes, wrapping paper, &c., is quite 25 per cent cheaper in the American States. 3. The cost of production of a box of apples to the grower in the foregoing States is approximately 40 cents. It costs the British Columbia grower, owing to the causes advanced, from 60 to 65 cents. 4. The present duty on a box of apples is 13 cents. It will thus be seen that the duty as now imposed is not nearly sufficient to compensate for the cheaper labour and material which the Americans have. 5. By the removal of duty imposed on American fruit entering Canada under present conditions, the American States will be able to undersell British Columbia in the markets of the middle west, as also in the home market. 6. Large sums of money have been invested by land and irrigation companies and private individuals in developing the fruit industry of the province, and their interests should be protected. 7. The provincial government has spent a considerable amount of money in recent years in advertising the fruit growing possibilities of the province, and have thereby attracted men with capital who have planted out large areas in fruit. 8. If the proposed tariff agreement becomes effective, a check will be put on men with capital coming to our province, thereby materially retarding the exploitation of our agricultural and fruit lands. 9. We have been struggling during the past ten years under somewhat adverse and difficult circumstances to develop our fruit industry, thereby bringing a yearly increasing revenue to the province. Abolition of the duty at present imposed means fiercer competition from the American States and we receive in return absolutely no

equivalent advantage. 10. The great fruit growing districts of the interior, where fruit growing has been made a speciality, will receive a serious setback if the present duties are abolished, and this will result in a lowering of land prices all round. 11. Men who have settled in our lands, putting labour and capital into them, and thereby developing our agricultural resources, should be protected. 12. The problem in British Columbia at the present time is that of settling our lands, and thus developing our agricultural and fruit industries. Too much of what should be produced in the province is imported from the United States, and this is increasing each year. Any course of action such as the proposed tariff agreement, which will discourage land settlement, is against the interests of the province, and should be strongly opposed. 13. An agreement which has been advanced by those in favour of a free interchange with the States, is that British Columbia will secure cheaper fruit, and that it will not interfere with provincial grown fruit. This is not correct, as our principal competitors are the States of California, Oregon and Washington, whose fruit comes into the market practically at the same time. As a matter of fact, it comes into the market shortly beforehand, and this consequently lowers the price for British Columbia fruit arriving immediately after. 14. It will divert interprovincial trade between the eastern provinces of Canada and British Columbia to the States, thus sending money to the American side which, as loyal Canadians, we would wish to see stay in our great Dominion. 15. It will materially affect traffic on our own transcontinental lines, by diverting a portion of such traffic to foreign railways. 16. It will be a setback to imperial preference, and federation of the empire which we all, as component parts of the greatest empire the world has ever seen, look forward to in the near future. 17. It is altogether a one-sided arrangement. We gain practically nothing, and lose much. 18. Let well alone. Our Dominion, and British Columbia in particular are entering on an area of unprecedented prosperity. Capital to develop our great natural resources is pouring into the country. The tide of immigration has set our way, and under existing conditions our future is assured.

The following figures furnished by the Inspector of Fruit Pests regarding imports into the city of Vancouver, are interesting. There were 79,388 boxes of apples imported; 14,367 of pears; 14,186 of plums; 655 boxes of prunes; 64,702 boxes of peaches; 12,699 of apricots; 473 boxes of crabapples; 25 boxes of quinces, and 11 of nectarines. These amounts would represent 266 full carloads of fruit of ten tons each. When you consider the other cities of the coast, and the interior, one realizes what a very large amount of fruit crosses the American side into our local markets. The present proportion of fruit marketed by British Columbia in the middle west does not reach 25 per cent of the total amount sold there.

Now, just a citation from the budget speech of the Minister of Finance of the province of British Columbia which was submitted to the legislature a few days ago. It will be interesting to every member of this House, as it is to every Canadian who is interested in the development of our western provinces. It is rather a remarkable statement. I may say that the Minister of Finance in introducing this subject gave the source from which he took his figures and like our own Minister of Finance he explained that it was difficult to get statistics of that nature bearing on agricultural products, but he took his information from the railroads and the express companies, and he had his figures rechecked, and he says he thinks he can safely say that they are at least approximately accurate. The provincial Minister of Finance finds that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1910, British Columbia produced $14,399,000 worth of agricultural products and there were imported into that province $14,962,904 worth of the same products. It will be noted that the province imported approximately the same amount as she produced. Now I appeal to every member of this House, and particularly to the members from Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. We have here an interprovincial trade with British Columbia of over $14,000,000 consisting of horses, cattle, sheep, swine, poultry, butter, cheese, milk, bacon, meat, lard, pork, fruits, vegetables, eggs, honey, hay and grain; all of which can be raised in the western prairie provinces, and can be exchanged for the fruit of the province of British Columbia, because as we know the prairie provinces do not produce fruit. And yet at one stroke this interprovincial trade will be very materially injured if not practically ruined, temporarily at any rate. So much for the local side of that question.

Thus far I have been dealing rather with the sins of commission of this government, and if they have done many things that they ought not to have done I may say that they have also left undone many things that they ought to have done. When the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs were down at Washington, did it not occur to them that there was something else they might have offered from the province of British Columbia in exchange for this free fish instead of our fruit industry? It did not occur to them that last year, in this House, we very properly voted $50,000 for experimental purposes to discover a way of treating the zinc ores of that province. Did they not realize, be-

cause they have the statistics, or could get them from the Minister of Mines, of the enormous value of those zinc ores in British Columbia, what it would mean to the Dominion of Canada if we had a successful treatment of those ores? They must have known, or should have known, before going into a question of this kind, of what immense value that would have been to this great district, with its newly developed, complex, mixed lead and zinc ores. Yet I find no reference in this treaty to these ores. Under the Dingley tariff ore was admitted free to the United States, but under the Payne-Aldrich treaty of 1909 the duty on mixed zinc and lead ores carrying over 25 per cent of zinc was one cent per pound on the zinc contained in the ore. There were certain reductions from this on ores carrying less than 25 per cent of zinc. As a matter of fact, the class of ores we have in that province are such that we could not export any that did not carry the amount set forth, so for practical purposes on all we can export the duty will be one cent a pound under the Payne-Aldrich tariff. In consequence of that, we deal only with that duty. The reason given for the imposition of this tax under the Payne-Aldrich tariff was that they were in competition with the zinc ores of Mexico, where they had low-priced coolie labour, and that this was being done on behalf of the American miner. I would call the attention of the minister to the way in which the Americans guard the interests of their miners, their workmen, their artisans and mechanics. The reason advanced did not apply in any particular to the province of British Columbia, because, as I will show you, not only do we pay as high wages as the Americans, but better wages. The British Columbia miner receives 50 cents to a dollar a day more in the zinc districts than the miners receive in the zinc districts of the United States. This refers to New Jersey, Missouri and Wisconsin. It is to be noted that considerably more than two-thirds of the zinc in the United States comes from New Jersey, Missouri and Wisconsin, and in none of these states are the wages paid as high as in British Columbia. The 'Engineering and Mining Journal' of January 11, 1911, page 25, says that the wages of miners in Wisconsin were $2.50 a day, and of muckers $2 a day. The muckers in British Columbia get $3 a day of 8 hours. It is necessary for the Canadian producers to sell their zinc ores in the United States, or ship them to the United States for smelting in bond for sale in Europe; there is no other way in which we can treat one pound of those zinc ores. So they are absolutely lying idle. If the Minister of Customs was in his place I would call his attention to an argument he made in this House, when he said: Do the people of Frontenac county want their iron ores, forsooth, to remain in the ground, because, possibly, at some future time their great-great-grandchildren might take them out? Let me give him his answer back and ask him: Do the people of British Columbia want their zinc ores to lie idle in the ground, because, possibly, their great-great-grandchildren may take them out? Yet neither hon. minister gave any attention to this great industry. The production of zinc ores in the United States, Mexico and Canada has been as follows:

	1906.	1907.	1908.	1909.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
United States..	905,000	903,000	838,000	1,000,000
Mexico.....	89,000	109,000	66,000	100,000
Brit. Columbia.	600	1,100	6,100	10,000

We produced these amounts notwithstanding the fact that we have to fight against this duty and to go to foreign zinc smelters to have our ores treated, to send them through in bond, and to pay all expenses and send them to the European market. Did it not occur to either minister that they might fairly and justly ask the United States in adjusting their tariff to remove that duty? The Americans themselves now want it removed, and I feel satisfied that if the ministers had merely suggested it it would have been done at once. The unpopularity of the zinc tariff in the United States is shown by the following comment of the 'Engineering and Mining Journal' of January 7, 1911:

> The results of 1910 showed that the tariff on zinc ore has not benefited the miners, the prices of zinc and zinc ore having averaged no higher than formerly, while it harassed the smelters. Thus it has helped nobody and has hurt somebody.

There is this difference in regard to lead. The government of Canada gave a bounty of $5,000,000, and very properly so, as they did in the steel bounties, and if it were not for that bounty, under the conditions we have in the United States, it would be impossible to operate our lead mines. As a matter of fact, a very large proportion of the zinc mines we cannot operate at all for the reasons I have stated. That is one of the sins of omission, and so it is in regard to this whole question. The more we see of it the more we find that they seem to have given it little attention and not to have studied it in all its relations. I would like even now, under the circumstances I have placed before the minister, to see the minister endeavour in some way, without putting it into this compact, if they are bound to force it through, that

some arrangement is made whereby that duty could be removed from the zinc ores of Canada. The smelters themselves on the other side, as set forth by the 'Mining and Engineering Journal,' are quite prepared to bring their influence to bear in that direction.

A word in regard to lumber. Let me say frankly it is a difficult question to deal with, or to argue about. You see the difficulties here. Our government had already removed the duty on lumber, and the result is that our markets, particularly our western prairie markets, have been flooded with the surplus products of rough lumber of the western United States. I was talking to a lumberman in this House to-day, and any lumberman will tell you that there is invariably a surplus of rough lumber at any mill. It is like the rough meat. The packers will tell you to-day that the reason of the high price of meats is because they can only sell the choice cuts. It is the same with the lumber industry. The Americans had plenty of rough lumber, which it was often difficult to dispose of, and whenever there was a glut in their own market they dumped it into the prairie provinces of our northwest. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) knows that delegation after delegation of lumbermen brought pressure on the government to have a duty put on, but he said they could not do it in the interests of the prairie provinces. Well, I am not here to discuss that question, but I am only saying that the supposed advantage given by the Americans in taking the duty off lumber is of no benefit so far as British Columbia is concerned. The Americans always have plenty of rough lumber, and it is impossible to send ours into their market and compete with it.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). Will my hon. friend tell the House who took the duty off rough lumber?

Mr. GOODEVE. The Conservative government took it off in the interests of the prairie provinces when the settlers came into these provinces in the early days. At that time the great spruce areas in that district north of Edmonton had not been opened up; at that time we had not developed the lumber industry in British Columbia to the same extent as to-day. Neither had we the same transportation facilities, and so the Liberal-Conservative government, as it has always done in dealing with these tariff questions, took off the duty in the interests of the people at large.

Let me now give you an extract from a letter written by Sir William Van Horne. In that letter he quotes what Senator Beveridge said with regard to the point I have made. Sir Wm. Van Horne quotes Senator Beveridge as saying:

We should freely admit Canadian lumber to American planing mills in return for Canada's freely admitting other American manufacturing products to Canadian markets. We should have a special tariff arrangement with this intimate neighbour and natural customer. This would mean millions of dollars of profit every year to Indiana's factories. Reciprocity would mean vast increases in Canada's purchases from us.

I would like now to quote two Liberals in reply to the position taken by my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman). I shall quote a Liberal premier and a Liberal minister of a Liberal government in Canada. Let me first take Sir George Ross, ex-premier of Ontario, who in turn quotes from the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). He said:

The question of our lumber industry has also its future aspect. No doubt the admission of lumber into the American market free of duty would enhance the value of lumber and probably the value of all standing marketable timber in Canada. But the personal interests of the lumbermen are not to be alone considered. One of the greatest questions now before the people of Canada is how to conserve their forests. Mr. Clifford Sifton, chairman of the Conservation of Natural Resources, speaking before the Empire Club, on the 20th ult., said. 'At the end of twenty years the United States would have no timber for sale in the ordinary way. In Canada the supply was large, but if the supply in the United States ran out, the supply in Canada would last the United States for only seven years. The time must come, however, when the people of Canada would demand legislation prohibiting the export of marketable timber.' This is the national view and the only view which will do justice to Canadian interests. Can this view be maintained under a treaty?

Can this view be maintained after the treaty is ratified? The answer given by Sir George Ross is no. I have here a very strong resolution condemning this proposed arrangement from the lumber men's association. The Minister of Inland Revenue told us that they have since somewhat modified their views and I may frankly say that I understand such to be the case, and I have already explained why. They say that as the duty is taken off in Canada, it cannot hurt us if the Americans take it off in the United States. But argueing from a national standpoint, treating this matter from the point of view of using our own natural resources in our own industries, if you say: Well, we did not take off the duty, my answer is this: Either this pact meant something or nothing. If you found it necessary to give something—I do not care how little—to induce them to take off the duty, you should not have consented; but if you did not find it necessary to give anything you should never have gone there. That is the position, as I take it.

Let me read just one extract from the resolution passed by the lumbermen to show the promises which had been made to them and which have not been kept:

Whereas the hon. Mr. Fielding assured the lumber manufacturers of this district some years ago that the Dumping clause would give us ample protection from American lumber, which is not the case for the reason that during the past 18 months the American market has been so demoralized that her mills have been selling lumber for less than two-thirds of its cost, and consequently exporters to Canada are willing to make affidavits that the price at which they are dumping lumber into this country is the 'fair market value if sold for home consumption.

That is to say the Americans gave the affidavits required by our customs laws because they felt they could conscientiously do so on account of the surplus they had to sell, and they made a dumping ground of the four prairie provinces against the lumber of the Pacific coast.

Allied to this trade is the paper and pulp industry, and that industry will be ruined. I talked to one of the largest traders in Canada only yesterday in this House, and he told me incidentally that he was investing in a large pulp and paper mill out in British Columbia but that it would be impossible for him to go on with that enterprise if this arrangement went through. As I was anxious naturally to get in touch with men who had actual knowledge of this business, I asked him to explain the situation exactly and he did so. He explained that there was a surtax of $2 per ton imposed by the United States on pulpwood cut from Crown timberland in Canada in addition to their tariff duty of $3.75 per ton, making $5.75 per ton; and the Dominion government, under this pact practically held a club over the various provinces to force them to allow their pulp wood to be exported free of duty to the United States in order to build up American factories.

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's). What is the name of that gentleman?

Mr. GOODEVE. I think that is an entirely private matter but the hon. gentleman can take my word. I would be very glad however to give him the name personnally after the adjournment. I may say, however, that he is a gentleman who I am sure would command the respect and confidence of my hon. friend.

I have here a photograph which I would like the House to see in connection with a letter sent to the Minister of Finance by the Western Canada Bag, Envelope and Box Board Company, to protest against this proposed arrangement. This is a picture of a new building in the process of erection in the constituency represented by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) for making coarse paper, roofing paper, felts, box boards, &c. In their letter they say:

If the reciprocity agreement, so far as it pertains to building paper, roofing paper, sheathing, &c., is adopted as proposed, it will positively kill this industry and prevent the operation of the plant.

Here is a letter which they sent me to show the impossible position in which they will be placed:

I take the liberty of enclosing herewith a copy of letter which we have just forwarded to the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier in reference to the removal of the duty on building, roofing and sheathing paper, deadening felt, carpet lining, box board, &c. We are also pleased to enclose herewith a photo taken sometime ago of our plant which is now under course of erection at New Westminster and which we wish again to emphasize we will be unable to operate if the proposed reciprocity agreement is adopted.

A copy of that was sent to the minister, and here is the letter to the Prime Minister himself:

The Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Premier of Canada,
Ottawa, Ont.

Honourable Sir,—In reference to the communication which we addressed to you under date of February 9, protesting against the removal of the duty on building paper, roofing paper, sheathing, deadening felt, box board, &c., we wish to say that the removal of the duty on the above products will have such a vital and disastrous effect upon our industry, that we take the liberty of suggesting, that if in your opinion you deem it advisable, we shall be pleased to come at once to Ottawa in order to present all information direct to you, as to the exact manner in which the proposed treaty will seriously and permanently affect us.

Yours respectfully,
W. C. Bag, Envelope and Box Board Co., Ltd.
(Sgd.) GREELY KOLTS,
President.

Now, again, I say I do not wish to reiterate. But is not this an awful thing? We in British Columbia have been offering all kinds of inducements to capitalists to establish industries to work up the millions upon millions of tons of pulpwood that we have in our province. I was myself a member of a Royal Commission to inquire into the handling and conservation of our whole timber resources, and I could occupy this House for hours on that subject alone. We have done everything possible to induce capitalists to establish these industries. We have not only these great supplies of raw material, but we have, as hon. members know, the finest water-powers in Canada, and also the coal, and we are there at tidewater. Yet, in the face of these advantages,

it has been impossible to get men to go in and start these mills. And to-day we are just beginning. The difficulties of the situation have been set forth here to the Minister of Finance. In the United States the mills have a population of five millions of people immediately surrounding the mills, and forming their home market, while in the province of British Columbia, there is a population of only 300,000. And these people whose letter I have quoted say: If necessary, we will come to Ottawa, not to ask favours, but to explain to the minister. And they get the same answer—'Too late.' I say it is an awful thing! Why did not the government consult the people of this country? Let me bring this case home to people here—and I am not going to labour the argument. Here we are in the city of Ottawa. Suppose any newspaper to-morrow were to suggest the taking away of the pulp paper industries of Hull, the Eddy and the Booth mills, wiping out the opportunities of employment for the people, but leaving the farmers and owners of pulpwood free to send their wood direct to the United States. Now, I ask: Is there a man, woman or child in Ottawa who would vote in support of that proposition. Yet, that is exactly the position in which we stand in British Columbia. We have all the conditions there for the inception of a successful industry, and we have the capital ready to embark on the enterprise. And yet the minister is prepared by this pact to wipe out the factories we see in imagination and even the one already started, a photograph of which I have shown. I say again, is not that an awful thing? I am amazed that we should hear from the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller), and even from a minister of the Crown, references to the difference between the automobile owner and the labourer. I say that we are all labourers in Canada, and the man who does something to build up the industries of Canada is deserving of the respect of every man—and I venture to say he receives respect from the vast majority of our people. Every true labourer is working for the good of this great Dominion of ours. I say all honour to the men who, starting with only their brains and their hands, have succeeded in building up industries here in Canada. If they have got wealth, I say, God speed and prosper them, for they have helped to build up this Dominion. I would be the last man to destroy these industries. I hope that there is no man in Canada whose vision is so limited, whose sight is so obscured that he would try by any such argument to sow the seeds of dissension amongst our people. Now, I do not know whether I should go on with these matters——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. GOODEVE.

Mr. GOODEVE. I would like to deal with several other subjects in the same practical everyday way. I have briefly touched the main points on the lumber and pulp question. I could cover 'Hansard' with the representations of these industries of our province, but I will pass on to deal with other matters that interest every man in Canada. The other day I read a paragraph in a newspaper giving facts which struck me, as having a vital bearing on this question. They were all the more important because they were given by one who had no thought of the particular question that is now before us. This item told of Mr. W. S. Workman, of the City Line, speaking at Glasgow on cheap sea-carriage, and the probable effect of oil fuel. Evidently, this gentleman is the manager of one of the large steamship lines in Glasgow, and he was dealing with the outlook of ocean transportation, pointing out that when oil fuel comes into use in vessels, the carrying capacity of the vessels will be materially increased. He gave the number of vessels on the stocks in the different shipbuilding yards of the old country that were to be equipped with the means of using oil as fuel, and went on to show how this would reduce the cost of carriage. This newspaper says that Mr. Workman—

> —pointed out that soya beans are brought all the way from Manchuria, a distance of 11,000 miles, for 30s. per ton, while the freight on grain from Glasgow to London is from 10s. to 12s. per ton. Oil, again, is carried from New York to Japan, a distance of 14,000 miles, for about 22s. per ton weight. But the thing comes nearer home when butter, meat, and tea are the subject of examination.
>
> Mr. Workman points out that last year no fewer than 36,000,000 pounds of butter came to us from New Zealand at a freight of only ½d. per pound, and 3,356,000 carcases of lamb at the same rate per pound. While, too, a pound of tea can be posted to any part of the country for 3d., the shipowner brings it all the way from India for ½d. per pound, and pays Suez Canal dues into the bargain.

He goes on to argue that when the new vessels are put in commission even these low rates of freight will be reduced. What does that mean? The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris) gave the statistics last night, and I do not need to repeat them. All these twelve agricultural countries that are put on the free list by this pact will be in competition with us, not only in the markets of the world, but absolutely in our own markets, right here in Canada. This fact is brought home to us by the information that we get from this absolutely independent and correct source.

Now I want to read a little history of Argentine, and show how that works out. Here is a letter that was handed to me and that illustrates the argument I am making:

Replying to your letter having reference to the importation of chilled meat into Canada under the proposed new reciprocity duty of 1¼ cents per pound.

We regret very much that we are unable to give you any figures which would indicate the present price of beef in the Argentine. We hope to be able to do so in the course of the next few days, when we will write you further.

At the present moment there are 1,500 New Zealand (Canterbury) or Australian lambs on the way to Canada.

1,500 New Zealand lambs on the way to Canada. This is official:

The owners, of course, are figuring on bringing these in paying a 3 cent duty (2 cent preference to New Zealand), and selling them in the eastern provinces at just a little better than the price ruling for Canadian lambs. If the duty now 3 cents was reduced to 1¼ cents it would mean that the Canadian market would have to reduce or decline 1¾ cents to meet the differential.

Last winter quite a few New Zealand lambs were brought in by the Pacific Coast, and we are informed were sold as far east as Winnipeg.

The lot we have referred to as now on the way to Canada is coming via London, and will arrive at St. John, so that as far as this country is concerned we will be equally affected in the east and in the west by the reduction of this duty. To-day choice young New Zealand mutton, 35-50 pounds, average, are selling in London for about 6 cents, freight and storage ⅝ cents, duty 1¼ cents, proposed, net cost per pound here 7⅞ cents per pound.

Canadian stock of the same class and description is now bringing in from 9 cents to 9¾ cents in Montreal.

Yet men will stand up in this House and say that it is absurd to talk about the competition of Argentine, New Zealand, Denmark, and all these other agricultural countries. I have shown you the actual facts of the present position. Now I want to give you another fact:

From the point of view of the manufacturer of meat food products, two facts in connection with the proposed reciprocity movement are not, we think, sufficiently well known.

There is in Canada a meat inspection law which requires that all meat to be shipped out of the country or to be shipped from one province to another shall have passed a post mortem inspection, and shall have been prepared in a proper and sanitary matter. This law co-operates with similar legislation in the United States, and recognizes the inspection certificate of the United States government when attached to the product. This means that American product can come into Canada, into any province, and be reshipped from that province to any other province.

The United States has a similar law, but they do not recognize the inspection certicate of the Canadian government, so that while it might seem to an ordinary observer that the Canadian packer would have at his door, under this proposed reciprocity agreement, a very large market on which he could sell some finished product, yet, on examination, this market is found to be absolutely blocked—as small packers in the United States who do not operate under government are few and far between——

That is just like the case when they let us have free fish and put a duty on the cans; it is something similar. Under their law they have a right to keep them in quarantine for thirty days, and you will see what that means:

—while those who do not operate under government inspection could not handle the products of Canadian packers, because their government will not recognize the certificate of inspection of the Canadian government, and would not allow products so marked to enter the United States inspected packing houses, nor could it be shipped from one state to another.

Here I am minded to ask the question, is that reciprocity? I think not. It is the old jug-handled policy over again, the same old thing I heard of as a boy:

The other point we wish to mention particularly is the stand taken by the Department of Agriculture in regard to the importation of American hogs. The department considers these hogs are not of a sufficiently healthy type to be allowed to come into Canada except after quarantine of sixty days. This would make the import of American hogs impossible—comparatively small packing houses require at least 1,000 per day—to bring in hogs from the United States at the present time would necessitate 60,000 hogs held up in quarantine and a perpetual investment of say $1,000,000 for live stock, which could not be used for two months from date of purchase. This would be a hardship no packing house could exist under.

Now just another item in regard to butter. I hold in my hand an original telegram absolutely authentic:

Monday, Chicago, March 6,

Lang Packing Co., Mill St., Montreal, offer 300 tubs or less, June or Sept. storage, creamery 60 pounds ash tubs, medium colour and salt, our score 90 points, 18 cts., Chicago.

P. H. WEAVER & CO.

That butter could be laid down in Montreal at 18½ cents, American butter: I find that the price of a similar quality of butter in Montreal is 24 to 25 cents, and here is a bona fide offer in the ordinary course of daily business of 300 tubs at a price that would lay it down at 18½ cents. I ask the Canadian farmer what he thinks about that kind of reciprocity. Does he consider that his interests have been protected in this matter? Here is another quotation from the New York 'Commercial,' of February 14, 1911:

The total exports of butter from Canada to Great Britain in 1909 were 5,353,770 pounds and to the United States 92,468 pounds. The latest available figures for the United States are contained in the census reports for 1900 when New York state alone produced upwards of 70,000,000 pounds and the aggregate production of the entire United States was more than a billion pounds.

All this billion pounds of butter comes into competition with the dairy products of the agricultural people of Canada. And here is what they say:

In the year 1909, we imported from Canada less than 100,000 pounds of butter, Canada imported from this country 473,805 pounds. Now when Canada removes her four cents a pound duty upon this product who can measure the amount of butter that this wider market will create for our own farmers? It will be our butter that will be flooding the Canadian market instead of this country being overwhelmed with the Canadian article.

The egg statistics are equally illuminating. in 1909 Canada's total exports of eggs amounted to about 552,000 dozen, the amount coming to this country being about 52,201 dozen. In the same time her imports of eggs aggregated 1,136,120 dozen, so that it appears the country bought twice as much as she exported. The Canadian duty on eggs amounts to three cents a dozen, and with this duty removed the burden is on the political farmer to show why he would not be benefited by this greater market instead of being injured by competition.

And so I could go on all through these statistics. All these favoured nation countries are highly protective, yet we have given the absolute freedom of our market to these twelve countries. No wonder the Finance Minister hesitated to give that information to us.

I think that if I had gone down and made a bargain of that kind I would have been very loath to tell the people about it. It has been said over and over again that Argentina will have no effect on our trade. We have had so many statistics quoted to us that I will not weary you with statistics, but I want to give one or two concise arguments that are based on these statistics and that I know are absolutely correct. I hold in my hand an intensely interesting article that I read several months ago from the 'Journal of the Royal Society of Arts,' published in London, and dated December 10. When first I read it I had no idea of this treaty coming on. There is an article written for this society by one Campbell J. Ogilvie. It is a most intensely interesting article and covers the whole history of the growth of the agricultural production of Argentina, beginning at the beginning, it is full of illuminating statistics, it contains documents and maps, and it is absolutely accurate. I find that until 1876 Argentina imported wheat for home consumption.

Argentina exported wheat and food products to Great Britain in 1908 to the amount of one-quarter of the total food products imported into the United Kingdom. Yet that market is absolutely in competition with this market, as I have shown by the transportation route, by the prices and by the conditions. Now, let us see what Argentina says. The people there are alive to the situation. This subject is so broad that one could take a single phase of it, occupy this House for several hours, and occupy it well, in placing this argument before it. But here is the summing up. After pointing out that they send 25 per cent of the total food products into the United Kingdom and that the United States sends in 33⅓ per cent, the writer of this article says:

The lesson shown her is one worthy of attention. We see that Argentina supplies England with one-fourth of her imported food, and the United States of America supplies nearly one-third. Therefore, it behooves both England and Argentina to see that America does not so manipulate things that she acquires the control over our meat and food supplies.

If it behooves Argentina and Great Britain to see that America does not acquire control over their meat and food supplies, how much more does it behoove the Dominion of Canada to see that America does not acquire control over that trade? Yet, in that connection, what are the facts? I can prove to you by the documents here that that is the exact position and the effect of this treaty. Let me quote again Sir George Ross in regard to it.

We must not forget that the mere exchange of certain articles may involve a great deal more than appears on the surface. For example, to abolish the duty on wheat on both sides of the line looks fair, but to accept an offer of that kind pure and simple would, in my opinion, be a poor bargain for Canada. I believe that the longer the American tariff of 25 cents a bushel on Canadian wheat is maintained the better for us—Canadian wheat has now a distinct place in the British market; if the market of the United States were freely opened it would be impossible to maintain its identity in passing through American elevators, and Canada would be the loser to the extent of any reduction in price.

Following up the contention of Sir George Ross, I want to read from an official document the statement of the Hon. Philander C. Knox, who made this bargain with the ministers from Canada. What does he say with regard to that?

In providing for free wheat we also take into account the facilities which the United States possesses for handling a part of the surplus of Canadian crop and thus preventing the demoralization of prices which results through the dumping of large quantities upon the European markets, where the world's price

is fixed. The free admission of grain from Canada thus meets the present situation, and provides against future contingencies when the Canadian surplus becomes greater by placing the control in the hands of our own grain-growers.

I especially call your attention to that. Mr. Knox says that

The free admission of grain from Canada provides against future contingencies when the Canadian surplus becomes greater by placing the control in the hands of our own grain growers. They have no cause to fear a demoralizing influx under the conditions which will result from the reciprocity agreement.

He says fairly and unmistakably in that paragraph that the result of this agreement willl be to place control of Canadian grain absolutely in the hands of American elevator companies. To show that that is a fact here is what the 'Northwestern Miller' says:

The disposition of Canada's surplus is a question upon the answer to which depends the future, not only of the milling interests of the (American) Northwest, but indeed of the United States. Should this surplus be shipped abroad, it must inevitably mean the destruction of the American export trade, the shifting of the American milling centre, the gradual decline of the American milling interest to a purely domestic basis, and its ultimate retrogression to a comparatively unimportant place in the list of large American industries. . . . The miller who is able to grind this enormous (Canadian) crop will be the miller of the future; and, where he is, there will be the great mills of the world.

I commend that to the grain growers of the Northwest, but I shall prove it by the farmers' delegations themselves because I want to take their authority. Here is what they say as quoted from the official document:

All we have said in regard to the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, applies equally to elevators that must be constructed in the near future at Hudson's bay and particularly at Pacific coast terminals. The reasons are even more urgent in respect to the Pacific coast than have been advanced for acquiring those at Fort William and Port Arthur. The reasonable and logical way for the grain produced in Alberta and even in the western portion of Saskatchewan to find its market is via what has been termed the 'western route.' The western development that is bound to take place in British Columbia in the next decade, assures us that a very large portion of the farm products of Alberta will find a market in this province.

Yet, this pact would force British Columbia to give its $14,500,000 worth of agricultural products not for the wheat of Alberta but for the wheat of Washington, Oregon and other American states. But they said more than that. Mr. Richardson, speaking on behalf of the grain growers, page 25, said:

I noticed a statement in a newspaper some time ago that it might be good policy to adopt the Minnesota law. Gentlemen, I think our trouble is all from Minnesota. All the wrinkles, all the knowledge gained in 35 or 40 years of elevator terminals there has been brought to Canada and used in Canada. We were doing much better before the Minnesota people came in. Do not let us go there to look for help. Surely, we are able to help ourselves.

So say I. But that is not all.

I think that our No. 2 Northern to-day is equal to Minnesota No. 1 Northern. I think that if I were to lay these two grades down before a miller in New York State, he would give ours the preference. Now, we want to keep it that way; we do not want to weaken our grades. I have always said that we have the best climate, the best people, we can raise the best wheat, and we have the best waterways,—let us keep on doing. We are a great country, and we can afford to buy these terminal elevators.

He is asking for terminal elevators, but I say the whole argument bears out what the Hon. Philander C. Knox says, what Sir William Van Horne, in his letter. says, what Sir George Ross says, what Mr. J. J. Hill says and what I do not hesitate to say. Mr. Hill has demonstrated a fact which I always believed, namely, that it is not the tariff that has made the difference in the prices of grain products in the west; that it is due to local conditions of transportation and matters of that kind, and he has proved that beyond all question, by the fact that there is a greater difference in the price between the various states of the union, than there is between the prices in western Canada and the prices in the western states. The position is that if we remove this tariff as the agreement proposes, then the American millers will get in our No. 1 hard northern wheat, mix it with the softer, inferior grain, skin it down as the technical term is, and it will go out to the Liverpool market as No. 1, but barely passing that grading, and it will take a reduced price. The very argument that the millers present for government owned elevators, will be absolutely out of the control of Canada, and it will reflect back on the Canadian farmer, and instead of getting a higher price, he will get a lesser price. There is a blue-book issued by the Dominion government giving the case of the Manitoba farmers and when you look at their case, and look at what the government has given them, you will see that the western men have literally asked for bread and they have been given a stone. I have here a letter received by the leader of the oppo-

sition which is very apropos of the situation, and which reads:

Montreal, March 2, 1911.

R. L. Borden, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Mr. Borden,—If the Hon. Mr. Fisher is correctly quoted in the Ottawa 'Citizen' of the first instant, he made a statement to the effect that I had succeeded in getting a resolution passed by the Montreal Board of Trade condemning the proposition before the House, but that two weeks later the 'loyal and imperial Board of Trade of Montreal rescinded that resolution, realizing that the Canadian millers would not be injured; inasmuch as they realized that the same agreement opened up to them for their flour a market of ninety millions of people.'

This sentiment apparently was cheered in the House.

I seconded the resolution brought before the Board of Trade by the council at the annual meeting on February first last, and this resolution has not been rescinded. It has been presented to Sir Wilfrid Laurier in its original form.

I am not aware of any Canadian millers realizing that by the proposed agreement a market of ninety millions of people to the south of us would be opened up for their flour products. The fact stands out preeminently that the Americans, as mentioned in my recent letter which appeared in the press, maintain a duty on Canadian flour entering their market of 50 cents a barrel and 12½ cents per hundred pounds on by-products, or $2.50 per ton.

Surely the Hon. Mr. Fisher was aware that in the agreement now before the House there is a prohibitory duty on both flour and by-products entering the United States from the Canadian miller.

Also as reported in last night's 'Star,' the Hon. Mr. Fisher mentioned my name, that I had headed an article which appeared in the press lately, 'Preserve the Integrity of the Empire,' and stated that he would rather substitute the words, 'Preserve my Preserve for the Benefit of Mr. Meighen,' that the free trade policy would interfere with the monopoly enjoyed by the millers in the northwest in purchasing wheat from the farmer.

The millers are purchasing their wheat in the open market in competition with the wheat buyers of the world. There is no monopoly. I deny the assertion that the company I represent is in any combination with any other milling company or private individuals for purchasing wheat either high, or low, or uniform. We run our own business quite independently.

Therefore, the Hon. Mr. Fisher has made quite a mistake in stating that I am striving to preserve a monopoly in the northwest in purchasing wheat.

If his theories are correct, that the arrangement now before the House will give the farmer a higher price for his wheat, thereby raising the value of farm lands enormously and also enhancing the value of timber lands covered with a crop of puly wood, then I will inform the Hon. Mr. Fisher that my holdings of farm lands west of the Great Lakes and of timber lands covered with a crop of pulp wood east of the lakes, even at their present value without any alleged enhanced value on account of reciprocity or the trade agreement with the United States, are ten times larger than my interests in the milling business of which I am president.

Therefore, according to the hon. gentleman's theories, I am working decidedly against my own interests in opposing the agreement.

I take my stand, however, against the present agreement from national and imperial and commercial grounds, entirely apart from prospective values of the properties in which I am interested.

Is it asking too much of you to have a member on your side read any portion of this letter in the House when you may think it favourable, and make my denial as public as the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Fisher have been made, as I believe it is not customary for a member of the House to use the name of a private individual as mine has been used by the Hon. Mr. Fisher.

Yours faithfully,
ROBERT MEIGHEN,
President and managing director Lake of the Woods Milling Co., Ltd.

I have here an official statement containing a message from the president of the United States, entitled, 'Reciprocity with Canada,' transmitting in response to Senate resolution of February 23, 1911, a report from the tariff board relative to various commodities proposed in the Canadian reciprocity measure,' and I shall quote from this, as they bear on my argument, some figures. The prices on February 11, were as follows:

—	Chicago, Ill.		Toronto, Can.	Montreal, Can.	
	$	$	$	$	$
No. 1 beef carcass	.....	9 50	9 50	9 50	10 75
No. 2 "	...	8 00	9 00	.....	
Lamb.....	8 50	9 00	12 00	.....	
Mutton.....	.....	6 00	9 00	8 00	8 50
Pork.....	10 00	12 50	10 50	12 00	13 00

On page 112, this report says:

With the increase of population dairying is year by year becoming a more important industry in both countries, and in many sections of our north central states, where beef making or sheep rearing were once in vogue, dairying, with its logical attendant industry of pork making, is rapidly extending. The lack of corn, the existence of a well-established dairy production, and the availability of suitable forage has led to the introduction of another agriculture speciality in which Ontario excels, to wit, the breeding and rearing of bacon pigs as contrasted with the heavy corn-fed lard hog of our middle west.

Coming to the general matter of meat production, we find that Ontario figures more as a breeding ground for animals of the beef and mutton types than as a commercial fac-

tor of special importance in the actual marketing of meat on the hoof.

Here is used the very argument I used the other day at Brockville, that our farmers in Ontario, particularly during the last 25 years, have gradually developed a class of hog which produces the best bacon in the world. It is a hard grain fed hog, and there comes into competition with it the soft corn fed hog of the United States which is sold at a lower price. To-day, in my own town of Rossland, our lumbermen and miners buy the American hog at a cheaper price than they can purchase Canadian raised pork, and that is the situation all over the country and it is stated here officially in this United States report.. One other statement, and I have done with these statistics. This I also know, because several of my friends have been fortunate in making a fortune in dealing along this line.

6. Live Stock.

The accompanying table gives a comparative view of the number in 1909 and the value in 1910 of live stock.

Prices of horses range from $106 to $125 per head in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and New York. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota and North Dakota the range is from $111 to $126, and in Montana, Idaho and Washington from $80 to $108. In eastern Canada prices of horses range from $107 to $139 per head, while in western Canada the range is from $107 to $156. In the great agricultural states of Indiana, Illinois and Iowa prices range from $120 to $124. In all the Canadian provinces except Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and Nova Scotia the prices are higher than in any of our states.

Prices of dairy cows range from $33 to $39 a head in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and New York. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota and North Dakota the range is practically the same. In the western border States of Montana, Idaho and Washington the range is from $41.80 to $46.50. In eastern Canada prices of dairy cows range from $32 to $48 and in western Canada from $39 to $41. The highest Canadian price quoted is $48 in Ontario as against $46.50 in Montana, the highest American price.

I have endeavoured to make a fair argument, taking all my statistics from official sources. I think I have shown that in every particular this compact, if carried out, will work to the detriment of the agricultural classes of the people of Canada both east and west.

That is undoubtedly the case, and I think I have proved the case. I have proved that it will work very detrimentally to the interests of the mechanics, artisans and labourers in every part of Canada. Over and above all that is the fact that from 1763, from the treaty of Paris, when this country was ceded to Great Britain, we, under the ægis of the mother country, have built up this great empire. We have occupied the whole of the northern half of the northern portion of this continent of America. Under her care and protection, through the assistance of her money, we have developed this country until we have one of the greatest inland carrying waterways in the world to-day. We have three great transcontinental railroads about to be completed; we have, as I pointed out before, a through route between three great continents. Then I ask you, as loyal Canadians, whether you, at one fell stroke, at the dictation of two men, or thirteen men, or any body of men, without consulting the interests of the people of Canada, without hearing their views on the matter, will cast aside those traditions that have made up a great Canadian people, so that the eyes of the nation to the south are turned upon us, the eyes of the whole world are turned upon us, the mother country is looking to this young giant at this time to assist her in building up that great empire to which Cecil Rhodes has referred in such splendid language. I looked to-day for a quotation, which I have mislaid, from one of the great American magazine men, who spoke before the Canadian Club, Mr. S. S. McClure. I wish you would remember those words of patriotism and faith. He says: There has been nothing in the history of the world that has stood for the civilization and advancement of nations in religion, morality and freedom like the great, mighty Union Jack. He, an American citizen, made use of these words. I ask you, then, as members of this House of Commons of Canada, are you going to cast aside all these traditions, are you carelessly and thoughtlessly and without due consideration to lose all the efforts of the last 150 years? I think not, I think that to-day, as in the earlier days, in those other three times, when we came to the parting of the ways, in 1867, in 1870, in 1878, if Canada, in 1911, is left to herself the better judgment will prevail and we will stand as we have ever stood for an independent Canadian nation within the British Empire; we will stand to carry out the great destiny that has fallen upon us. Thus we would be doing the duty that those who have gone before have left to us and those that come after will realize that at least this House, this parliament of Canada, has stood for the best interests that go for the making of a nation.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton). Mr. Chairman, we have listened for quite a long time to the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve), but I regret to say that I did not hear anything new during his three-hour speech. He has told us that he did not want to put anything on 'Hansard' that was there already. Of course, that is a matter of judgment for himself, but I venture to think that he has

put very little on 'Hansard' that has not been put on 'Hansard' quite a number of times already. The hon. member spoke about making arguments and backing them up. The hon. gentleman is a lawyer, and I volunteer if there is any characteristic of a lawyer at all it is that he has a keen sense of what argument is, and I am sorry that the speech of my learned friend was not—

Mr. GOODEVE. My hon. friend the Deputy Speaker knows I am not a lawyer; I am only a plain, ordinary, business man.

Mr. FIELDING. He is not guilty to that extent.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am glad he has made that explanation, for I was sorry for the sake of the profession that it would require so many words from a lawyer to put forward the very meagre ideas that were brought forward before this House. There are very few things in my hon. friend's speech that are really of importance and serious. He says that this agreement, if it goes into force, is going to stagger and break up our relations with the mother country. If that is true it is a very serious matter. He makes another charge against the members of this government, who have made the agreement, that they bound us hand and foot to the American government and sacrificed our autonomy, so that we will have no control whatever in future over the making of our own tariffs. That is another very serious charge. He made another statement that this compact was holding a club over the heads of the different provinces of Canada in respect to the question of pulp wood. That is another charge made by the hon. member, which, if true, is very serious. There is nothing better in cases of this kind than to go right to the very source of the matter and find out what is in this agreement to corroborate, or to carry out, or to sustain the statements made by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve).

On the question of being tied hand and foot and our autonomy being hampered in any way let us read the fourth paragraph of the agreement as set forth and signed by the Canadian plenipotentiaries. Will any ordinary man, whether in this House or out of it, say that there is anything in that paragraph to back up the statement made not only by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) but by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster)?

The only allusion to that phase of the subject is to be found in section 4:

> 4. The governments of the two countries having made this agreement from the conviction that, if confirmed by the necessary legislative authorities, it will benefit the people on both sides of the border line, we may reasonably hope and expect that the arrangement, if so confirmed, will remain in operation for a considerable period. Only this expectation on the part of both governments would justify the time and labour that have been employed in the maturing of the proposed measures. Nevertheless, it is distinctly understood that we do not attempt to bind for the future the action of the United States Congress or the parliament of Canada, but that each of these authorities shall be absolutely free to make any change of tariff policy or of any other matter covered by the present arrangement that may be deemed expedient. We look for the continuance of the arrangement, not because either party is bound to it, but because of our conviction that the more liberal trade policy thus to be established will be viewed by the people of the United States and Canada as one which will strengthen the friendly relations now happily prevailing and promote the commercial interests of both countries.

I ask you what there is in that section to support the very serious charge made against this government by that hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Goodeve). Let us see how that compact is understood by the United States government. Mr. Knox, Secretary of State for the United States, tells us in his letter, and that letter shows that they understand the pact exactly as it is expressed. He says:

> Department of State, Washington,
> January 21, 1911.
>
> The Hon. W. S. Fielding, and
> The Hon. William Paterson,
> Washington.
>
> Gentlemen,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of this date in relation to the negotiations initiated by the President several months ago for a reciprocal trade arrangement between the United States and Canada, in which you set forth and ask me to confirm your understanding of the results of our recent conferences in continuation of these negotiations.
>
> I take great pleasure in replying that your statement of the proposed arrangement is entirely in accord with my understanding of it.

There it is set forth clearly and distinctly by our plenipotentiaries that no such binding, no such tying up can possibly be the result of this agreement. The plenipotentiaries of the United States, speaking on their own behalf and on behalf of the President of the United States says he understands the agreement precisely as it is expressed by our plenipotentiaries. There can therefore, be no such binding or trammelling of our rights or interference with our autonomy. I submit, therefore, that the charge made on that point is without foundation so far as the agreement is concerned, and we have nothing else to draw upon but that agreement as submitted to us. A very serious charge was made by the last speaker (Mr. Goodeve), namely, that we were interfering seriously with the autonomy of the provinces and were putting a club in the

hands of the people of the United States by which they might force our provinces into sending pulp wood free of duty into that country. I submit that that charge is just as unfounded as the other. Paragraph 10 of the agreement deals with that point. It is well the people should know exactly what the agreement is and what foundation there is for such serious charges as are made by gentlemen who are opposed to this arrangement

10. With respect to the discussions that have taken place concerning the duties upon the several grades of pulp, printing paper, &c.—mechanically ground wood pulp, chemical wood pulp, bleached and unbleached, news printing paper and other printing paper and board made from wood pulp, of the value not exceeding four cents per pound at the place of shipment—we note that you desire to provide that such articles from Canada shall be made free of duty in the United States only upon certain conditions respecting the shipment of pulp wood from Canada. It is necessary that we should point out that this is a matter in which we are not in a position to make any agreement. The restrictions at present existing in Canada are of a provincial character. They have been adopted by several of the provinces with regard to what are believed to be provincial interests. We have neither the right nor the desire to interfere with the provincial authorities in the free exercise of their constitutional powers in the administration of their public lands. The provisions you are proposing to make respecting the conditions upon which these classes of pulp and paper may be imported into the United States free of duty must necessarily be for the present inoperative. Whether the provincial governments will desire to in any way modify their regulations with a view to securing the free admission of pulp and paper from their provinces into the market of the United States, must be a question for the provincial authorities to decide. In the meantime, the present duties on pulp and paper imported from the United States into Canada will remain. Whenever pulp and paper of the classes mentioned are admitted into the United States free of duty from all parts of Canada, then similar articles, when imported from the United States, shall be admitted into Canada free of duty.

I submit that nothing could be plainer or stronger than the statement there made by the Canadian plenipotentiaries. And that statement is that there is no desire to interfere in the slightest degree with the full powers of the provincial authorities to deal with this question. If the provinces, which now have those regulations, wish to continue them, there is nothing to prevent their doing so. And if any other province sees fit to make such regulations, there is nothing in this compact to interfere with that right in the slightest degree. I submit, therefore, that there is not the slightest ground for these two grave charges made by the hon. members opposite in connection with this agreement.

A further charge made is that this agreement is going to strike at the loyalty of the Canadian people, that it will switch them off from their attachment to the mother country, and make them Americans. Well, the quotation I am about to make from the report of the British ambassador to Washington will no doubt be accepted by the people of this country, and his opinion is very much stronger than anything I could say. What does Mr. Bryce say on this point. I suppose it would be quite unnecessary to give any certificate of character to this witness, as to the force of his observations or his credibility. But, in case there might be, I will read what was said about him in this House a couple of days ago by no less a personage than the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden, Halifax). That hon. gentleman said:

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has stated that some people in this country had apprehensions as to what might be the result when Mr. Bryce was named the British ambassador at Washington. So far as I am concerned, I have heard of none of these apprehensions and know of no one who entertained them, unless it be the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself. I believe that Mr. Bryce has acted conscientiously and with ability and energy on behalf of the interests of the mother country and of Canada throughout the course of these difficulties at Washington.

That is the man whose evidence I wish to put before the House in connection with the charge of disloyalty to the interests of the Canadian people as alleged in connection with the negotiations of the agreement which is now under consideration in this House. This is the despatch:

London, March 8.—Ambassador Bryce's reports to the foreign office on the subject of the United States-Canada reciprocity negotiations were issued in a white paper this evening. The most interesting communication is under date of January 22, the day following the conclusion of the agreement. In this the British diplomat says:

This is the part I particularly wish to bring forward in answer to my hon. friend from Kootenay:

As at present advised, I am disposed to believe that British interests are not to any appreciable extent prejudiced. No opportunity was lost in the course of the negotiations of reminding the Canadian ministers of the regard which it was right and fitting that they should have to the imperial interests. The arrangement still rests in reality on a growing realization of the fact that a high tariff wall between contiguous countries whose products are economically interchangeable is an injury to both and opposed to sound fiscal principles. In so far as the arrangement oversteps this basis it is probably influenced and will at any rate be publicly justified and defended in the United States, by the traditional policy of the United States of pro-

moting close economic relations with the states of the western hemisphere.

That such a policy is not counteracted by and does not check the rapidly growing sense of national consciousness and international importance in the peoples of those states has of late been abundantly proved.

No more in Canada than in the republics of Latin America to which the United States government has sought to extend its pan-American propaganda, does there seem a likelihood that a freer interchange of commodities will lead to closer relations of a political kind.

That is the opinion expressed by the right hon. gentleman who occupies the very high and honourable position of Ambassador from His Majesty's government in Great Britain to the United States government at Washington. He is responsible for advising his government and his King as to effect this agreement is likely to have upon the attachment of this nation to the Crown. If it has any tendency to break up our loyal connection with the Crown of England, it would be the duty of this man, his special duty, to so report. He reports to the very contrary. Therefore, I think the people of Canada, and the people of the British Empire generally, will accept the opinion of so notable a representative of the British nation as Mr. Bryce in preference to any opinion that may be expressed by gentlemen in this House who cannot be expected to have such a wide knowledge of the subject in hand as did the gentleman whose business in particular it was to hold close supervision over this question.

I do not propose to follow any further the observations of my hon. friend from Kootenay. As to whether the interchange of products between this country and the United States is a good thing or a bad thing, I am not in a position to say with any authority. I do not profess to be an expert in questions of trade. But, as an ordinary individual having ordinary knowledge of the commonplace things that govern trade. I should suppose that this arrangement ought to be a good thing. I believe it is a good thing; and for that reason I intend to support the motion before the House. A great deal has been said, and I suppose a great deal more will be said hereafter, to show that the men we sent to Washington were not fully equipped for the very important business they had in hand. All I have to say is that, if we are to enter upon any agreement at all with a foreign country to extend our trade and better our conditions, in this case we did the very best we could. In the party to which I belong, I cannot put my hand upon a better equipped set of men than those we sent to Washington. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), has been for the last thirty years in training in this line of work. For the last fourteen years he has held the position of Minister of Finance of the Dominion and for fourteen years before that he was Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, having charge of its finances. Since he took charge of the finances of the Dominion, he has on two occasions carried on inquiry all over the country on fiscal questions including every subject that possibly could come under consideration at Washington. He was assisted by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), a man of almost the same length of training and of immense experience. And these gentlemen had two experts at their elbows. I submit that the Dominion of Canada was as well represented as we could hope it to be—we had no better men. I feel about sending the Minister of Finance to Washington much as the English people felt when they sent their best man to command in the Boer war. They had sent one general after another into the field, and at last they brought forward the veteran, Lord Roberts. We felt that we were in the last ditch, that we had strained every nerve, and that if Lord Roberts could not do the trick we had no one else to send. That, I believe, is the way the people of Canada felt about the negotiations at Washington—if the Minister of Finance could not succeed, we had nobody else to send who would better the situation. I am satisfied that the Canadian people, at all events the friends of the government and those who can approach this question without bias, will be satisfied that the very best thing had been done for the Dominion of Canada and that the future operations of this agreement will show that the best agreement of a commercial kind for the Dominion of Canada has been made that ever was entered into between this country and any foreign nation, and that another wreath will be placed upon the head of the Minister of Finance as the man who has ably looked after the affairs of this country and in whom the people of this country have good reason to place implicit confidence.

Now, Sir, I cannot understand why it should be a bad thing for us to make a trade agreement with the United States. It will not be said by any person that we should not trade wherever we can do so profitably. It will not be said by any person that when we have seven or eight million people alongside a nation with 90 million we should not trade with them, particularly when it is taken into consideration that we have just as great and just as productive a territory as they have, that our object is to grow and become just as large as they are. It must be admitted that our ambition is to grow, and expand in

every direction. I would like to ask those hon. gentlemen who oppose this agreement and ask us to let well enough alone, how they propose to reach that high state of nationhood which all patriotic Canadians have in view. Therefore, if it is right and proper that we should seek expansion of trade, where can we more reasonably hope to obtain it than with our neighbours alongside of us? I think it will be admitted that the 90 or 100 millions of people in the United States, are good customers. They are men largely of our own blood, speaking our own language, having our own high ideals, and they are prepared to use anything that we can supply to them. I think it is admitted that there is abundance of room in the American market for anything we have to sell. We are a new country, and we are not exporting largely the finer class of manufactured goods, but we are exporting largely the products of the sea, of the farm and of the forest. I think it will be admitted that there is abundant room in the United States for the sale of all these articles. If that be true, and if the American people are willing to buy and to pay the price we ask, can there be any serious objection to trading with them? I submit there is none.

Now, Sir, another objection that is put forward by the opponents of this agreement is, that it will undermine the loyalty of the Canadian people to the British flag. It would seem that if we can assure our Conservative friends that there is no danger in that direction, they would be quite willing to allow this agreement to go into force. We are already dealing with the United States in exports to the extent of something like $114,000,000 per year. For many years we have been doing a profitable trade with the United States, and as a consequence, I do not think there is the slightest trace of disloyalty in the Canadian people. We are also importing into this country something like $250,000,000 worth of goods, and I submit there is not the slightest trace of disloyalty in the Canadian people in consequence of that trade. Now if we can do this enormous trade that we have done in the past without any harm to our loyalty, is it reasonable to suppose that a still larger trade with our United States neighbours will have any such effect? Who can really argue, that a much large trade with them than we have been doing, will have any effect upon our loyalty to the Crown to which we owe allegiance? I say it is a sad reflection on the Canadian people that any person should talk in that way. Where are our Conservative friends going to find those disloyal people of whom they talk so much? Are they going to find them in British Columbia? I guess not. The people of British Columbia pride themselves on their English origin and their English ideas. Are they going to find these disloyal people in the province of Alberta? There are no such men in that province. Are they going to find them in Saskatchewan or Manitoba? Certainly not. Are they going to find them in the great and loyal province of Ontario? No one supposes for a moment that there are any in that province. Are they going to find them in Quebec? We never heard of any. The people of Quebec have stood their baptism of fire and showed their loyalty to the British Crown more than once. It is not likely that the sale of an ox, or a cow, or a barrel of potatoes, or a ton of hay, by the people of Quebec to the United States, is going to vary that loyalty which has stood the test for 150 years, and no more strenuous circumstances are likely to arise again. In New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, I am sure the people have proven their loyalty and their love for the old flag for nearly 200 years, and they are not going to change now.

Now if these things be so, and we can find no trace, no seed of disloyalty in this Dominion, where is the danger of having the fullest and amplest trade with our neighbours? Is there any danger in giving a man who has wheat to sell an opportunity to sell it in England, to sell it in Canada, or to sell it in the United States? Have not our people a right to trade to any extent with any of these countries? Have not the men who raise wheat in the Northwest a right to sell it in Winnipeg, or in Montreal, or across the border, wherever they could get the best price? No one will make the assertion that the Canadian farmer is incapable of competing with the American farmer, or any other man on earth, in the production of grain. He has the capacity to bargain for the sale of it, he has the capacity to arrange for its transportation. If that be the case, if we have the transportation facilities, and if we have the products, why should we not seek a market for them? If the English market is open to us to-day, and if it is the best, surely we have common sense enough to hold it. If we can get more money for our wheat in the Canadian market, surely we can trust the Canadian farmer to sell it in Montreal, Winnipeg or Toronto. If he finds that he can sell his wheat in the United States to better advantage than in the Canadian market, whose business is it to interfere with him? Is it not the duty of this government to place the widest possible market at his disposal? That has been the theory of the Conservative party as well as of the Liberal party for the last forty years, at all events, ever since confederation. There has

been no party in power or in opposition in Canada that has not been favourable to better trade relations with the United States than we could usually have.

There is a great cry that we have no mandate to make this agreement. If this is a good bargain, if it is a good proposition for the Canadian people, if it is a good thing for the farmer, for the lumberman, for the men who have manufactured goods to sell, if it gives the manufactured article any advantage, is the manufacturer or the farmer going to say to the Canadian plenipotentiaries: True, I can sell my wheat, my horses, my sheep, or my goods better, but I do not think I will take advantage of this agreement because you had no mandate from the people when you made it. That would be carrying the matter to an extreme absurdity, and I am reminded of a story of the man who was so extremely strong on the eight-hour law that he allowed himself to drown after he had been eight hours in the water rather than transgress it. He said that he would not break the eight-hour law, but that he would rather die in the water than try to save himself he had struggled for eight hours. That is a very extreme case, but it would appear to me that the farmer, or mechanic, or lumberman who wished to find fault with this agreement by saying that there was no mandate would be in the same class as the extraordinary man who would not save his life, after he had struggled in vain for eight hours.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to pay a little further attention to some observations that were made about the prosperous condition of this country, and before I reach that I wish to say something about the province of Nova Scotia, and the coal question. I suppose the coal industry is the largest of any one industry in Canada. The coal industry of Nova Scotia has a capital invested in it of something in the vicinity of $100,000,000, it has 10,000 or 12,000, possibly more, men directly dependent upon it, and for us in Nova Scotia the coal question is a very important one indeed. At the same time, we realize that we are part and parcel of the country, that it takes all kinds of people to make a world, and that all manner of agreements, give and take must be made in order that we shall get along peaceably and harmoniously the one with the other. That being the case, and knowing that there must be revenues raised in this country and that the consumer must also be taken into consideration, the consideration of this question all manner of agreements, give and take, must be made. Speaking as one representing the coal industry of Nova Scotia, while we would like to have seen the duty remain as it was, and while we think it would have been perfectly justifiable to let it remain, we are content to take our share of the burden of taxation upon the people, and if eight cents a ton has been taken off that coal we must put up with it, and do the best we can. I think that with the fair start the coal industries have made, with the standing they have attained now, and the character of the article that we are producing, we will be able to stand the strain that may be cast upon us by reason of this reduction. However, I notice in a paper published in Sydney that it is cast up to the premier of Nova Scotia, and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that they have never done anything for the coal trade, and that they have always been trying to hurt it. I want to state that in so far as I can learn there is nothing on record in the history of the Conservative party that would indicate or in any way satisfactorily prove that they have ever done anything for the coal industries of Nova Scotia. The coal industries of Nova Scotia have a history, and that history shows that nothing was done for them worthy to be mentioned by the National Policy. Our friends speak of the National Policy as the only thing that they ever produced that is worthy of praise or mention. What is this National Policy? A stranger coming into this country would think that it was some great, herculean act performed by the Conservative party of that day that had brought about the greatest possible amount of prosperity and expansion in this country. What does it amount to? Before the adoption of the National Policy in 1879 we had a tariff of 17½ per cent, and the Conservative party raised that to something around 25 per cent. That is all that the National Policy is, nothing else; no great statesmanship about it, no great difficulty about raising a tariff from 17½ to 25 per cent, or a little higher, or as high as you like. There is nothing wonderful about it. That is all the National Policy is, and what has it done for the coal industry of Nova Scotia? I am talking here in the presence of members of this House, what I say will go before the coal owners of Nova Scotia and the people I represent. Talking, therefore, in this place and subject to criticism, I submit, Sir, that while the coal industries of Nova Scotia had nothing to go upon but the National Policy it was simply dragging along, and starving. You will find the Halifax 'Herald' of September, 1906, reporting that in those days of the National Policy coal was simply capable of giving half time and half pay to its people, and that it was on the ragged edge of poverty. That is the way that paper speaks in an article written by Mr. Milner who professes to be an authority on the coal question. From 1878 to 1893 we had nothing in Nova Scotia, but the National Policy in

so far as the coal industry is concerned. During the whole of that period the highest year's output in the Island of Cape Breton was only 700,000 tons—a very small output and produced by half time and half pay, according to the Halifax 'Herald.' In those days the hon. gentleman who is now the Finance Minister was the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia. He came to the conclusion that something had to be done, and that an improvement ought to be made in the conditions of affairs in Nova Scotia. He set about bringing American capital into Nova Scotia for the purpose of improving the conditions of the coal trade.

What happened in these days is just what is happening in this House to-day. He was met with the most strenuous opposition from the Conservatives in the local legislature; he was told that what he was doing would reduce the thousands of miners of Nova Scotia to the position of serfs, depriving them of their manhood and liberty; that they would be subject to the combines and monopolies of the United States; that the Americans were purchasing the Cape Breton mines to close them down and that ruin would follow. Any one who reads the speeches of the then leader of the opposition in the local House, Mr. Cahan, will realize that I am not overdrawing the picture. In the face of all that, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, then Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, went on with the agreement, and as a result $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 of capital was invested in this industry, and where we were then exporting 700,000 tons of coal per annum we are to-day exporting over 5,000,000 tons, and the towns and hamlets which had then a population of two and three thousand are to-day cities of twenty thousand people. Where we then had many disjointed companies with small mines we have to-day this magnificent development of the Dominion Coal Company, and the Dominion Steel Company, and the Tar and Chemical Company, and the cement companies and others, none of which would be in existence were it not for the policy laid down by the Hon. Mr. Fielding, who was then in charge of the destinies of Nova Scotia. At that time, Senator MacKeen, who was then a member of this parliament, and whose Conservatism will not be questioned, because he vacated his seat in this House to make room for Sir Charles Tupper when it was found necessary to bring him back into politics to try and redeem the fortunes of the Conservative party; Senator MacKeen, because of the character of the Tory opposition to this great scheme, found it necessary to write, in the interests of Nova Scotia and of Canada, as follows:

> I believe that legislation by which alone it was possible to bring capital into the country for the development of our coal and iron industries to an extent far beyond the capacity of Great Breton capitalists to invest, is, and must be, for the good of the whole province, and should not be condemned but encouraged by every one having an interest in the prosperity and welfare of our country.
>
> I have no sympathy with parties who, prompted by political passions, deliberately denounce measures which, if successfully carried out, must result in public good; and such a course seems to me to say very little for the intelligence of those persons who pursue it.
>
> They still hold them and with the exception of two small mines which could not be worked to a profit, they are working more vigorously than ever. A company which only purchases mines in order to close them does not commence to build forty miles of railroad at a cost of upwards of half a million dollars and push the work forward with the utmost despatch. Nor does it entirely rebuild a large shipping pier at a further outlay of nearly $300,000, and this is what the Dominion Coal Company are doing with the railroad from Bridgeport to Louisburg, and with the old international pier. Surely this alone would by all reasonable men be accepted as a sufficient contradiction to this mean slander.
>
> Depend upon it, this company has come to stay, and the above facts should effectually silence those cavillers who for purposes of their own have tried to arouse the fears and stimulate the hostility of the miners of Cape Breton by falsely alleging that the policy of the company would deprive them of employment in the future.
>
> I think those who seek for any reason to stir up opposition to a company which has introduced such an enormous amount of capital into the island, and which is laying itself out to provide employment for a far greater number of miners than are at present employed in the industry, is no friend to the inhabitants of Cape Breton, and fails altogether to appreciate the important consequences which I firmly believe will follow the establishment of this concern.

That was the language Senator MacKeen used under conditions which to my mind were very similar to the conditions which exist to-day. We were then in Nova Scotia bringing about a new condition of things, we were getting more capital into the country, and the Conservatives told us as they are telling us to-day: leave well enough alone, what we have we hold, don't do anything for the advancement of this country but just stand where you are. Well, the Liberals went on with their policy in Nova Scotia and development and progress followed, and it was due not to the National Policy but to what is known as the Whitney legislation and the enterprise and foresight of the Minister of Finance, who to-night leads this House. Our Conservative friends have criticised the representatives from Nova Scotia in this House because we are willing to agree to a cut of eight cents a ton on the duty on coal and they tell us what marvellous things they would do for

us if they had control. There is no better means of arriving at what people would do if they had the power than to take what they say when they are out of power, and, when a few evenings ago this very important question, the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) was put up as the representative of the opposition to reply to the First Minister. We have a right to assume that the leader of the opposition did not put up the hon. member for North Simcoe without some consideration to answer the most important speech that will be made on this great question, and which was delivered by the Prime Minister, who was listened to with greater interest on this question than would be any other man in the country. I suppose the leader of the opposition did not mean any discourtesy to the Prime Minister when he put forward the hon. member for North Simcoe, on the contrary I would expect that the hon. gentleman submitted to the leader of the opposition what he was going to say, and that anything he did say on so grave an occasion had the full sanction of his leader. On the question of protection for coal this is what was said by the hon. member for North Simcoe, who represented the leader of the opposition on that important occasion:

> If Nova Scotia continues to send such men to this House, and there is no doubt from the signs of the times that there will be a change in the next parliament, I for one, staunch protectionist as I am, will have to consider whether it is worth while for the rest of the country to grant a duty of 50 cents a ton to Nova Scotia on coal and a bounty on her steel.

That is the threat which is held over our heads by the gentleman who spoke for the opposition in answer to the speech of the Prime Minister. Later on, I think it was yesterday, another front bencher of very high standing I suppose in the Conservative party, evidently very close to the leader of the opposition, and, I presume, when talking on trade questions, voicing the ideas of that hon. gentleman; I refer to the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup), spoke on the question of protection to coal, and said:

> We only bear the duty on coal and iron in consideration of a duty on our products, and since that was the direct bargain made in 1878 and renewed since, as you have broken the bargain, and removed our duties, we will insist that the duty on coal and iron be removed in order that justice may be done.

That is what we have to expect if our friends on the other side should come into power, and I submit, Sir, that on the question of coal, as I have already explained, whatever is done to-day in the province of Nova Scotia, whatever strides the industry has made, have been made, not because of any assistance or support received from the national policy, as I have pointed out that during the ten years of the national policy the great property now known as the Dominion Coal Company coal areas, and that of the Nova Scotia Steel Company across the water, together only produced 700,000 tons of coal, whereas to-day the same properties are producing, under the new legislation, something over 5,000,000 tons, all brought about by what is known as the Whitney legislation, a new departure from the old road, in which we travelled for 20 years before that departure was made. I submit that the occasion was much like the present, and that we in Nova Scotia followed the Premier in those days and followed him to success in the teeth of the most vigorous opposition the Conservatives could make to the project. I submit we have a perfect right, and we are bound, I think, to place every confidence in the scheme that the Finance Minister has set before us to-day, believing that the same results will follow.

Mr. BLAIN. When was the duty put on soft coal?

Mr. McKENZIE. A duty was put on soft coal as far back as 1870 or 1871. It was taken off by our Conservative friends when they were in power before 1878, and in 1878 it went on again, but my submission is not that the Conservatives put the duty on or took it off; I am arguing, and I think successfully, that the duty was not sufficient and did not give any impetus to the coal industry in Nova Scotia, and the standing of the coal industries in Nova Scotia to-day is not due to the national policy, but to the Whitney legislation introduced and carried forward by the Hon. Mr. Fielding, then Prime Minister of the province of Nova Scotia. I said, further, that the cry then was to be satisfied with what we had and go no further.

There is one thing more that I propose to say in connection with this matter while we are answering the charges made against us by the Sydney 'Post' on this coal question. They say that the Minister of Finance and the Premier of Nova Scotia were always the enemies and never the friends, and that the duty was, of course, the saviour of that coal question, and that were it not for the duty the death knell of the coal industry in Nova Scotia would have been struck long ago. What did Sir John Macdonald say about the coal duty when we in Nova Scotia were told by the Conservatives that we could not get along without the coal duties, but that every miner would be thrown out of employment, that the pit mouths would be closed if the duty was taken off? On the 30th day of July, 1890, in the midst of this condition, and when our Conservative friends were holding forth that the only

friends of this industry were Sir John Macdonald and his government, he writes this letter to an American gentleman of high standing in the cabinet of that day:

My Dear Sir,—In answer to your esteemed note of this day, I desire to say that I am fully assured that the parliament of Canada will be ready to take off all duties on coal, ores and lumber imported from the United States whenever Congress makes these articles free of duty. The Canadian government has already authorized Sir Julian Pauncefote to state to the American government that they will be prepared to take off the export duty on logs whenever Canadian lumber is admitted into the United States at the reduced rate of one dollar per thousand board measure. You are at liberty to show this to the members of Congress and the President as you please. It should not, for obvious reasons, be published in the press or quoted in Congress. In the United States Tariff Act provision might be made for making the above-mentioned articles free whenever they are made free by the Canadian parliament.

I remain, my dear sir, faithfully yours,

(Sgd.) JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. LENNOX. I would call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that a few moments ago he referred to the hon. member for East Hastings as saying:

We only bear the duty on coal and iron in consideration of a duty on our products and since that was the direct bargain made in 1878 and renewed since, as you have broken the bargain, and removed our duties, we will insist that the duty on coal and iron be removed in order that justice may be done.

Mr. McKENZIE. That is exactly what I quoted.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member quoted that as being a statement made by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) as a proposition that he advanced. That was not fair to the hon. member for East Hastings. I think my hon. friend intended to be fair, so I will read what the hon. member for East Hastings said leading up to this:

I warn the Finance Minister that if he is as regardless of his own province as he apparently is of the Dominion as a whole, the farmers whom he has selected as the particular objects of his animosity, who, of all people, are to be deprived of protection, whose markets are to be given not to the United States but to the world, I warn that hon gentleman that if he really is true to his newly found and oft-professed although rarely acted-up-to belief in the doctrine of protection, the day is not far distant when the farmers of Ontario will say: We only bear the duty on coal and iron.

And then follows the quotation which the hon. member read. My hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie)—

Mr. McKENZIE. Is my hon. friend going to break into my speech?

Mr. LENNOX. I do not wish to. I am only calling the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the hon. member for East Hastings was not giving that as a statement of the attitude he or any member on this side would take, but merely as what the farmers would probably say as the result of the Finance Minister's action. I think it fair to say that.

Mr. McKENZIE. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) stated positively what he believed would happen, and to this he gave the force of his opinion, whatever that may be worth.

Mr. LENNOX. That is not fair.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not wish to have patch work made of my speech by quotations of this kind.

Mr. LENNOX. I submit that that is not fair, and as a question of fact——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot interrupt except with the permission of the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie).

Mr. McKENZIE. I have granted, I think, all that can fairly be expected of me in the way of interruptions.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) must resume his seat. There is a well understood rule that whenever the Speaker or the Chairman has occasion to rise to order, any hon. gentleman who is endeavouring to address the House, must stop speaking and resume his seat. The hon. member knows the rule. The hon. member for North Cape Breton has given way to the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) for a considerable length of time, and now he objects to do so any longer. Therefore, the hon. member for South Simcoe has not the right to interrupt unless he rise to a point of order.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to a point of order. I do not propose to take a lecture from the Chairman in a matter of this kind.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must resume his seat. It is not permitted to criticise the action of the Chairman. That will not be allowed unless the House itself will change its rules. If the hon. gentleman has a point of order to raise, he must raise it concisely and distinctly and specify the point he raises, but he cannot be allowed to criticise the action of the Chair.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to a point of order, perhaps two points of order. One is that when I am speaking, and am in the midst of a sentence the Chairman has no more right to interrupt me than has any one else.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. On that point I rule that the Chairman has the right to intervene at any time any hon. member is out of order, and if the occasion requires it, will do so.

Mr. LENNOX.. The next point I wish to raise is that the statement made by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) is not correct as a matter of fact.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not a point of order. My hon. friend knows that.

Mr. LENNOX. And therefore I have a perfect right to call the attention of the Chairman to the fact that the hon. gentleman who has the floor has misstated a matter of fact. I wish to proceed now to point out in what respect the hon. gentleman has misstated the fact.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has not the right to correct any misstatement of fact made by an hon. member unless it brings into question his own word. In such a case, he may deny the accuracy of the statement affecting himself personally, and have the words withdrawn, but he is not at liberty to interrupt an hon. member who has the floor because he believes that that hon, gentleman is making a statement which is not correct.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to appeal from your ruling, Sir. The point I wish to make is this——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman wishes to appeal from my ruling he has the right to do so, but he has not the right to debate it. My decision has been given. If he desires to appeal from it, I shall refer his appeal to the House through Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FIELDING. I would ask my hon. friend not to press his appeal. On reflection I am sure he will see that an interruption can only be allowed by consent. I do not suppose he is anxious that we should have appeals in points of order, and I would ask him not to press it.

Mr. LENNOX. I suppose I have the right to state what my point of order is. It is this. The hon. gentleman, in dealing with the statement which he attributed to the member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), misrepresented what was said by that hon. gentleman. I am quite prepared to assume that he did so inadvertently, but I desire to call attention to the misstatement of fact, and I submit that under the circumstances, as a member of this House, I am entitled to have that misstatement made right by appealing to the records of the House. But I understand that you, Mr. Chairman, hold that I have not the right to do so. If that be the case, with the greatest respect to you, Sir, and the Minister of Finance, I propose to prosecute the appeal.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The committee will now rise in order that I may report to the House with the Speaker in the Chair, the point of order taken and the ruling I have made, namely, that no hon. member has the right to interrupt an hon. gentleman who has the floor for the purpose of denying a statement of fact not personal to himself or affecting his own words.

The committee rose and the Speaker took the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for South Simcoe, Mr. Speaker, having claimed the right to interrupt the speech of the hon. member for North Cape Breton in order to correct a statement of fact not affecting himself, and permission being denied by the hon. member for North Cape Breton, the Chairman decided that the hon. member for South Simcoe was not entitled, under the rules, the privilege of so interrupting. Thereupon the hon. member for South Simcoe appealed from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained.

Mr. LENNOX. Before you put that motion, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. No debate can be allowed on that motion.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not wish to debate it. What I wish to say is that the reference made is not, in my opinion, a true and correct summary of the position.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am sorry, but I have to take the statement as given me by the chairman.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to enter my protest in that way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Perhaps I might be allowed a word. If in writing it, I have not correctly reported the position, I would be very willing to ask that the hon. gentleman be allowed to correct me.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the chairman wishes to correct his report, that is another mat-

ter. I have to take the statement as made to me by the chairman.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to explain, Mr. Speaker, but I realize that it would not be in order for me to rise while you are standing——

Mr. SPEAKER. There is the difficulty. Under the rules no debate is allowed on this motion. The question is: Shall the decision of the chairman be sustained?

Motion agreed to, and decision sustained.

The House again resumed in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am sorry that there should be any such interruption or difficulty. I should expect fair treatment from the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), but I am interrupted by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) in characteristic style——

Mr. CAMPBELL. I rise to a point of order. I absolutely object to being referred to when I am not interrupting. I did not speak to the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) who has the floor. I made a remark to the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), and suggested that he hand 'Hansard' to the gentleman who has the floor so that he could correct himself, if he had made a mistake.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Evidently, a mistake has been made; but there is no point of order.

Mr. McKENZIE. It is my experience in addressing this House to be interrupted by the hon. member for South Simcoe. I presume he does not do it with malice aforethought. But he seems to fall into the habit of interrupting me frequently, and, I believe, without sufficient reason. However, I do not object very much, but I wish to put myself fairly before the House and the country. I quoted remarks in 'Hansard' complete in themselves, made by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup). I could not put his whole speech again on 'Hansard.' I did not garble the paragraph, but quoted it complete. To put myself right before hon. members, I will quote it again. I do so for the purpose of showing that the coal duty has no friends among the Conservative party. These are the words of a gentleman in good standing in the party on the left of the Speaker. I submit that he is a man who takes a very active and prominent part in the debates of this House, and seems to be regarded by his friends as an authority. When he speaks on a question of this kind, we his opponents have a right to believe that he is stating the view on the trade question of the party to which he belongs. His words are:

> We only bear the duty on coal and iron in consideration of a duty on our products and since that was the direct bargain made in 1878 and renewed since, as you have broken the bargain, and removed our duties, we will insist that the duty on coal and iron be removed in order that justice may be done.

That is word for word as it is in 'Hansard.' The difficulty with my hon. friend from South Simcoe is, that he wishes, evidently, to put on 'Hansard' the whole of the speech of the hon. member for East Hastings in the midst of my speech.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) permit me a word? I would not interrupt without permission.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am willing to be asked a question, but I do not wish, if I can avoid it, to have more of somebody else's speech in the midst of mine.

Mr. BLAIN. The point is that in the very next sentence the hon. member for East Hastings gives his own opinion, I am sure my hon. friend has overlooked that.

Mr. McKENZIE. All that has been put on record by the hon. member for South Simcoe.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood it was not. That is the very point of contention. I am asking my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie), with his permission, if he will allow the opinion of the hon. member for East Hastings to go on 'Hansard,' in conjunction with the statement made. If he is unwilling, I will not press it.

Mr. McKENZIE. A good deal of the speech has been read by my hon. friend from South Simcoe, as much as I thought was fair to be interlined in my own speech.

Mr. LENNOX. We will have it to-morrow.

Mr. McKENZIE. My hon. friend is quite welcome to have it to-morrow, or every other day of the session. If he thinks there is anything more in the speech that is of advantage to him, he cannot be prevented from putting it, in the proper way, on the record. But I do not think it fair that I should be asked to sit down that the long speech of the hon. member for East Hastings may be read into my own.

It is growing late, and as it is impossible for me to finish my observations this evening, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. FIELDING, House adjourned at 11.48 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 10, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FISHERY REGULATIONS.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) whether the regulations under the Fisheries Treaty of 1908 with the United States have been proclaimed, and if not, what is the obstacle to their proclamation?

Mr. BRODEUR. They have not yet been proclaimed. I have been informed that a message has been sent to the President of the United States to the Congress recommending the passage of the necessary legislation to put these regulations into force, but I have not been informed that the necessary legislation has been passed. So that the matter is in statu quo for the present.

Mr. BRADBURY. When may we expect the report down with regard to the Manitoba Fisheries Commission? I have had a wire to-day from Manitoba asking for it. As it is pretty late in the season, the people there are getting anxious about the matter.

Mr. BRODEUR. A report was received by me a few days ago, and I immediately transmitted it to the Printing Bureau to be printed. As soon as it is printed it will be brought down. I expect that it will be ready in a few days.

Mr. BRADBURY. Is it possible to get a copy before it is printed, as the printing may take some time?

Mr. BRODEUR. Only one copy was sent to me. I expect that it will be ready in a few days, as it is not very voluminous. I will call the attention of the Secretary of State to the matter

PRIVILEGE—MR. NORTHRUP.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I rise to make a personal explanation as a question of privilege. Last evening, while I was absent from the House, certain references were made to myself and to some remarks which I made last Wednesday, by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). So deep is my respect for the dignity of this House, and so sincere my regard for the maintenance of the good reputation of its members, that had the references been only to myself, rather than have marred the pages of 'Hansard' with the proofs which I shall be compelled to give this afternoon, I would have preferred to have lain under the imputation of being the hypocrite and fool which I must have been had I made the remarks attributed to me. But as the remarks of the hon. gentleman not only related to myself, but reflected on the honour of the leader of the opposition, and on the fair fame of the Conservative party, I am compelled, however reluctantly, to lay the facts before the House. The hon. member for North Cape Breton, according to 'Hansard,' at page 5124, spoke as follows:

> Later on, I think it was yesterday, another front bencher of very high standing I suppose in the Conservative party, evidently very close to the leader of the opposition, and, I presume, when talking on trade questions, voicing the ideas of that hon. gentleman; I refer to the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup), spoke on the question of protection to coal, and said:
>
> We only bear the duty on coal and iron in consideration of a duty on our products, and since that was the direct bargain made in 1878 and renewed since, as you have broken the bargain, and removed our duties, we will insist that the duty on coal and iron be removed in order that justice may be done.
>
> That is what we have to expect if our friends on the other side should come into power, and I submit, Sir, that on the question of coal, as I have already explained, whatever is done to-day in the province of Nova Scotia, whatever strides the industry has made, have been made, not because of any assistance or support received from the National Policy, as I have pointed out that during the ten years of the National Policy the great property now known as the Dominion Coal Company coal areas, and that of the Nova Scotia Steel Company across the water, together only produced 700,000 tons of coal, whereas to-day the same properties are producing, under the new legisaltion, something over 5,000,000 tons, all brought about by what is known as the Whitney legislation, a new departure from the old road, in which we travelled for 20 years before that departure was made.

The hon. member who spoke, being not merely a distinguished member of this House, but a gentleman who enjoys the experience of having occupied a seat on the bench for many years, and being therefore acquainted with the consideration of questions of evidence and the construction of documents, when that hon. gentleman chose to say, in the first place, that I was voicing the sentiments of the leader of the opposition, and that, I take it, could only mean the Conservative party—and were there any doubt on this point it is put beyond question by his final words: 'That is what we have to expect if our friends on the other side should come into power'—I think the House will allow me to state what I did say on the occasion in question. Referring to the unrevised 'Hansard'

of last Wednesday, at page 4962, I quote my remarks as follows:

I warn the Finance Minister that if he is as regardless of his own province as he apparently is of the Dominion as a whole, the farmers whom he has selected as the particular objects of his animosity, who, of all people, are to be deprived of protection, whose markets are to be given not to the United States but to the world, I warn that hon. gentleman that if he really is true to his newly found and oft-professed although rarely acted-up-to belief in the doctrine of protection, the day is not far distant when the farmers of Ontario will say: We only bear the duty on coal and iron in consideration of a duty on our products and since that was the direct bargain made in 1878 and renewed since, as you have broken the bargain, and removed our duties, we will insist that the duty on coal and iron be removed in order that justice may be done.

I went on:

I, as a protectionist, would be exceedingly sorry to see a movement of that kind on the part of the agricultural element of this country. I think perhaps the most dangerous feature in this measure is the unhappy setting of one class against another, for nobody can possibly argue, even the Finance Minister, and the Prime Minister know it is impossible to argue this agreement on any platform without denouncing the manufacturers and appealing to the farmers. If it is to the interests of this country to set class against class, let us proceed with this discussion, but if not, let us know that the true basis of our national prosperity is a protective policy, then let all classes enjoy it, or as the farmers say, either all shall have it or none, and I am sure there is no man in Canada so rampant a free trader, except possibly the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), as to believe that it is the true interests of Canada that all protection should be removed from all industries.

I leave the alleged quotation given by the member for North Cape Breton and the full 'Hansard' report of my words to show whether or not I am justified in calling the attention of the House to what I would consider certainly a misquotation of my remarks. The hon. gentleman, as a judge, knows perfectly well what perhaps some men may not know, but in order to make perfectly clear to him, the difference between a partial and a complete quotation, let me give him an illustration. If I were to look at my hon. friend in the eye and say: The Good Book says: 'All men are liars,' probably he would counter on me by saying: Yes, but the rest of the quotation is: 'I said in my haste, all men are liars.' And, therefore, the Psalmist meant exactly the opposite of what the garbled quotation would have indicated. I trust I have done my duty in laying before the House this alleged quotation of my remarks and my actual remarks as reported in 'Hansard.'

REPORTS OF BANK CURATORS.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to revert to the return to an order of the House of Commons dated February 6, 1911, for a copy of the curators' reports in the cases of all banks for which curators have been appointed. I mentioned the other day, and the Finance Minister took note of it that with reference to the Bank of Yarmouth, instead of the return including the curator's report, it simply included a synopsis of the curator's report what I want is not a synopsis which may be very different from the report itself, but that which is provided for in the Banking Act, and which the Finance Minister has a right to have, and which the member of parliament has a right to call for. Coming then to the Bank of St. Johns, and the St. Hyacinthe Bank, I think that the only thing brought down is a small page of statistics giving a financial statement, that and that alone. With reference to the other banks, the curators give reports upon the conduct of the banks, and causes that led to the failure and they detail the delinquents and in what matters they have been delinquent, which of course is the only thing that a curator's report is meant for, to give to the Finance Department, after it has given it to the Bankers' Association, an idea of what were the defects, what were the faults, what were the delinquencies, so that, having this knowledge, the department can do what is considered proper either to punish in these cases or to provide that such things shall not easily occur again. Therefore, in the case of the Banque de St. Hyacinthe and Bank of St. Johns I want the curator's report upon the nature of the transactions and the causes that led to the failures. They are given in the case of the St. Stephen bank with great particularity, and I may say that they furnish food not only for consideration, but for legislation. I am certain that the full report from the Bank of Yarmouth will do the same, and I shall be very much mistaken if we do not get profitable information from the curator's reports in reference to the other banks. Therefore, what I want from the Finance Minister is first the full report of the curator in the case of the Bank of Yarmouth and the full reports of the curators in the cases of the Banque de St. Johns and the Banque de Hochelaga.

APPOINTMENT OF COLOURED PERSONS IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries prepared to give an answer to the question I asked yesterday in regard to the colour line in the naval service?

Mr. BRODEUR. I thought at first from the remarks of my hon. friend that he referred to a man who wanted to come as a recruit in the navy, but I understand it is the case of a man who wanted to pass his examination for the inside service. It appears that this man had not passed his examination for the inside service, but had passed the qualifying examination for the outside service and consequently was not qualified to come into the inside service.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What about the coloured man the Minister of Agriculture sent out to the agricultural farm?

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman in question has been sent by the Civil Service Commissioners for temporary service at the experimental farm. He is doing there most excellent service, and everybody there is perfectly satisfied.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He is looking after the black Minorca hens? Is that it?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In the outside service or the inside service?

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. JAMESON. When may we expect a return in regard to the bait freezer at Barrington Passage ordered on the 21st of last month?

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall make inquiries, I thought that was down.

SUPPLY—TRANSPORTATION IN CANADA.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, in taking advantage of this opportunity to make a few observations in reference to the transportation problem of the Dominion of Canada, I presume no apology to the House is needed. I admit at the outset that I fear what I have to say will prove dry and to a certain extent uninteresting in comparison with the discussions that have taken place in the House in the past few weeks; but the facts that I will try to place before the House may be useful in further discussions and although some of the figures I shall give may be found in the annual reports at various places, I think probably that if they are placed on 'Hansard' it will be more convenient for hon. members to get at them, and that they will be of more practical use than if members are obliged to find them by looking through the reports.

I am of the opinion that transportation has as much to do with the success of a country as tariff has. These two are interwoven in a measure, but, certainly, if we do not provide the methods by which the wealth producers can get the products of their labours to market at a reasonable rate, with fair speed and in good condition, there is little use of having any tariff, and less use of hunting for markets for these products. I think it is no exaggeration to say that in the matter of perfecting transportation facilities by aid from various sources, Canada, possibly, leads the world in the courage she has shown. There is a difference of opinion as to the propriety of further encouraging these great transportation companies by cash subsidies, by land grant, or by guarantee. It is not the policy of the present government, as I understand it, to any more give aid by way of land grants for the extension of transportation facilities. The land of the Dominion of Canada has become too valuable to give in this way, and the potentialities of increase in that value are so great, on account of the rapid development of the country, that it is more practical to give in dollars and cents any aid we have to give. And, besides, when it is given in this way, the people know exactly what they are paying for the benefits received. I have no fear of the success, present or future, of the railway companies of the Dominion of Canada. If there be north-and-south lines we must not forget that a line running south that can take traffic from Canadian roads also runs north, and can bring traffic to Canadian roads. And, Canada having the geographical position on this continent that she enjoys ought to be able to more than hold her own in the carrying trade of the continent, other things being at all equal. Our rail routes are shorter and we own the largest portion of the waterways that lead from the west to the east. Under these conditions, it rests, I think, with the people of the Dominion of Canada themselves to say whether they shall maintain their carrying trade, and also to say whether they shall, in the future, do their own carrying trade, and also a portion of the carrying trade of the great country to the south of us.

Let me for a moment refer to the Board of Railway Commissioners. I need not take up much time in pointing out the beneficial work being done by the board for this country. It is admitted everywhere in Canada, I think it is admitted outside of Canada, that the Board of Railway Commissioners as now constituted is doing better work than any similar body in the world. And it is the most popular tribunal for the settlement of difficulties in which the people are concerned that exists to-day. I will not go into details to show how many applications have been received during the year. The figures will be found in the report. Day after day the department receives word of approval of the work being done by this body. The fact that the

humblest citizen in the Dominion can come either by letter or personally before this board and get his grievance adjusted, is, to my mind, the outstanding beneficial feature of the board. It has been suggested that counsel should be engaged to protect the interest of the public in cases coming before this tribunal. In any large cases, such as investigations of express companies, this is necessary, and it has been done, but where a farmer has a grievance about a crossing it is not necessary, before this democratic board, that he should have any counsel. He merely writes a letter, and probably by return mail, has the satisfaction of having his grievance redressed and of learning that the railway companies have been asked to do what he wants them to do. There has been added to the staff of the board an operating department, presided over by Mr. Nixon, a very active and prominent railway man. The difficulty heretofore in deciding cases, particularly those between the railway companies themselves, was the absence of a head who had had a great deal of practical experience in deciding what was practical operation of railways. Consequently railway companies, with their ablest counsel and their own operating men present, were in the position to take strong ground either way, and it was difficult for the board to arrive at proper conclusions. The chairman of the board, ex-Judge Mabee, suggested that an operating department should be established, the head of it to be a practical man, who could give the board advice, and who would know what was practical or not practical in any orders given by the board, or any requests made. The working of that department has proved very beneficial in disputes arising between railways, or between railways and private individuals, as to operation, the work of the board in this respect has been greatly simplified, and it is much easier to get an early decision than it was some years ago.

It may be of interest to the public to know just the situation of the railways of Canada. The following figures afford a comparison of mileage of main track in operation:

MILES OF RAILWAY TRACK IN OPERATION.

	Miles.
1901	18,140
1909	24,104
1910	24,731

Increase in one year 1909-1910, 627 miles.
Increase for ten years, 1901-1910, 6,591 miles.

In this mileage, the Grand Trunk Pacific line is not included, it being yet operated as an uncompleted road. The mileage under construction on June 30th last was 4,500 miles. If we add the lines under construction to those already in operation we have a total mileage of close upon 30,000 miles in the Dominion of Canada.

The capital invested in railways in Canada is shown by the following figures:

CAPITAL INVESTED IN RAILWAYS.

1909	$1,308,481,416
1910	1,410,297,687

Increase for one year, $101,816,271.

1901	$ 816,110,837
1910	1,410,297,687

Increase for 10 years, $594,186,850.

Sir, when you look at the comparatively small debt of the Dominion of Canada, and compare it with the amount alone invested in railways in this country, I think it will be recognized that, for the advancement we are making in our transportation facilities, for the advancement we are making in other lines, the debt of Canada has been kept down remarkably well. Let me now submit to the House some tables bearing on this question:

AID TO RAILWAYS.

1909	$188,963,339
1910	190,753,062
Increase	$ 1,789,723

This increase was made up as follows:—

By the Dominion	$1,382,192
provinces	248,531
municipalities	159,000

In addition to the foregoing cash subsidies, the Dominion in 1910 made a loan of $10,000,000 to the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Land subsidies to the extent of 55,292,321 acres have been given by the Dominion and the provinces, of which 32,040,378 acres were granted by the former.

TRAFFIC.

Passengers carried:

1909	32,683,309
1910	35,894,575
Increase	3,211,267
1901	18,385,722
1910	35,894,575
Increase for 10 years	17,508,853

Tons of freight:

1909	66,842,258
1910	74,482,866
Increase	7,640,608
1901	36,999,371
1910	74,482,866
Increase for 10 years	37,483,495
Equal to 101 per cent	

EARNINGS AND EXPENSES.

Gross earnings—

1909	$145,056,336
1910	173,956,217
Increase	$ 28,899,881
1901	72,898,749
1910	173,956,217
Increase for 10 years	$101,057,468

Operating expenses—

1909	$104,600,084
1910	120,405,440
Increase	$ 15,805,356

1901	50,368,726
1910	120,405,440
Increase for 10 years	$ 70,036,714
Net earnings—	
1909	$ 40,456,252
1910	53,550,777
Increase	$ 13,094,525

Equal to 32·3 per cent.

EQUIPMENT.

The railways of Canada added last year to their equipment:

Locomotives	110
Passenger cars	138
Freight cars	1,934
Company's cars	789

These additions brought up the available rolling stock to the following numbers:

Locomotives	4,079
Freight cars	119,713
Passenger cars	4,320

Now, the question of transportation is very important as regards the men who are working with their hands as well as with their heads in this work throughout the Dominion. It is customary, in discussing transportation problems, to refer to them as being the property of capitalists, and dominated by them. They are to a certain extent, but the development of our railways, the development of our waterways, is of vital interest to the men who find employment on these railways and on these waterways. Here are the figures: There were in the service of Canadian railways on June 30 last 123,768 employees, whose wage bill amounted to $67,167,703. In addition, there were 16,709 employees engaged in outside operations such as steamers and hotels, whose remuneration amounted to $5,169,923. The aggregate would therefore be 140,477 employees, with a total wage bill of $72,337,626. Assuming that each railway employee represents five persons, it is obvious that about one individual in 10 of our total population finds a livelihood from the railways of Canada.

Now, to put it briefly, these figures show I think these facts: The year 1910, measured by the increased volume of traffic measured by the earnings, economic administration, satisfactory maintenance, and swelling mileage, and measured by every proper standard, appears to have been the best year in the history of Canadian railways.

Now, leaving railways for a moment, I want to place on record the figures in connection with the canal traffic of the Dominion; because, discuss it as you may, increase our railway facilities as we must, one thing to my mind is absolutely necessary, and that is that Canada must not lag behind in keeping her waterway transportation as fully developed as possible. It is a curious coincidence, perhaps not so curious when you come to go into it in detail, that the greater the increase in railway traffic the greater the increase in canal and waterborne traffic. That arises from the fact that the volume of traffic is greater and that the regulating force of the waterways on the rates of railways attracts traffic to those particular routes that are so governed. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the way for Canada to secure and to keep for herself an ever-increasing trade is to be alert on the question, not only of railways, but the development of harbours and waterway transportation. Following is a statement of tons of freight passed through the various canals during the years 1909 and 1910:

	1909.	1910.	Increase.
Sault Ste. Marie	27,861,245	36,395,687	8,534,442
Welland	2,025,951	2,326,290	300,399
St. Lawrence	2,410,629	2,760,752	350,123
Chambly	752,117	669,299	82,818
Ottawa	336,939	385,261	48 322
Rideau	91,774	134,881	43,107
St. Peter's	79,850	85,951	6,101
Murray	102,291	177,941	75,650
Trent Valley	59,952	46,263	13,699
St. Andrews	.....	8 283	8,283
Total	33,720,748	42,990 608	9,269,860
1901		5,665,259	
1910		42,990,608	

Increase for 10 years.. .. 37,325,349 tons.
Equal to 660 per cent.

It will be observed that while the railway traffic increased 101 per cent the waterborne traffic through our canals increased 660 per cent. This emphasizes what I have said that Canada can keep her carrying trade and add to it if she is alert to the privileges that providence has placed in her way in developing the resources and waterways that we have.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). That waterway traffic, the minister must remember, is not Canadian traffic.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would be happy if it were all Canadian, but I am gratified to know that my prophecy has been carried out, and that in addition to carrying Canadian traffic we are also handling a lot of American traffic through our waterways.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). We are not carrying it; it is the Americans who are carrying it through our waterways.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is going through our channels at least. It went through the Sault canal.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems a remarkable increase. Can the minister give us any figures with respect as to just how much of this remarkable increase is due to the conditions pointed out by my hon. friend from South Lanark?

Mr. GRAHAM. What conditions?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). American traffic from American ports to American ports passing through our canal at the Sault.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not those figures with me. Perhaps I can get them when we are in supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They are very important.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know that they are important to my argument. I am pointing out the necessity of the continued improvement of our waterways, and I have shown conclusively that our waterways do carry the traffic and that the people get the benefit of it. If we are to continue to have this traffic borne through our canals we must develop this branch of our transportation system. I have the figures here for all the canals, not only for the Sault but for the Welland, the St. Lawrence, Chambly, the Ottawa, the Rideau, St. Peter's, Murray, Trent and St. Andrew's canals, and these figures show that these waterways have increased more rapidly in their carrying capacity than the railways of which they are the regulators and that if Canada is to retain her hold on the carrying trade she must be alert to the greater improvement of her waterways.

Now, I want to point out how the railway traffic is divided. This is a matter of deep interest at the present time to the House. I dare not travel afield to get into some other discussion, but I merely point this out to hon. gentlemen who have been discussing at some length the question of transportation from another standpoint. For the year ended 30th June last following were the classes of commodities carried by the railways of Canada:

	Tons.
Products of Agriculture	12,891,351
" animals	2,765,006
" mines	26,152,022
" forests	13,068,940
Manufactures	10,014,279
Merchandise	2,518,190
Miscellaneous	7,073,078
Total	74,482,866

Mr. FOSTER. Is this dealing with Canadian products solely?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is dealing with traffic on Canadian railways without any division as to where it comes from. Put into percentage form, and carrying the comparison back to 1907, the result is as follows:

	1907.	1908.	1909.	1910.
Agriculture	16.85	14.91	17.91	17.31
Animals	4.37	3.92	4.21	3.71
Mines	32.68	35.92	35.81	35.11
Forests	14.11	10.56	11.82	13.44
Merchandise	4.08	3.18	3.58	3.39
Miscellaneous	9.79	11.02	9.32	9.50

Joining products of agriculture and products of animals, and classifying them as products of the farm, the showing is as follows:

	1907.	1908.	1909.	1910.
Farm products	21.22	18.83	22.12	21.02

There is no means by which the volume of farm products shipped to the United States over Canadian railways can be ascertained. Turning to the Trade and Navigation returns, however, it is seen that for the year ended 31st March, 1910, the value of products of agriculture exported to the United States was $8,204,250, and of animals and their produce $10,629,614. It is not known what was the value of the commodities of these classes carried by the railways. Only the tonnage is reported. It was impossible to trace this out and to find what proportion foreign agricultural products bore to the Canadian traffic, but I would presume that the great bulk was of Canadian production.

I tried to get some figures as to the shipment of our wheat through Canadian and American ports. The figures are a little difficult to get at, and from various sources I find that they come to varying conclusions, but the figures given to me, I think, are practically correct. Of course, it must be borne in mind that these figures include wheat shipped to Buffalo also, and from there to New York and other American ports, while the figures with respect to Canadian ports will include all shipments, I presume, which go to Montreal. The total shipments of Canadian wheat to Canadian and American ports by rail and water for the crop year ending August 30, 1910, are:

	Total. Shipments. Bush.	To American ports. Bush.	To Canadian ports. Bush.
1908	65,629,873	10.515,264	55,114,609
1909	87,121,814	21,423,530	65,698,284
1910	101,468,538	29,717,525	71,751,013
	*44,396,047	*17,032,391	*27,363,656

(*Three months ending November 30.)

Shipments to Duluth, contained in above totals.

	Bush.
1908	1,571,940
1909	1,566,700
1910	4,500,000

The bulk of the shipments to the United States were exported from that country either as flour or wheat. Dutiable wheat imports into United States from Canada:

	Bush.
1908	114,956
1909	650,601
1910	1,856,181

These are a few general figures as to the traffic which I wish to place on record, and I think they will, perhaps be of use to members of the House in discussing various matters.

Now, Sir, looking to the second point with which I wish to deal, namely, the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, hon. gentlemen understand that I am not going into detail on this subject now, because probably later on there will be a discussion on this question and it would only be repetition

were I to enter into details to-day. But, for the benefit of members of the House, so that they will know exactly how the progress of the work stands, I wish to present the following general statement:

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mountain Section.

Total expenditure as certified to by the chief engineer..		$18,765,330 20
Total payments made to the company..		11,763,509 61

Prairie Section.

Total expenditure as certified to by the chief engineer..		$34,436,168 48
Total payments made to the company upon guarantee.... ..	$10,735,482 92	
Total payment made to the company on account of special loan..	10,000,000 00	
		20,735,482 92

The amount spent by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for rolling stock, locomotives, &c., up to date is $14,744,253.14.

The progress of the road on the Mountain section is given to me thus briefly:

It will be noticed that the road is progressing from the terminus of the prairie division west and from Prince Rupert eastward. During the last few months, I had the privilege with the Prime Minister and others, of visiting Prince Rupert and going out on this line for a number of miles towards the mountain pass. It may seem peculiar to those who are not in a position to know, when I say that there are sections of the Transcontinental east of Winnipeg much more difficult of construction than any section through the mountains from Prince Rupert east. Going along the Skeena river there are distances of several miles absolutely level and the difficulty the contractors have is not to overcome obstacles of grade so much as to overcome the difficulty of draining the railway owing to the level country. We went out for a good many miles over this section, and I believe it will be found in the years to come that this portion of the road running from Prince Rupert east, will tap many fertile valleys of British Columbia, and of course, we do not know what it will open up in the way of mineral and timber wealth. From Wolfe Creek west the road is ballasted as far as Edson for several miles; track laying has been completed to the 57th mile and grading, &c., has been completed to the 65th mile and at intervals as far as the 117th mile. The contract for the work has been let as far as the 180th mile, and at Edson there is under construction a station house, one engine house, and one machine shop.

Mr. FOSTER. That is up to what date?

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. GRAHAM. Up to December 31 last; I think that is the date speaking from memory. Track laying has been completed as far as mile 102 east from Prince Rupert, and grading, &c., is completed as far as mile 102 and at intervals as far as mile 184. The contract has been let for work as far as mile 240, the contract dating from the 1st November, 1909. At mile 8 (Zanardi Rapids), a 625 foot steel bridge has been completed. At mile 147 the portals of a 700 foot tunnel have been completed. At mile 135 a 180 foot tunnel has been completed.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Would the minister give the percentage of the work done and how long it will take to complete?

Mr. GRAHAM. The percentage is not nearly so large as we would like it to be, but I hope to be able to give a statement as to that later on. The contractors believe that the work will be completed in three years. They make the statement that they have had great difficulty in obtaining labour for that section. When we visited the west they were offering as high as $3 a day for the ordinary labourers, and the statement of the contractors was, that while men who had taken up farms and desired to earn money on the railways, were easy to get on the prairie, these men would not leave the prairie and take employment in the mountain sections. Of course, there are two or three sides of the story of the difficulty. It is contended by some people that the difficulty is, that the men are not treated right, but I will not now discuss that phase as it is foreign to the subject I am now bringing before the House. It is certain, however, that they are offering very high wages, and the reason they give for not being able to get on more rapidly is the difficulty of finding labour. We are in hopes that this season will find the contractors with a full staff on hand and rapidly constructing the road.

Now, coming to the Transcontinental: The portion of the road being constructed by the government from Moncton, New Brunswick to the city of Winnipeg, about 1,804 miles, I have a statement made by the Transcontinental Railway Commission concerning the various contracts.

This statement shows districts, mileages, &c., percentage of work done on each contract, miles of grading done, miles of track laid, miles of telegraph line completed, percentage of steel bridge superstructures completed and total percentage of work done to December 31, 1910, on all these 21 contracts, which appears to be 67·62 per cent. It is as follows:

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

STATEMENT showing Districts, Mileages, &c., and amount of sundry items of work done to December 31, 1910.

District.	Contract No.	Contractor.	Through Mileage of Contract.	Boundaries between Districts.	Per cent of contract completed.	Miles of grading completed in district.	Miles of track laid in district.	Miles of telegraph completed in district.	Per cent steel bridges Completed in district.	Remarks.
A.	1	Grand Trunk Pacific Con. Co ..	0– 50	Moncton, N.B.—256·61 miles.	99·50					
	2	J. W. McManus & Co., Ltd....	50– 58		98·43		*50·6			
	3	Grand Trunk Pacific Con. Co ..	58– 96·42		99·04	251·8	†249·92	206·49	81·1	
	4	" " " ..	96·42– 163·80		99·36					
	5	W. Kitchen Co., Ltd.....	163· 8– 195·58		89·87		300·52			
	6	Lyons & White	195·58– 256·61		88·71					
B.	7	M. P. & J. T. Davis.....	256·61– 310·22	New Brunswick and Quebec boundary—507·22 miles.	62· 8					
	8	" " (East Que. Bridge)	310·22– 460·45		75· 7		*28·05			
	9	" " (West " "	460·45– 510·31		88·02	419·6	†302·21	186·6	73·9	C. B. 107 miles transferred from "C" to "B."
	10	Macdonald & O'Brien.....	510·31– 610·41		94·04					
	11	Grand Trunk Pacific Con. Co ..	610·41– 656·83		92·93		330·26			
	12	Macdonald & O'Brien.....	656·83– 763·83		28·10					
C.	13	" "	763·83– 878·80	107 miles west of Weymontachene, Que.—192·91 miles.	Nil.		*2·0			
	14	Grand Trunk Pacific Con. Co..	878·80– 956·74	Quebec and Ontario Boundary.		74·3	†15·8	Nil.	.....	D.C. 31·6 miles transferred from "D" to "C."
D.	14	" " " ..	956–74–1028·80	216·11 miles.	66·46		17·8			
	15	E. F. & G. E. Fauquier.....	1028·80–1128·77				*28·5			
	16	M. P. & J. T. Davis.....	1128·77–1172·85	144 miles west of Cochrane, Ont.—255·19 miles.	73·04	197·4	†174·4	92		
E.	16	" "	1172·85–1232·85		12 49				71·2	
	17	" "	1232·85–1332·85				202·9			
	18	E. F. & G. E. Fauquier.....	1332·85–1407·85		Nil.	76·9	Nil.	Nil.		
	19	O'Brien, Fowler & Macdougall Bros.	1407·85–1428·04	399 miles west of Cochrane or 125 miles east of present Lake Superior Junction—376·09 miles.	63·45				.....	Mileage to west bank of Red River but percentage of grading contract covers only to east bank of Red River.
					55·54					
F.	19	" " "	1428·04–1534·04				*87·2			
	20	" " "	1534·04–1557·46		84·76	346·5	†298·4			
	21	J. D. McArthur.....	1557·80–1804·13	Winnipeg, Man.	95· 5			266·99	54·1	
							385·6			

* Sidings. † Main.

Total percentage of work done on all 21 contracts, 67·62 per cent.

OTTAWA, January 31, 1911.

H. MACPHERSON, *Asst. Chief Engineer.*

The following statement is an itemized statement of the value of the work done up to December 31, 1910, and an estimate of the value of the work required to complete, together with the total cost of the road as estimated by the chief engineer:

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—EASTERN DIVISION.

STATEMENT showing Work Done to December 31, 1910, and Estimate of Cost of Completion.

SUMMARY.

Items.	Value of Work done to December 31, 1910.	Value of Work required to complete.	Total Estimate of cost of work.
	$	$	$
Grading—contract items, including clearing, excavation, culverts, sub-structures of bridges, tracklaying, ballasting, ties, signals, interlocking appliances, telegraph lines, fencing, water supply, track scales, temporary trestles and extra work, also pump houses and pumps, and sub-structure of Cap Rouge viaduct	69,176,400	28,175,800	97,352,200
Right of Way—and expenses	1,629,900	1,910,100	3,540,000
Rails and Fastenings—including frogs, switches and diamond x'ings	8,534,900	4,037,100	12,572,000
Buildings—including stations, section and tool houses and divisional point buildings	664,800	3,644,200	4,309,000
Steel Superstructure of Bridges—including flooring	3,342,100	2,242,900	5,585,000
Surveys—and expenses	3,987,000	26,000	4,013,000
Engineering—and expenses	4,398,500	2,712,000	7,110,500
Springfield Shops—locomotive shop plant and equipment, including water supply, sewerage system and lighting	1,117,860	1,227,200	2,345,000
Car shop plant and equipment	Nil.	1,300,000	1,300,000
Terminals at Quebec—and line from Quebec bridge to Quebec city	19,000	4,419,000	4,438,000
Rentals—of joint terminals at Winnipeg	105,000	95,000	200,000
Headquarters—salaries and expenses	1,605,100	969,900	2,575,000
Total	94,580,500	50,759,200	145,339,700

Ottawa, February 21, 1911.

H. MACPHERSON,
Asst. Chief Engineer.

Mr. AMES. Does that include the interest charged?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think it does.

Mr. AMES. Will the minister let us have a statement of interest to date, to show how much the money has cost us?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think there is now on the Order Paper a question as to that, which the Finance Department is to answer. This statement is, I think, more complete than any I have been able to give to the House before, as previous statements did not include the terminals.

In this connection I might mention that the portion of the line from Winnipeg, or, more strictly speaking, from a point east of Winnipeg, to Superior Junction has been operated during the last few months in assisting to carry the wheat crop of the west to the east, joining with the Grand Trunk Pacific's own line at Superior Junction, and the traffic being carried from there to its own elevators at Fort William. The arrangement made with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company I have not yet laid on the table, but I propose to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it operating regular passenger trains?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think not. It is operated rather as a contractor's road than as a finished line; but we were anxious that the people of the west should have the benefit of this other line.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). How much did they carry?

Mr. GRAHAM. I gave that a few weeks ago.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). What rates did they charge?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no information as to that, but I imagine they would have to be the same as those of the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern. I can ascertain that for my hon. friend.

Another question of great importance, which has been discussed a good deal in the House, is that of the settlement of disputes between the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the Transcontinental Company as to overclassification and overbreak. The inspecting engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and the engineers of the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners met and adjusted some of the differences. These settlements involved reductions from the contractors' estimates as follows:

District 'F'—Contractor J. D. McArthur, $73,022.20.

District 'A'—Contractors Lyons and White, $16,219.10.

District 'B'—Contractors M. P. and J. T. Davis, $1,714.60; Contractors Macdonell and O'Brien, $22,116.02. Total, $113,071.92.

The chief engineer of the company and the chief engineer of the commission were also able to agree in the determination of a portion of the disputes with respect to overbreak on the McArthur contract, which involved a deduction from the contractor's estimates of the sum of $173,667.09. The other point, which is not yet determined, is in reference to 106 cuttings on the McArthur contract. On this the engineers could not agree and they called in the arbitrator, Mr. Collingwood Schreiber. Mr. Schreiber has made a report, which was concurred in by the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, and the chief engineer of the commission. It is difficult for a layman like myself to arrive at the exact meaning of the report on account of its technical nature; but in discussing the matter with the chief engineer, I find that, in order to ascertain definitely the result of the award in regard to these 106 cuttings, the engineers are now busy figuring it out, and I hope to have their report at an early date.

Mr. LENNOX. I have heard it stated that there had been a reduction made of about $500,000. Is there any report to that effect?

Mr. GRAHAM. Is that including classification, rock cutting and over-break together?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think not. I asked the engineers to put this in figures as they had it the same way, and I was at a loss to give the House what I thought information, and they put this part of their agreement into figures for me. The chief engineer of the commission the other day said he was unable to tell me what this would amount to. I could make a guess but it would not be information to the House, and might only lead the House astray, but as there are disputes on 106 cuttings, one would suppose it would be quite a considerable amount. This note is given me:

Mr. Schreiber's award was made on the 19th of January, ultimo, and was concurred in by the chief engineer of the company and the chief engineer of the commission. In regard to this award the chief engineer of the commission reports as follows: With reference to the award on the 106 cuttings which were referred to the third arbitrator, I am unable to say what amount will be deducted until the various awards for solid rock, loose rock, common excavation, train-haul and over-haul on train-hauled material has been worked out by the division engineers for their respective divisions.

These 106 rock cuttings and over-breaks with the items in reference to over-classification covered all the objections raised by the Grand Trunk Pacific as to classification and over-break and practically will form a settlement of the difference between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental Railway Commission.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister given the figures with reference to the eastern section between Quebec and Moncton?

Mr. GRAHAM. They are all in the return which I placed on 'Hansard'.

Mr. DANIEL. Can the minister give more information with regard to the time of completion of the Quebec bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not been discussing that topic, but expect before long to satisfy all curiosity and place the papers on the table. The time given by the various tenders runs from three to five years.

Another question of vital interest to the people of all Canada is the Welland canal. This canal has a very interesting history. It forms one of the most important links in the waterways transportation on this continent. There has been a good deal of discussion as to the proprietv of further developing this waterway and in order that I may say a few words intelligently about that I wish to read a concise history of the size, capacity and cost of the Welland canal as it is to-day.

WELLAND CANAL.

Main line from Port Dalhousie, Lake Ontario, to Port Colborne, Lake Erie.

	Old Line.	Enlarged or New Line.
Length of canal...	27½ miles.	26¾ miles.
Pairs of guard-gates (formerly 3)..	..	2
Prs. guard-gates (lift)..	26	25
Number of locks (guard)	1	1

Dimensions—	Old Line.	Enlarged or New Line.
1 lock 200 x 45 1 lock 200 x 45 1 (tidal) 230 x 45 24 locks 150 x 45	.. .. ..	270 feet x 45
Total rise or lockage.. ..	326¾ feet.	326¾ feet.
Depth of water on sills..	10¼ feet.	14 feet.

Construction commenced, 10 ft. 3 in. 1824
Construction completed.. 1833
Enlargement commenced, 14 ft... .. 1872
Enlargement completed.. 1887

Welland River Branches.

Length of canal—
Port Robinson cut to river, Welland, 2,622 feet.
From the canal at Welland to the river, via lock at aqueduct, 300 feet.
Chippewa cut to River Niagara, 1,020 feet.
Number of locks—one at aqueduct and one at Port Robinson, 2.
Dimensions of locks, 150 by 26½ feet.
Total lockage from the canal at Welland down to River Welland, 10 feet.
Depth of water or sills, 9 feet 10 inches.

Grand River Feeder.

Length of canal, 21 miles.
Number of locks, 2.
Dimensions of locks, 1 of 150 by 26½ feet, 1 of 200 by 45 feet.
Total rise or lockage, 7 to 8 feet.
Depth of water on sills, 9 feet.

Port Welland Branch.

Length of canal, 1¾ miles.
Number of locks, 1.
Dimension of lock, 185 feet by 45 feet.
Total rise or lockage, 7½ feet.
Depth of water on sills, 11 feet.

The Welland canal has two entrances from Lake Ontario, at Port Dalhousie, one for the old, the other for the new canal.

From Port Dalhousie to Allanburg, 11¾ miles, there are two distinct lines of canal in operation, the old line and the enlarged or new line.

From Allanburg to Port Colborne, a distance of 15 miles, there is only one channel, the old canal having been enlarged.

From the head of the Welland canal there is a deep water navigation through Lake Erie, the Detroit river, Lake St. Clair, the St. Clair river, Lake Huron and River St. Mary to the Sault canal, a distance of about 580 miles. From the Sault the distance through Lake Superior to Port Arthur is 266 miles, and to Duluth, 400 miles.

Amount spent in construction, $7,693,824.03; enlargement, $20,644,791.99; total, $28,338,616.02.

My reason for pointing out the difference in distance from the Sault to Fort William, Port Arthur and Duluth is that grain carrying vessels in the busy season desire to make all the trips they can and while a few miles by rail-haul can be overcome in a very brief space of time it is not so with ship carriage, and Port Arthur and Fort William have the advantage in allowing vessels to carry grain to and from these ports and make a greater number of trips during the season than they could make if they go all the way to Duluth.

It may be of interest to point out to the House that for some years surveys have been going on in connection with the Welland canal but more activity has been shown during the last two or three years; we have had special parties surveying in order to, if possible, find a route for a better and bigger canal, if it is deemed better to build a new canal than to deepen the old one.

Now, at this point, I cannot define the policy of the government as to what is to be done on the Welland canal; or, rather, I am not in a position at the moment to indicate the time at which it will be done. That it must be done sooner or later, I think everybody in the Dominion of Canada will admit and it is of greater interest to no other people than to the people of western Canada that the Welland canal should be deepened so as to allow large vessels to go at least to the foot of Lake Ontario without breaking bulk. Three routes have been surveyed, and difficulties have been found in each one. I think that, especially for the benefit of members from that portion of Ontario, the House will bear with me, while I read briefly from the report made by Mr. Sullivan, one of the engineers in charge, who, by the way, is a son of our old friend, Senator Sullivan:

On Route No. 1. Following the present canal from Port Colborne to about three miles below Welland, thence towards Fonthill and via the Twelve and Fifteen Mile creeks to Lake Ontario, extensive surveys had been made, and a good location accompanied by some not insurmountable difficulties obtained, when borings taken at the sites of two dams located on the Twelve Mile creek developed a heavy bed of quicksand underlying both foundations. Since Mr. Weller's report of October 8, 1910, a readjustment of the location of some of the locks was considered, with the object of utilizing a very probable site for a dam, which would have a less head acting on it and which was located further down the creek. Borings taken at this point developed quicksand quite as extensive as at the original site. As the feasibility of this route depends very much upon the construction of these dams further borings are to be made in an effort of finding or exhausting the means of building them. These borings I expect to have started in a week or ten days.

Route No. 2 follows the present canal to Allanburg, thence along the level country west of Thorold to the escarpment, the descent of which would require locks in flight, thence to the old canal at St. Catharines and via it to Port Dalhousie. Some borings have been made at probable lock sites on this route with the result that in some cases rock was found at too great a depth to be used for a foundation, and at other points quicksand was developed. A personal examination of the conformation of the escarpment indicates difficulties in locating the flight of locks. However, it is intended later on to have a line run over this route which, with the information obtained from the borings, will demonstrate whether it is at all feasible.

Route No. 3 commences at Lake Erie, east of Morgan's Point, thence across the marsh to Chippewa creek, east of Marshville, thence curving to the west, in the vicinity of Boyle, through the divide by a deep cut to the rocky gorge on Twenty Mile creek near the village of Jordan.

Since Mr. Weller's report on October 8, 1910, except as mentioned above, the survey work has been confined to this route and the location has been determined and plotted on the plan. Alternate lines through the divide were investigated and the one in the vicinity of Boyle offers the advantage of considerable less excavation and the borings now in progress indicate an entire absence of quicksand.

Thirteen borings to rock in all cases were made between Lake Erie and the source of Fifteen Mile creek, north of Boyle. There will be a small rock cutting about one mile in length at the Lake Erie entrance, and the remainder of the material as indicated by the borings will generally be a firm clay. Borings intermediate to the above, and carried a little below grade of bottom of canal, are in progress and so far confirm the above results. Another boring machine is employed in determining the surface of the rock in the gorge between Jordan and Lake Ontario.

Advantage is being taken of the presence of the ice to take soundings, and two parties are now engaged at this work, one at Jordan harbour and the other at the Lake Erie entrance.

Of field work there remains to be done the completion of a survey for the location of the necessary pondage area at the head of the locks, which will be taken up as soon as the soundings at Jordan are completed. Also borings south of the escarpment are necessary to determine the character of the material to be excavated, and at the lock sites borings throughout the depth of the rock to determine its character will be required. To date this route is meeting anticipations. The quantity of excavation has been taken out over almost the whole line.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Can the minister say how far from Port Colborne is the entrance to this third route?

Mr. GRAHAM. Several miles, I think.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). It would not be possible to utilize the entrance there?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, that would be one objection, to my mind, to this route. Of course, I am not speaking officially, but personally and without having gone into it in detail on the ground. But the advantages of this route would have to be very great, to my mind, to justify us in giving up the work done at Port Colborne.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). I think it is the best route, and the one on which the canal ought to have been built at first.

Mr. GRAHAM. There may be advantages sufficiently great in this route to justify us in going to another point than Port Colborne.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). It would mean the abandonment of an expenditure of nearly $5,000,000.

Mr. LALOR. Has any investigation been made of the Port Maitland route?

Mr. GRAHAM. Is that covered by this route No. 3, which commences on Lake Erie, east of Morgan's Point? My hon. friend knows the locality better than I do, and can inform me as to that.

Mr. LALOR. That is a little west of Port Colborne.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, a few miles west.

Mr. LALOR. I may be prejudiced, and so may other people in my district, but Senator McCallum, who was one of the best authorities on navigation and shipping, always maintained that the Port Maitland route, was the best. I hope the minister will take that into consideration, as he promised he would.

Mr. GRAHAM. I made a note of it at the time, and called the attention of my engineers to it. Before finality is reached in regard to this matter, we must gather all the best opinions we can. In a former construction of the canal, the matter was regarded as of such importance, I believe, that the government of that day appointed a commission to make investigation.

Now, the objection has been raised that, even if the Welland canal were enlarged, wheat would go through that canal and go to Oswego and be there transferred for New York. Personally, I cannot agree with that opinion. The new Erie canal from Buffalo to New York is to be only 12 feet draught. We now have a canal of 14 feet draught. It is true that a considerable portion of our grain goes through Buffalo, to New York—not so much as it did a few years ago. But, it takes the Buffalo and New York route, not because that is a better water route, for it is not. To my mind, the fact is, that up to the last few years, we have not had the terminal facilities at Montreal and elsewhere to handle the grain coming from the west. And I believe that this parliament is justified in dealing liberally with the harbour commissioners of Montreal, to provide all possible facilities for handling the grain traffic which comes from the great west. With that done, there is no danger, to my mind, that a longer, slower and dearer route can ever compete with the Canadian waterways route.

Mr. CAMPBELL. May I ask, has there ever been, within the knowledge of the minister, any congestion of the wheat traffic at Montreal?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed that congestion is one of the greatest difficulties. And while, there is a very marked improvement, and while a lot of money is being spent there, yet, that being the outlet for traffic coming through from all Canada west of Montreal, it is in our own interest that we make it as perfect as possible. My hon. friend will agree with me that what did yesterday in the west will not do at all to-day. Conditions are changing. It is a marked fact that in Montreal, which is the gateway to Canada from the east during the season of navigation, the value of property has gone up as rapidly as it has in the city of Winnipeg, or in any western city, and largely due, to my mind, to the enormous growth of western Canada, as well as to the development of other parts of Canada. But what I was trying to point out was that we must not neglect that part of our transportation facilities, and while we are bringing traffic to them, we must be liberal in our expenditure in our own interest, and see that every facility is afforded in order to ship these goods as quickly and as cheaply as possible through the Canadian gateway to the great European market.

Now let me go back to the Welland canal proposition. I have had some correspondence—I am not at liberty to give the names of the gentlemen with whom I am corresponding—but I say to the House that they are in touch absolutely with the grain carrying trade of Canada and of the United States. They know the Oswego situation, perhaps better than any man in the House. I have obtained some information from these gentlemen as to their idea concerning the expressed fear that if we deepened the Welland canal, traffic would go down through that canal and then to New York via Oswego. Personally I have not the faintest fear of that. All these past years it could have gone down in a small canal as opposed to our greater one. But as I am pointing out, by having waterways and a clear open lake and river channel down to within a short distance of Montreal, even if the St. Lawrence canal were never deepened, grain can be carried from Oswego to Montreal as cheaply and more quickly than it can be carried to New York, even by their enlarged canal. So there is no fear on that score. As I have pointed out, if we look after our business properly, the transportation facilities will be to our advantage, because grain can be handled more cheaply in Montreal than it can be in New York city. Now let me tell you something of what I have learned. That canal is limited to a depth of 12 feet, ours is 14 feet now. If ours were enlarged, there is no doubt that we would take the traffic through the Welland canal any way to some point down on the lake at the foot of lake navigation.

Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. LALOR. Are you speaking now of the new Erie canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. It was rumoured years ago that they were going to make that canal 14 feet, my information is that the probabilities are it will be confined to 12 feet. That was the original idea, that was the depth proposed when the grant of $101,000,000 was made for the construction of that canal.

Mr. LALOR. What is the proposed depth of the Georgian Bay canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. The figures are given for 22 feet.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Twenty-two feet on the mitre sill, and a 20-foot or 21-foot navigation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Sometimes you can drag it over a little more.

There seems to be no estimate of the amount of traffic that the new Erie canal is expected to carry. But let me point out that a great many of our best transportation experts think that the railways, even if that canal is constructed, would continue to carry the greater amount of agricultural products, such as grain, from Buffalo to the east. Now, let me give the distances, and point out just what the situation is; because we in Canada have the natural advantage and we dont want to be driven away from that fact, we possess the natural advantage and our duty is to see to it that we make the best possible use of that advantage. The distance from Oswego to Albany by the new canal is about 170 miles from Albany to the Battery in New York 150 miles. Now, by the Hudson river, from New York to Poughkeepsie is 75 miles, and has an 18-foot depth; from Poughkeepsie to Kingston 20 miles, 14-foot depth; from Kingston to Albany the distance is 55 miles, where the canal is only 10 feet. On the old canal it takes about 10 days for a boat to go from Oswego to New York with a towed cargo; they must carry this in barges, because a vessel that can only go through ten feet of water is not big enough to be called a ship in these days. On the old canal it takes 10 days to go from Oswego, and on the new canal it would take them about seven days. Now, compare that with the time it would take to convey a cargo bigger than that from Oswego to Montreal, and the difference is altogether in favour of the St. Lawrence route. Now, you may ask why does it take so long to go that distance. On account of the great locks, it is necessary to go from Oswego up 175 feet, and then you have to drop 420 feet before you get to New York, and in a canal going over that height of land and down again, a canal of ordinary capacity, one can understand the time that would be necessarily taken up in the lockages. That is one of the things we are going to try to overcome

in the construction of the new Welland canal, to reduce the number of lockages, because every hour saved in transportation of the people's produce means an addition to the price the people will get.

Mr. LALOR. Why do you mention Oswego? Would not Buffalo be more likely to be the port for western grain?

Mr. GRAHAM. The reason I spoke with reference to Oswego was this, that a strong argument has been put up against deepening the Welland canal, the argument being that we would assist the Americans to bring wheat down through the Welland canal, and ship to New York via Oswego. They would use our Welland canal to bring their ships through, and not break bulk until they got to Oswego. But I say there is no danger, even if they brought them through that way, because Montreal can be reached much more quickly than New York.

There is another thing. I believe that to develop the cost of terminal facilities that would be necessary for a greatly improved traffic, or increased traffic, would be so enormous in the city of New York that it would far more than overcome any difference of rates that may exist by the St. Lawrence route. At the present time there is a difference, there is a large charge in the city of New York, amounting to quite a tax on the transfer of grain. The charge in the harbour of Montreal, although complained of by some, is comparatively light. It has been stated, and is true, that for a portion of the year, and a portion of the year only, the insurance rates by the St. Lawrence route are sufficiently high to make a difference. But the improvements that have been made in the St. Lawrence, and are being made, and are still to be made, will positively reduce the necessity for an increased insurance. So if at the port of Montreal, taken in connection with the St. Lawrence route, we do our duty as Canadians, the St. Lawrence route will be placed in a far superior position to any American route that can be proposed. I have some figures in reference to that question, but I will not enter into them at the present time.

My hon. friend behind me has said that the Georgian Bay canal route is the route. I would discuss the question of the Georgian Bay canal route at greater length but for the fact that it is not in my department, and I am supposed to be discussing questions connected with my department. I might say distinctly that I believe it is in the interest of Canada from one end to the other to enter upon both enterprises and at a not very far distant date. We must remember that when we bring the products of the great west to the east the products of the east are carried back to the west, and if we could take the time to go into the prospects for increasing that trade in a few years, we would arrive at a conclusion that it is necessary—in the interest of the Canadian carrying trade?—no, it is necessary in the interest of the people who produce in Canada, as well as who buy goods in Canada, that these two great waterways should be developed by the people of Canada, and I believe that no greater interest would accrue from any investment that the people could make than that which would result from the development of these two waterways. My hon. friend will see that I am quite clear upon this subject, and that the diffidence I have about discussing it in detail only arises from the fact that it is not in my department, but I believe in this project just the same.

There is another transportation problem that is opening up before us, and I hope the House will allow me to digress for a moment semi-seriously, because I am at a loss what to call this new project—whether Hudson's bay or Hudson bay.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would call it the Taft canal—Taft's big scheme.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not referring to that; I am referring to a Canadian scheme. I am at a loss whether to call this new project the Hudson bay route or the Hudson's bay route. The division in the government will not be serious.

Mr. HENDERSON. I notice that one of them is going to resign over it.

Mr. GRAHAM. My colleague the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) has a great number of authorities for saying that it must be Hudson's bay. I might make a slip in not calling it by the right name, but I am confronted with the fact that away back in 1897 the following order in council was passed:

His Excellency, by and with the advice of the Queen's Privy Council.

And so on, and this is the concluding paragraph:

His Excellency is further pleased to order and direct that all questions concerning geographical names in the Dominion which arise in the departments of the public service shall be referred to the Board, and that all departments shall accept and use in their publications the names and orthography adopted by the Board.

I find on page 46 of this publication that the board says that we should say Hudson bay and straits, and not Hudson's bay; so, I am in a quandary to know which authority I should follow. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I will refer to it as the new route to be opened up between the great west and the European markets. To begin at the beginning would be a serious proposition. That route

has been used for many years by traders and by companies—I think I might say a particular company—and I may be pardoned for adding that I believe that company has not been awfully anxious for any of the rest of us to make any particular investigation of its possibilities. What is known as the Hudson bay route, in so far as the waterway is concerned, has been used before we were born, particularly those of us who are young. The question of building a railway to Hudson bay is not at all new. I suppose that if we were to mention the name of a particular individual in connection with the project of building a railway to Hudson bay the man whose name would be mentioned would be Mr. Hugh Sutherland.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Oh, long before his day.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is recent history. Away back about 1882, I think, he was discussing it. He obtained from the legislature of Manitoba in 1885 a bonus of a million dollars, but he was to complete the road within five years. He failed to get the capital. In 1886 the offer of aid was altered to a guarantee of four per cent on $4,500,000 for 25 years. Even with this pledge of assistance he was unable to proceed. Some years later, I think about 1890, perhaps a little later—that was changed again, and the government offered to give 12,800 acres a mile and $6,400 of a subsidy. That also failed. I think I may safely say that, all private effort having failed to get the railway to Hudson bay, the government shows its usual wisdom and courage in taking up the matter itself. The federal government has at different times sent four or five expeditions up to the bay and the straits. As a matter of fact, the question of the ice difficulty is not at the bay, but is in the straits.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does there exist at the present time any land grant subsidy to aid the construction of the Hudson Bay railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I think not. As indicated in reference to one or two other projects, hon. gentlemen will, I think, not find in the main estimates an item for the Hudson Bay railway. I think there is no large item for that work, but I am not giving away any secrets when I say that the House will be asked to discuss and consider a vote for the construction of the Hudson Bay railway before we rise. Just two or three figures from a pamphlet that was issued by the Department of the Interior and prepared by Mr. McKenna. The figures are approximately correct, but changes in routes of railways and certain surveys they have made may, perhaps, not exactly correspond with these figures. However, I have chosen these because they are the most convenient, and I therefore propose to use them:

The Canadian Northern has reached the Pas on the Saskatchewan river, and from there to Churchill is some 467 miles. With that distance spanned, Winnipeg, which is, via the Canadian Pacific railway, 1,422 miles from Montreal, would be within 945 miles of Churchill. Brandon is 1,555 miles from Montreal, from Churchill, 940. Regina is 1,780 miles from Montreal, from Churchill, 1,200. Medicine Hat is 2,082 miles from Montreal, from Churchill, 1,500. Calgary is 2,262 miles from Montreal, from Churchill, 1,682. Prince Albert is by the shortest rail routes, 1,958 miles from Montreal, from Churchill some 717. Edmonton is, by the shortest rail routes, 2,247 miles from Montreal, from Churchill, 1,129. And these distances by rail to Churchill are measured over existing railways that were built for carriage east and west. With a railway from the Pas to Churchill, roads would be built over the shortest routes between important centres and that port. With a direct connection between Regina and the Pas the distance to Churchill from that centre would be 774 miles, from Medicine Hat it would be 1,076, from Calgary, 1,256 miles.

Churchill is 2,946 miles from Liverpool, while Montreal via Belle Isle is 2,761 miles and via Cape Race, 2,927 miles; and New York by the northern route is 3,079 miles from Liverpool.

In a recent trip to western Canada this question among others came up at an interview held with the Prime Minister in Brandon, and in the course of the short reply which I made I intimated that this would be a magnificent route for the carrying of cattle from the west, a remark which then caused a smile, and some of my confreres of the press looked upon it as sufficient of a joke to record it. Now, I would like to call the attention of them all to the fact that this is one of the principal statements made by the Grain Growers' Association of western Canada. I want to say to the farmers of Ontario that in mixed farming, cattle raising and dairy products, the province of Alberta in a few years to come will be one of the greatest producers in the known world. That province is not given up so entirely to wheat raising as is Saskatchewan, but, the character of its rolling land, its ample supply of water, its stretches of bush land, all point to it as a magnificent country for mixed farming and a great producer of good stock and of the best dairy products. While in that country I asked to be given samples of the butter produced at the creameries, and while in several places I found creameries working under government supervision, there was one large creamery run entirely independent of government recognition by a gentleman whose parents, if not himself, were natives of Denmark. I am somewhat of a judge of dairy products, living in the centre of a splendid dairy district in Ontario, and it is just as well for us in the east to know that the

butter produced in Alberta is equal to the butter produced in any other part of the Dominion. You might call it gilt-edged butter, it is of fine flavour and splendid texture. I take it that the development of the dairy industry in Alberta will result in a great increase in the profit from farming. That country is splendidly adapted for stock raising, and what is more natural, where you can place live stock on a train to-night and have them carried to an ocean port in a journey of one or two cool nights and one comparatively cool day, and shipped by a comparatively cool water route, than this that live stock will be taken to the markets of the world in better condition than by a long hot rail haul. That idea certainly seems most reasonable.

Sir, the Hudson Bay railway will afford an outlet for the products of the farmers of western Canada; it will carry their dairy products, their live stock, as well as their grain products, quickly to market, and perishable goods will be landed in a much better condition on the consuming markets of the old country than could possibly result from transportation by any other route. It is considered by some to be an experiment. Well, be it so, but the government that hesitates to make even an experiment in what it believes is not worthy the confidence of the people. I believe the Hudson bay route will prove beneficial to the people of the west, and the people of the west being prosperous and getting more money in their pockets for the sale of their goods, they will be able to spend more money in eastern Canada for the purchase of goods there. Well, Sir, the government propose to proceed with this work. It is not a small task; it is estimated that it will cost well in the vicinity of from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000, which will include, I believe, elevators, wharfs, &c. But, if we add to that—and my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) will agree with me that I generally do add to the engineers' estimates—if we add to that five or six million dollars I believe the money would be well expended. If it were the railway alone it would be a comparatively small project, but in working out the enterprise arrangement has to be made for a steamship service, so that the produces of the country may not only be carried to an elevator on the banks of the Hudson bay, but that they may be taken the speediest way to the markets of the world, so that the farmers will get the highest price. The Hudson Bay railway will not only enable the western farmer to ship his goods by a quick and safe route, but I believe the opening up of the Hudson bay will benefit the coal areas in the eastern part of the Dominion, which is a matter of interest to my hon. friend from North Cape Breton, and indeed to all hon. members from eastern Canada. I am informed by those who have given this matter some study that the opening up of the Hudson bay route will enable vessels sailing with a cargo from the old land to make Sydney a port of call, where they will take on a cargo of coal and proceed to the Hudson bay, thus giving the people of the west the advantage of the splendid quality of coal that is produced in eastern Canada and developing that interprovincial trade about which we have heard so much during the last few weeks.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the distance from Sydney to Hudson bay?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will get that information for some other occasion, when I will deal with this question more in detail. I understand, however, that Churchill is practically the same distance from Liverpool as is Montreal.

Mr. STANFIELD. Has the minister any information as to the rate of insurance on cargoes by the Hudson bay route?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is possible and probable that at first the rates of insurance may be a bit heavy, but, during three or four months of the navigation there is no reason why they should be any heavier than by the St. Lawrence route. There are optimists, and I am inclined to believe a little with them, who say that with the advances we are making in science it will not be many years until a way will be found to keep the Hudson straits open for a great deal longer time than four months.

Mr. LALOR. Has the minister any information as to the amount per bushel of wheat, or per 100 pounds, the Hudson bay route will cheapen transportation?

Mr. GRAHAM. Unless it be for the higher insurance there is no reason why a bushel of wheat should not be carried as cheaply from Churchill to Liverpool as from Montreal to Liverpool. The insurance may have some influence on it, but we hope to be able in a few years to so improve that channel, if the project proves a success, as I believe it will, that even the insurance will not militate against the route.

Mr. FOSTER. One or two points I would like the minister to address himself to. First, as to the time when cattle are shipped from the Northwest. I suppose they would have to be ready for shipment by the first of September at the latest in order to get them out by the Hudson bay route. Then, I suppose it would be impossible to have the grain of one season shipped out the same year? Would not the cost of storage and the depreciation of grain at the elevator count as a factor in the increased cost? The third point is this: The vessels which are built for that service must be of a peculiar kind, and they will be employed there only four or five months of the year. What

is the possibility of their obtaining paying traffic for the other seven months of the year?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a difference of opinion among the shipping men with whom I have discussed the matter as to the necessity of peculiarly constructed ships. But even if they were peculiarly constructed, that would not render them useless at another port, though they would perhaps, not be so useful as they would be if otherwise constructed. With regard to shipping cattle, I understand that in Alberta cattle are fattened on June grass, and if they are fattened up to September, the navigation of Hudson Bay is open till November.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Till October.

Mr. GRAHAM. The reports say that it is open till November. Then, we may be able to do some of the Dakota trade as well as our own, as it may come on a little earlier. I think you can commence shipping wheat in September at least, which would give two clear months to rush the wheat traffic, and I think facilities should be provided for rushing that traffic in those two months as rapidly as possible. But there is to my mind, no reason why wheat will deteriorate in an elevator at Fort Churchill any more than at Port Arthur.

My hon. friend mentioned a few moments ago the question of the Trent canal. I admit that I had not that question in my notes, but if I did not refer to it, my silence might be misconstrued. The question of the Trent canal is one which has been before the country for a great many years. This much I wish to say concerning that work, that it will open up one of the most beautiful tourist countries on the continent of America; and, outside of any traffic which it may bring to the people of the section through which it runs, or from lake to lake, I believe a great good will come to them from it. It is a work to which we have been committed for years, and the more I see of it, the more I am convinced that it is going to be money well expended; and the more I see of what is done in other countries, in connecting waterways by means of even shallow canals, the more I am convinced that the money spent on that work will bring a good return to the people of Canada.

I would like to refer to the development of the water-powers along the Trent canal. I think it was in the year 1905 that the Ontario government, by an arrangement, handed over to the federal authorities the different works that had been constructed along the chain of lakes which form part of the Trent canal system. For years the Ontario government, in connection with the lumbermen, I think, maintained certain dams and other works along those lakes and streams. Negotiations were begun in the time of the Ross administration between the Public Works department of Ontario and the Department of Railways and Canals at Ottawa. It was contended by the Ontario government that when these works were given over to the Dominion, the province ought to be allowed to retain any water-powers which would be developed by the construction of more dams or the enlargement of existing dams. Although I was a member of the Ontario Legislature at the time I do not think that was a good contention. The Dominion government, in taking over all these works had the right, it seems to me, to the water powers which accrue from the taking of them over. However, the present Ontario government dropped that contention and came to an arrangement by which all these works, with the control of the water-powers, came to the Dominion government. I found this situation when I took office, and there was a most peculiar condition of things along that route. There were old patents, nearly a hundred years old, which gave to the riparian owner not only his land, but the bed of the stream, the water-powers, and every other right in the land. I found some of these men enjoying absolute ownership of water-powers without any development. There was a different situation arising every few miles, as the patents were issued at different times. It was a difficult problem to work out. I believed then, and I am confirmed in that opinion to-day, that the water-powers along that route, should be developed only incidental to navigation. May I give to the House a little idea of my own in political economy on this subject? We have in our hands in Canada a means, in addition to tariffs and in addition to transportation, of protecting our manufacturers and making them equal if not superior in productive capacity to any others in the world. We have in Canada sufficient water-powers, I believe, to make this country the manufacturing centre of the world.

Mr. BRADBURY. You are giving the western water-powers away.

Mr. GRAHAM. To whom are they given?

Mr. BRADBURY. To companies.

Mr. GRAHAM. For what?

Mr. BRADBURY. We do not know yet.

Mr. GRAHAM. Every one that is leased, I believe, is given on the condition that it must be developed, on the principle that the man who develops that water-power can

produce goods as cheaply as they can be produced anywhere else in the world.

Mr. BRADBURY. You are not giving the water-powers to manufacturers, but to companies to sell the power and speculate with it. They have control of the whole Winnipeg river.

Mr. GRAHAM. If there is a condition that a water-power must be developed, then the development must bring the return, otherwise the grant will be cancelled. I do not believe that conservation of water-powers means tying them up and looking at them. That would be acting on the same principle as the miser who puts his money in his sock, instead of using it or depositing it in the bank and getting interest on it, or putting it into business. There is no use of our saying that we own millions of dollars' worth of water-powers. They are not worth five cents to Canada if they are simply left to run down the rapids. They only become valuable as we utilize them in a way to get the best returns from them for the people of Canada to whom they belong. Believing in that, I attempted to work out a policy along the Trent Valley canal. I found that the Hydro-Electric Commission had made some investigation there and had arrived at the conclusion that the only way to do it, was to have all under one control, at least for transmission; that to leave the powers in separate entities would not mean the development of all the power or the transmission to the municipalities in the district., I might say in this connection, that notwithstanding what has been said, I believe that no person will be found in the Ontario House or in the Ontario government to say that when I was a member of that legislature I opposed their cheap power project. As leader of the opposition, I did nothing of the kind and I refer my friends to the record. I always said that it was a big problem; I disagreed in some very minor details with the powers taken by the Hydro-Electric Commission, particularly in reference to private property, but on the general principles of giving the people cheap power, I encouraged the Hydro-Electric Commission in the Ontario legislature, and said if they could do that for the people, they would accomplish a great good. I believed that along the Trent Valley system, we could work out, without resorting to public ownership, a scheme which would give the people cheap power. Two policies were presented to us. One was to put the various powers up at auction and get the most money we could for them. That might have been good policy for the finances of Canada, but it would be an ancient and retrogressive policy. I wanted to get a policy that would first ensure development and secondly send the power to the greatest number of communities. I found that the Ontario government at Healey's Falls had certain rights, but had leased them to the Northumberland Power Company. The Northumberland Power Company was composed of a large number of shareholders from different parts of that section of the country and they waited on me on two occasions, the deputations being so large that I had to take them to a large committee room. We discussed it and I found that they were much interested not to make money personally, but to get water-power to the various municipalities; that was their chief object. In general this was the plan we adopted. We came to a man who owned a water-power who had been owning it and using it for years; we said to him: Make over to the government of Canada your vested right in dam and water-powers, and we will develop with our new dam, which we need for canal purposes—as we built only those needed for navigation and the water-power development was incidental—and we will. with our extra development, hand back to you all the water-power you have now and are enjoying, free of cost and we will charge you $2 per horse-power for and give you the first right to get the surplus. We thought that was fair. It would look as if we were giving the water-power cheaply, but in doing that in every one of these leases, to these men, I put in a clause that the rates to be charged for the water-power thus developed, must be regulated by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada. The result has been that another question arose. They said: Now we want to get a large company to take charge of these powers, and control them, if it is possible, so as to make one transmission line to distribute the power as far as possible. My advice was asked and while hon. gentlemen may not agree with me, I said: Yes, I will take no objection to it; but on one consideration, you must not over-capitalize the company and the rates of the company must be subect to the Board of Railway Commissioners in every instance. That plan is now being worked out and the result is that while it is in a way a bold policy, because those who object to water-powers being given at a low rate, can criticise and they have some argument on their side, the policy in my mind is favourable to the people getting cheap power, because we keep control of the price of that power in every instance. What is the result? That the power being distributed by that company to-day in central Canada, I believe, is the cheapest power, all things considered,

that there is in Canada. That may be putting it strongly, but I believe not too strongly. The rates collected are very cheap. They are now distributing power in several centres, they have made contracts with a large number of municipalities from which these gentlemen came, who were the original shareholders in the Northumberland company, and when I tell the hon. gentlemen that the largest vote polled in any municipality against giving a franchise to this company at the price named was only 19 votes, they will agree with me that the people of that section think we are doing a good thing for them in the power problem.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it a perpetual franchise?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know the arrangement, but I imagine that under the new Ontario law, a perpetual franchise would not be allowed. I think I am safe in saying that in no municipality have they asked for a monopoly or exclusive franchise, so sure are they that they can compete with any company.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the minister ever considered how far the federal government are justified in taking possession of streams, diverting them for navigation purposes and then selling the power developed by these canals to private individuals, without making any return to the provinces from the revenues thus derived?

Mr. GRAHAM. Navigation, of course, comes under the federal authority and any work that is necessary for navigation would be under Dominion jurisdiction. However, I do not care to discuss the constitutional question. Along the Trent special conditions existed and any rights the provincial government had, they gave to us by agreement.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Has the minister considered that where he provides cheap power for a particular locality, he should in principle, supply it to the whole Dominion?

Mr. GRAHAM. If it could be done, I would be glad to attempt to work out that problem, and if the House would let me, development on the Rideau might be considered, I am sure it could be solved, so that we could supply power east to Smith's Falls, Kingston, Perth, Kemptville, Merrickville and Gananoque, and possibly Brockville. It is a subject that is worth looking into and discussing. We find in Ontario that the west particularly, is getting cheap power; Toronto, for instance, gets cheap power. The distance from Niagara to the central part of Ontario is so great that if power could be developed cheaply in that district, it would be a great advantage. I believe it would be one of the best ways to assist the manufacturers and those needing any power if where we have power in sight, we should develop it and place the control of rates under the Board of Railway Commissioners, so that our manufacturers will be able to compete with any people in the world.

Mr. SPROULE. Reverting to the Hudson Bay railway, has the government decided whether the terminal will be at Fort Churchill or Fort Nelson?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have not decided which would be the proper port—Nelson or Churchill. The surveys of the Railway Department show that, from a railway standpoint, Nelson would be the port. There are a great many people who consider that Churchill would be better. The Marine Department sent out parties to make a thorough examination. They have been able to make a partial report, but not a complete one. But the fact that we have not that report at the present time will not interfere with the beginning of construction; because, for a distance of 170 miles from Pas mission to Split Lake, the route will be the same which ever port is chosen. So we can go on with the present construction, and when the port is determined the road can be continued.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the minister leaves the subject of canals, he should deal with the Newmarket canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) never lets me forget that. We will discuss it in detail if he desires, when we get into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Before the hon. minister leaves the subject of canals, can he tell us what the government charges the Seymour Power Company for power?

Mr. GRAHAM. The companies owning power were given the balance of the power at $2 per horse-power. I believe the Seymour Company is the large company. What arrangements they have made with private holders for power I do not know.

Mr. SEXSMITH. There is only the Seymour Power Company now. They control the power of the Trent canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Seymour Power Company originally had certain water-powers in that locality. They may have acquired others from private holders. What arrangement they have made with those private holders, I do not know. But we in dealing with these companies, placed an upset price of $2 per horse-power; and, at that figure, speaking from memory, the income derived by the government from power developed along the Trent canal will pay a respectable interest on the dams erected.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that for a 24-hour day?

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall be able later on to give details as to the figures to be paid.

Now, coming to the Intercolonial: if there is any gentleman in this House, or elsewhere, who has conceived the idea that it is an easy thing to manage, either through a board or in any other way, a state-owned railway in this Dominion, he is seized of a wrong conception. I have discovered two very difficult things to deal with—among the very many difficult things that there are to deal with. One is the Quebec bridge and the other is the Intercolonial railway. I am not sure which of these would take the prize in a competition, but I am sure that each would win distinction. In discussing the Intercolonial railway, the people of Canada who do not live along that railway, and hon. members who have not yet accepted the hospitality offered them to take a trip over it, possibly do not understand the length of the railway—I never had a proper conception of it until I went over it, and never had a thorough conception of it until I tried to manage it. The Intercolonial is not at all a small railway. Its main track has a length of 1,490·67 miles, and its sidings represent 446 miles. Now, you people go between Montreal and Toronto on the fastest train you can take, and you leave Montreal at 9 o'clock and you arrive in Toronto at 4.20, and you travel on one of the fastest trains on the continent. Now, the main line of the Intercolonial railway is more than four times as long as that trip. It covers a distance greater than that from Montreal to Winnipeg. Yet, in discussing this road and all its details, hon. members are apt to imagine that the minister who directs the road at comparatively long range, ought to know the name of every man who ever drove a spike on that line. One of these hon. gentlemen could not take any railway of the same length and get from anybody but the roadmasters such details as the Minister of Railways is asked for in this House. Ask Sir Thomas Shaughnessy with regard to any 1,400 miles of his road, and he would know the details so far as the capacity of the road is concerned, and the quality of it. But, as to anything further than that, he would refer that inquirer to the roadmaster or the divisional engineer, or some other person whose business it was to understand these details. I say this, not to suggest that hon. members of this House should not ask for all this information, but that they should not be impatient, if, with regard to some small section of the road in their own territory, every man engaged upon which they know as Jim, or Jack or Tom, the minister does not know details that have not escaped their own knowledge but needs time to learn them from the man who has had these matters in charge. The Intercolonial is being run, approximately at least, as all other roads are being run. The capital spent on the Intercolonial, up to March 31, 1910, was $82,819,218.52. In 1911, the additional capital expended on the road will be about $1,000,000, the smallest capital expended on the Intercolonial railway for many years, notwithstanding the fact that a great portion of it is being spent on special works at the city of Chatham and at Sydney Mines and North Sydney. The net revenue last year which the Intercolonial was able to hand back to the receiver general was $623,164.66—that is we handed to the receiver general within less than $400,000 of our estimated capital expended during the present year.

In order that there may be some figures in 'Hansard' as to our business, allow me to quote a few. These figures are from a statement by our statistical branch, made up to June 30, which is the end of the year recognized by all railways for making returns to the department. These figures will not coincide with the figures given to the end of our fiscal year, March 31, but they will serve the purpose immediately in hand and I am not using them further than this statement:

TRAIN MILEAGE.

Passenger trains—	
1909	2,705,492
1910	2,596,804
Freight trains—	
1909	3,568,680
1910	3,805,646
Mixed trains—	
1909	487,881
1910	379,227
Total—	
1909	6,762,053
1910	6,781,677
Increase	19,624

It will be interesting to know that that increase was all in freight trains. The increase in freight trains was greater than that, because there was a decrease in the number of passenger trains run. My memory is that the mileage of passenger trains was reduced, but we carry more passengers on the trains that we run. Take now the economy in management. I wish to put on record a statement for the benefit of those who make comparisons, and it shows a comparison of our expenditures as respects maintenance of way, equipment and traffic expenditure, between the Intercolonial and the Canadian Pacific railway. I have taken for the purpose of this comparison the Canadian Pacific railway. And while I use the Canadian Pacific railway largely in all my comparisons, it is not at all with

the object of reflecting on the Canadian Pacific railway, which is one of the greatest roads in the world, and one of the best managed. But it is the most convenient, as it runs for some distance in the same portion of territory in which the Intercolonial railway runs. Here are the figures:

DISTRIBUTION OF OPERATING EXPENSES.

		Per cent.
Maintenance of Way and Structure:		
1909	$1,642,398	18.39
1910	1,755,106	19.91
C. P. R.		23.64
Maintenance of Equipment:		
1909	$2,040,824	22.24
1910	1,867,712	21.19
C. P. R.		21.75
Traffic Expenses:		
1909	$188,121	2.08
1910	182,808	2.07
C. P. R.		4.22

I may explain that item by saying that it refers largely to the expenditure in looking for traffic, and I admit that the other railways spend a greater percentage than we do in looking for traffic in different parts of the world. The Canadian Pacific railway, for instance, whose expenditure is twice as great as that of the Intercolonial, has its steamship lines running to Europe, has its steamship lines on the Pacific, and has its lines spreading all over the continent, almost, and they have a large and very active staff looking for business. Ours is a comparatively small road with no steamship connections of its own, and no railway connections of its own west of Montreal, except the Grand Trunk railway. So the expenditure for getting traffic is necessarily higher on the Canadian Pacific railway than it is on the government road. Now I will give the balance of the table:

		Per cent.
Transportation Expenses:		
1909	$4,959,207	54.84
1910	4,802,924	54.49
C. P. R.		47.47
General Expenses:		
1909	$221,972	2.45
1910	206,718	2.34
C. P. R.		2.92

The comparison is hardly fair, but it is the only comparison I could get. I wanted to put something on record, and I have taken the Canadian Pacific railway, which I think shows the Intercolonial railway perhaps at greater disadvantage in that respect than any other road, though I do not think it is discreditable to the government road.

Mr. STANFIELD. Will the minister compare the wages of the officers and men on the two roads?

Mr. GRAHAM. The wages of the men are settled by agreement between the brotherhoods and the management.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. STANFIELD. I merely ask the hon. gentleman if he will compare the wages paid on the two railways without speaking of the unions. Take the engineers, for instance.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know what they are paid, but I know they are paid according to agreements made with the officers of the brotherhoods, in each case. I think the rates are higher than on the Grand Trunk railway.

Mr. STANFIELD. Not for the engineers.

Mr. GRAHAM. You cannot say that because a man gets a certain amount per day or per mile from the Intercolonial railway, and a higher amount from the Grand Trunk railway, that the Grand Trunk railway pays the higher wages. It is all controlled by a schedule, and there are some instances where the Canadian Pacific railway men, or the Grand Trunk railway men, I do not know which, run many miles more to be called a trip, and get the same pay that the Intercolonial railway men get for a shorter distance. If my hon. friend will take the Intercolonial schedules, leaving out figures for wages, and take all the conditions surrounding the service on the Intercolonial railway, and the conditions on the company roads, he will find that the Intercolonial railway employees are in as good position as those on any company road in the Dominion of Canada. Requests for increased pay have been made all over the road, some of them have been considered, some of them have been granted, and others will be granted, or are in course of settlement. The Intercolonial railway men are equal to the company men on any road in the Dominion of Canada. With the increase of wages that will have to be given, I cannot hope to be able to make next year a statement perhaps as favourable as this year. But I have this to say that I have been endeavouring to recognize as far as possible the claims of the men to fair wages for the work they perform. But it is not fair to take the rate of wages paid alone as an indication, we must take the whole schedule which contains the conditions, and states what a day's work is, and what a trip is.

Now a question has been asked as to the difficulties the Intercolonial railway has to contend with. In the first place, the Intercolonial has to contend with the keenest competition. I am not complaining of that from the standpoint of the people of Canada, because they get the benefit of keen competition, I am only speaking from the standpoint of the income of the Intercolonial which has to meet this keen competition. The keen competition with water transportation must always tend to keep the rates down low. To Montreal we have to compete with water transportation

through a long season of open navigation, and the rates for the entire year, on some commodities on the Intercolonial, have to be made on the basis of water borne competition. Large producers at North Sydney, for instance, say: If you do not agree to carry our traffic at this very low rate the entire year, we wont give it to you at any time of the year, but we will send our summer traffic by the St. Lawrence, and rush it in the fall, and keep it in the spring as long as possible.

Then from Cape Breton to Halifax we have water competition all the year around. I think, on the whole, that the Intercolonial railway has keener competition by water than any other route in Canada. Then, in addition to that, we have between St. John and Montreal, on the state-owned railway, to carry goods 250 miles free. In other words, the distance from Montreal to St. John via Canadian Pacific railway is less by 250 miles than from Montreal to St. John via the Intercolonial railway. Our rates from St. John to Montreal must of necessity be the same as the rates of the Canadian Pacific railway, and it resolves itself into this situation that, of all the traffic carried between Montreal and St. John, the Intercolonial railway carries it more than half as far as the Canadian Pacific railway carries it, and does not get one cent for the service. When hon. gentlemen are discussing the reasons why the income of the Intercolonial railway is not better, let them bear in mind that between that important point and Montreal the Intercolonial railway carries goods more than half again as far as the Canadian Pacific railway carries them, for which it does not get one cent. Then the Intercolonial railway never was built as a road for commercial purposes, I believe. I am not going into that phase of its history, but it would not have been built in the peculiarly meandering way in which it was built if it had been intended as a straight commercial proposition. That is one thing that the management of the Intercolonial railway has to contend with.

Mr. DANIEL. How much shorter will the National Transcontinental railway be from Moncton to Montreal than the distance from Moncton to Montreal via the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not sure of the distances, but the National Transcontinental railway will open up new country in which there exists to-day a great deal of local traffic; it will haul that freight and its particularly good grades and curves will enable it to do a great deal of business. I will discuss the question of the National Transcontinental railway later.

Then I make this statement, Mr. Speaker, that there is no road in the Dominion of Canada that gives—I am not going to say better—but as good service to the people all along the line as does the state-owned road. What I mean by that is this—

Mr. RHODES. Make that mild.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I am going to make the statement, and I am ready to give my hon. friend the proof—there is no road that will stop at as many little places for the accommodation of the people as the Intercolonial railway, as my hon. friend knows.

Mr. RHODES. Not at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, my hon. friend likes to have the train stop not too far apart in his constituency, and I am not disagreeing with him.

Mr. RHODES. I have not met with very great success.

Mr. GRAHAM. That shows that my hon. friend is more advanced in his requests than even we are. There is no road in Canada that gives the service locally and practically stops at the people's doors as does the state-owned railway. We have places where the Intercolonial railway trains stop every two and a half miles. I have endeavoured to get the Grand Trunk railway to stop at a distance of six or seven miles in my own constituency, and it took me five years to get them to build a platform and to stop one train a day.

Mr. TALBOT. In what part of the country do they stop every two and a half miles?

Mr. GRAHAM. In several places. They may not do so where the population is sparse, and there is no business to give the road, but there are places where the Intercolonial railway stops to take up milk and all that kind of thing at intervals of two or three miles.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Is not that very objectionable? Is not that the cause of most of your accidents?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is the cause of our trains being delayed and of a slow time table when we might have a fast one. But I do not object to it. I am pointing it out as one of the benefits the people derive from the state-owned railway, enabling them to get better accommodation than would be, or is being, given by any company-owned road.

I make another statement, and I know I will have to substantiate it to the hon. leader of the opposition, because he asked me for it last year. I want to make it strong, because the proof is good and strong. It is that the freight rates on the Intercolonial railway per mile are cheaper than the freight rates on any road in the Dominion. I want to make the further statement that the passenger rates, taken

by the mileage, are cheaper than the passenger rates on any other railway in Canada.

Mr. RHODES. In making your rates on the Intercolonial railway, are you striking an average between local and competitive through rates?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, but the way we get at the rates produces accurate results. We take the receipts, the money we get.

Mr. RHODES. And the mileage?

Mr. GRAHAM. The passenger mileage, and we find out how much we actually got in money—no guess at all—for carrying every passenger one mile. We do the same thing with freight tonnage, take the actual receipts, and we know exactly how much we got for the service.

Mr. RHODES. Have you any data to show how your local rates compare with the local rates of other railways?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am going to give a statement all the way from five miles up to 200 miles, comparing the Intercolonial railway rates with the rates of railways in Ontario approved by the commission. I am going to compare them with the rates approved by the commission in New Brunswick over the same mileage of the Canadian Pacific railway, and I am going to compare them with the rates per mile on the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway in the province of Ontario.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

ALBERTA ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Alberta Electric Railway Company—Mr. McCarthy.

On section 8,

Mr. GRAHAM. The wording of this clause is peculiar because part of the territory through which this railway will run is not yet formed into municipalities and the only way to protect the highway was through the Lieutenant Governor of the province.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Is there a provision that when municipalities are incorporated the consent should be given by them rather than by the Lieutenant Governor?

Mr. GRAHAM. The consent of the Lieutenant Governor is necessary only where municipalities are not formed ; I assume that when a municipality was formed the railway would come under the Act.

Mr. GRAHAM.

On section 12,

Mr. DOUGLAS. I move that section 12 be stricken from the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does Mr. McCarthy agree to that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 13,

Mr. DOUGLAS. I move that the words: 'or in the Telegraph Act' in line one be stricken out, and also the words 'telegraph or telephone lines or any' in lines two and three.

Mr. GRAHAM. What is the purpose of that amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The province of Alberta owns and controls all the telephone lines in the province, having bought out the Bell Telephone Company at great cost, and the government feel it would be against the interests of the people to have any competition in telephone lines which might be given under this section as it stands.

Mr. GRAHAM. It would be a good idea not to put the Bill through its third reading to-night so that the member for Calgary may understand what this amendment is.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) is in accord with this particular amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. All right.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 14,

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). Pursuant to notice, I move, in the absence of Mr. McCarthy, that the following be added as section 14:

The company may lease or otherwise acquire coal mines and coal mining rights, and work, develop, operate and turn to account all such coal mines and coal mining rights held by the company.

Mr. SPROULE. This clause I took objection to in the committee, but my attention was called to the fact that we had given the same right to other railway companies who contemplated operating in that country, where coal is so very plentiful, in order to get traffic. While I still regard it as objectionable, it is not nearly so objectionable as a Bill which preceded it, in regard to a company which proposed to go into the United States and purchase coal. In that case there was really a monopoly of the coal business by the Grand Trunk railway. You might buy coal from a mine owner, but you could not get the Grand Trunk railway to bring the coal across the line for you unless it was bought from the parties with whom they were operating. But in the Northwest there is not likely to

be a monopoly of that kind, because coal is so plentiful.

Mr. NESBITT. I was opposed to the clause on principle, but if it has been arranged between the parties, I do not think I should interfere.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think we had better let it pass. It was explained in the committee pretty fully. In the west the railway companies practically all own coal areas, and operate them in connection with their traffic. It may be that in the years to come we shall have to cancel all these rights by legislation if they are abused. If it should happen that the coal companies and the transportation companies should put their heads together so that where you reduce the freight rates they will add them to the price of coal, it might be necessary to pass legislation in Canada similar to what has been passed in the United States, prohibiting coal companies and railway companies from being one and the same people.

Mr. McKENZIE. Under what regulations are coal mines operated in the west? With us they are operated under very stringent laws and regulations adopted by the local legislature. The running of a coal mine is a pretty important thing, and I think it is rather dangerous to allow these mines to be operated without any regulation, or to allow any company to own and operate a coal mine. Coal mines should be operated under regulations that would safeguard the lives and health and general safety of the coal miners.

Mr. NORTHRUP. All that this House is professing to do is to incorporate a company, and to give it power to operate mines. How those mines should be operated would be a matter of local jurisdiction if they come within local jurisdiction, of Dominion jurisdiction if they come within that. We do not interfere with the right the Dominion would have, in the place of a provincial government, to regulate how the mines should be worked. If we incorporate a company and give it power to undertake some manufacturing enterprise, we do not, therefore, exempt it from the right the province would have to regulate how its industry should be carried on. All we do is to give this company a right to do a certain thing, and that must be done in conformity with the law.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not think my hon. friend's knowledge of everything in heaven above, on the earth beneath and in the waters under the earth, includes a knowledge of how to run a coal mine. If the coal belongs to the province, it may have the right to make regulations; if it does not, it has no right to make regulations as to operating.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Nobody said it had.

Mr. McKENZIE. My hon. friend says this company will be given the right to own and operate a coal mine, and the local government may come in and make regulations.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Not at all.

Mr. McKENZIE. I ask, who is going to make them? We have no law governing this point, so far as I know. The operating of a coal mine is a scientific subject. I have never heard of giving, in this general way in a Railway Act, the right to own and operate coal mines in any province. I am told that the local legislature would have no control over this company or its operations. I am inquiring whether there is any law on the subject. I would like to see the mining laws of this country made as uniform as possible. We have excellent mining laws in the province of Nova Scotia, and I would like to see them in force wherever there is a coal mine. I presume that there are good mining laws in British Columbia and in Alberta, and I would like to know that this right to operate a coal mine is subject to the laws of the province where the coal mine is situated.

Mr. TURRIFF. I have no intention of opposing this clause. Practically all the other railway companies who are doing business in Alberta own coal mines and large tracts of coal land; but I want to point out to the Minister of Railways that what he thinks may possibly exist in a short time is very likely to exist. All the large railway companies own, and some of them operate, coal mines in Alberta, and those who are not operating are preparing to operate. These big railway companies have also bought out practically all the coal mines in British Columbia. Therefore, we are very likely to have in the west the same condition that exists in Pennsylvania and Ohio, where the railway companies own so much of the coal lands that they can dictate terms to everybody else who owns coal lands, and who does not happen to own a railway in connection with them. The point raised by my hon. friend from Cape Breton I think is a very reasonable point, but in Alberta and Saskatchewan, while the Dominion government own the coal lands, the local governments have control of the working and inspection of the mines, and I have always felt that as the local governments have all the expense of these services, it would be better if they had full control and received whatever royalties there are on coal lands. They would thus be in a better position to look after the safety of the working of the mines. The very position feared by the Minister of Railways is likely to arise in the near future and we should be very careful in granting

the right to these railway companies to own and operate large coal mines for fear that others who have invested in coal mines may be put out of business, because they cannot compete with mines owned by the same people who own the railways.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to support in every particular what my hon. friend has just said in regard to the undesirability, in the public interest, of a railway company being also an owner of coal mines. While the same men may own the railways and the mines, if they own them under the one organization neither the local government nor the Dominion government can control their operations as effectually as if they were separate concerns. The situation which the Minister of Railways fears must be dealt with by drastic action if it arises. It will arise in the future if it is permitted, and the time to stop it is now and not hereafter. It strikes me that as this charter is for an electric railway, it is reasonable to say that the precedent in regard to steam railways does not apply. It is evident that the coal mine owner who also owns a railway is in a more advantageous position than the coal mine owner who does not. It is in the public interest that there should be as many separate owners of coal mines as possible and therefore when you give a special advantage to the owner of one coal mine because he owns a railway you enable him to monopolize the coal mines which are tributary to that railway, you put the other owners at a disadvantage and put the general public at a disadvantage to that same degree. I cannot allow this charter to pass without entering the most emphatic protest I can against the principle of chartering railways and coal mines together as in this particular case.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This railway may be operated by electricity, steam or other power. Will that alter the minister's opinion?

Mr. OLIVER. That makes no difference in my estimation as to the disadvantage of the owner of the transportation also owning the coal whether the transportation is by steam or electricity.

Mr. BRADBURY. It may be a steam railway before it is completed. I agree with much of what the minister has said with regard to the advisability of keeping the coal lands separate from any great corporations. I believe what the minister has said will likely take place within a few years and that the railway companies have monopolized too much of our coal lands. With regard to this Bill I feel that we have already created a precedent in the west, we have granted several charters and several companies have secured control of coal mines. I understand a compromise has been arrived at in reference to this Bill,

and I think it would be hard to create a new precedent.

Mr. NORTHRUP. In the Railway Committee the point was brought out that if a new railway like this is limited to the operation of the small area of coal land required to furnish its motive power the cost of producing the coal will be increased as compared with the cost of operations on a larger scale, and that this will increase the cost of operation of the railway with a consequent increase in the cost of freight to the public. I agree that if the day has come when the railway companies control the coal we cannot move too soon. The minister will see that if we refuse this right the same individuals may still own the coal and the railway, may have their offices side by side, and the result to the public would be the same as if they were given the powers asked under this Act. I hope the minister will see that it is really in the interest of the public as well as of the company that the company should be allowed to operate a sufficient amount of coal lands to produce coal at the least possible expense and thus save coal rates.

Mr. TURRIFF. The argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) hardly applies. The great trouble experienced by the coal miners in that part of the country is the lack of cars. Often a mine will have orders in hand to keep it going twenty-four hours a day for months, but they cannot get a regular supply of cars, with the result that they may be working only half time. The difficulty is not so much in the matter of freight rates, or in the selling of the coal by the mine owned by the railway at less than the neighbouring mines sell it, but in this lack of a steady supply of cars.

Mr. BRADBURY. The Railway Commission can regulate that.

Mr. TURRIFF. They have control in such a matter. But in a country like that, where there is a tremendous traffic in coal—hon. members hardly realize the traffic there is in coal in the Crowsnest Pass, where there are dozens of mines operating—the success of a mine may depend absolutely upon obtaining cars steadily and in fair proportion and at the right time. It is a pretty difficult matter for a railway commission, or anybody else, to regulate the supply of cars if the railway company are interested in putting cars in any particular place. I am not saying they are doing that now. But I do say there is often a shortage of cars, and there is the tendency of which I have spoken. The House cannot be too careful in legislation of this kind.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Admitting every word that the hon. member (Mr. Turriff) says—namely, that the present grievance in the Northwest is the scarcity of cars, we are not going to correct that by preventing the

railway from adding more cars. And if you allow them to operate the mines they will certainly provide more cars.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to repeat what I said. My objection to covering the two enterprises with the one charter is not met by stating that the same people may operate the same enterprise under two different charters. I am not learned in the law, but it seems reasonable to believe that, if the two separate enterprises are operated under two separate charters, each enterprise will be more amenable to the legislation necessary to regulate and control it than if one charter covered both. If the railway charter covers coal operations there is no doubt that in the legislation to protect the rights of the public we should have more difficulty in reaching the coal operation than if the coal operation were carried on under a separate charter. What my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has said in regard to the possible condition as to the supply of cars I do not know that it is any breach of confidence to say, describes a condition which has prevailed and which has been a very serious drawback to the development of the coal industry in the Crowsnest Pass. That is a matter of record. Building an electric railway in some other part of the province of Alberta to develop other coal mines would have no effect on the situation in the Crowsnest Pass as it exists. The necessary effect of the linking together of the two enterprises is to give an undue advantage to the coal enterprise which is linked with the railway over the coal enterprise which is not linked with the railway. The railway is, or ought to be, a common carrier, to carry for everybody on equal terms—that is the purpose of chartering a railway; the railway gets special privileges on the theory that it will act as a common carrier and will deal on terms of equality with parties desiring to ship over it. But it will not act as a common carrier and deal fairly between parties if it is interested in one particular enterprise to which it looks chiefly for its traffic. No railway commission, no governmental control can properly protect the public interest in these cases. I speak strongly on this matter, because the coal interest of Alberta is probably the greatest interest in the Dominion of Canada, and it is an interest on whose proper development the whole prairie country tremendously depends. It is of interest to every man on the prairie that coal shall be produced under competitive conditions and delivered to him at the lowest possible rates of transportation. There is sufficient tendency to secure monopoly now, and this parliament should not let any legislation pass that would in any way tend to increase the possibilities of monopoly.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). I would ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) if the proper remedy would not be the one suggested by the Minister of Railways and Canals when he said that he intends to build the Hudson Bay railway in order—this is one of his reasons—that Cape Breton coal may be taken up by vessel to Hudson bay and shipped over the railway and delivered to purchasers in western Canada at much lower prices than it can at present be bought for. I see that one of the reasons assigned by the officers of his department for building this railway is that in Edmonton, for instance, where coal is now selling at $9 a ton, he will be able to deliver it, taken all the way from Cape Breton, at $7 a ton.

Mr. SPROULE. That argument was seriously presented to the House this afternoon.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart, Lanark) is serious or not, but the Northwest is a big country, and, while there is enormous possibility of production of coal—and, indeed, an enormous production of coal—in the western part of Alberta, yet the charges for transportation are such that it is not possible to deliver that coal in the city of Winnipeg in competition with the coal which is brought from the middle of the state of Pennsylvania, shipped by rail to the lake port—Cleveland—carried thence by steamer to Fort William, transhipped again, and carried by rail to Winnipeg. The transportation rates are such that that coal from Pennsylvania is laid down in Winnipeg at such terms as to practically exclude the Alberta coal from Winnipeg market. Now, what is done with the Pennsylvania coal may, as far as I am aware, be done with the Nova Scotia coal. I am not familiar with the circumstances, but I do not see any greater difficulty in one case than in the other.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the hon. minister (Mr. Oliver) believe that that condition is largely due to the fact that the coal in Pennsylvania is anthracite, while the coal from the west is bituminous, and, therefore, not of equal quality?

Mr. OLIVER. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) says does not apply, because there is anthracite, as he knows, in the Rocky mountains.

Mr. SPROULE. But not of the same quality.

Mr. OLIVER. But it is anthracite, and is mined and put on the market under very favourable conditions. But the same applies not only to anthracite, but to the whole coal supply.

Mr. SPROULE. But the minister knows that if a party goes to a dealer in Winni-

peg and buys coal he is willing to pay $2 or sometimes $3 more for the Pennsylvania anthracite than for the western bituminous coal, because the heating qualities of it are much better.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. gentleman is altogether wrong as to the heating quality of Pennsylvania, or Virginia, or Ohio bituminous coal being higher than that of the bituminous coal of Alberta; the opposite is the fact. Take the coal from a number of the mines in the Crowsnest Pass, and you will find it high in steam producing qualities, higher than the ordinary bituminous coal that comes from Pennsylvania, as the Minister of the Interior has said. Hundreds of thousands of tons of bituminous coal come in from the eastern United States to Winnipeg, and many of the railroads use American coal for one or two divisions west of Winnipeg, simply because the freight rates are cheaper, and they find it cheaper to use that coal than to bring coal from western Alberta or British Columbia, where the better quality of steam coal can be got.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that when I was in Winnipeg some years ago, and I met a gentleman who was buying a lot of coal from Pennsylvania for which he was prepared to pay $12 a ton, while he could get Canadian coal for $9 a ton. I asked him why he was paying so much more for the Pennsylvania coal, and he said that it was because it was richer in heat producing power.

Mr. HERRON. I agree with the arguments of the Minister of the Interior, but I cannot agree with his conclusion as to what would happen if we deprived this company of the power of operating coal mines. Now the conditions are such as the minister has stated with reference to railways giving privileges to particular coal mining companies in the way of cars. If that applies to all railway companies who are operating there now, and have the privilege to operate coal mines, and if this railway becomes a competitive railway to the present system, why should you not give the same privileges to this railway? It may be all right to take these privileges away from companies , but I think it should be done at the same time with each and all of them, and that until then this company should have the same privileges as others are enjoying. If they are going to be a competitor in getting low railway rates, they must have the same opportunities in conducting their business.

On section 15,

Mr. NESBITT. Before the Bill is reported, I would like to comment on the remarks of the hon. gentleman with reference to this clause being the same clause that has been in other Bills that we have put through that we should pass this Bill. I do not agree with that? I am not opposing this Bill now, because it is an arrangement between the parties, the Alberta government and the promoters, but otherwise I would oppose it, because I have opposed in the committee all clauses such as this, and I intend to oppose them. It does not make any difference to me that the charters were given with these clauses in that should not have been given; that is no reason why we should continue to give them.

Bill reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 111) to incorporate the Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Railway Company. —Mr. Carvell.

Bill (No. 126) respecting the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company. —Mr. Fortier.

Bill (No. 125) respecting the Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company. —Mr. Smith (Nanaimo.)

Bill (No. 119) respecting the Ontario Northern and Temagami Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Proulx.

SUPPLY—TRANSPORTATION IN CANADA.

The order for public Bills having expired, the House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. GRAHAM. In continuing my observations on the transportation problems of Canada, I may remind the House that at six o'clock I was discussing the state-owned Intercolonial railway and Prince Edward Island railways. I had said at six o'clock that among other things characteristic of the Intercolonial railway was the fact that its rates were the lowest in Canada. A practical way to find out exactly what the rates are per ton per mile is to take the actual receipts, the actual tonnage and mileage, and there can be no possible mistake made in arriving at a conclusion. The same thing is done with the returns made by other railways. Having laid down this accepted standard of measurement, how did the Intercolonial railway rate per ton per mile for 1910 compare with the rate of other railways? Here are the facts:

Intercolonial	·553 cent.
Canadian Pacific	·778 "
Grand Trunk	·672 "
Canadian Northern	·734 "

It will be seen that the rate of the Canadian Pacific was 40·6 per cent higher than that of the Intercolonial, of the Grand Trunk 21·5 per cent higher, and of the Canadian Northern 32·7 per cent higher.

Let us see what this difference in freight Trunk 21·5 per cent higher, and of the railways was concerned in 1910.

To proceed with the comparison and to show what condition the state-owned railway would have been in had it received the same revenue, or had it had the same earning power per mile as other roads, I will take the Canadian Pacific railway as an example. The Canadian Pacific railway last year carried 20,551,368 tons of freight. It earned on this $58,904,060. The Intercolonial railway carried 3,984,044 tons, upon which it earned $6,120,692. Suppose the Canadian Pacific railway had carried this freight at the same income per ton per mile as the Intercolonial railway did its earnings would have been decreased by $17,035,236. Reverse it; suppose that the Intercolonial railway had had the same earning power for freight per mile as the Canadian Pacific railway, its net earnings would have been increased by $2,485,000. Or, in other words, instead of a net revenue last year of $600,000, had the Intercolonial railway been possessed of the same earning power for its freight as the Canadian Pacific railway, the Intercolonial railway would have had a surplus last year of over $3,000,000.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Does the minister see that that depends entirely on the class of stuff carried? If you compare a road that carries coal entirely with a road that carries ordinary freight, the comparison would be ridiculous.

Mr. GRAHAM. For my purpose, the comparison is absolutely correct.

Mr. HAGGART. (Lanark). Yes, for your purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM. And for the purpose of my hon. friend when I explain it to him. I am not making this comparison to show that the Canadian Pacific railway is charging too high rates.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). You are making it for the sake of showing that the Intercolonial railway charges less than the Canadian Pacific railway, which amounts to the same thing.

Mr. GRAHAM. No. Before six o'clock I was pointing out the difficulties under which the Intercolonial railway laboured, and one of these is that the freight is of a low class, and in consequence, even if its rates per mile were the same as the Canadian Pacific railway, over all its territory its net revenue would not be the same per mile on account of the low classification of its freight That emphasizes my contention and it is one of the difficulties under which the Intercolonial railway labours. Later on I will prove to my hon. friend that mile for mile, on the same kind of freight, the Intercolonial railway rates are much lower than those of the Canadian Pacific railway.

Let us now look at passenger traffic. In 1910 the rates per passenger per mile were as follow:

Intercolonial	1·691	cents.
Canadian Pacific	1·821	"
Grand Trunk	1·767	"
Canadian Northern	2·184	"

Thus, the passenger rate of the Canadian Pacific was 7·6 per cent, of the Grand Trunk 4·5 per cent and the Canadian Northern 29·1 per cent, higher than the passenger rate of the Intercolonial. Taking again the case of the Canadian Pacific for purposes of comparison, the effect on earnings from ticket sales was as follows: In 1910 the Canadian Pacific carried 11,050,924 passengers, on which it earned $24,428,282. If, however, the Canadian Pacific had carried this traffic at the Intercolonial rate, it would have received $1,743,918 less than it actually did receive.

Reversing this passenger test, the Intercolonial in 1910 carried 3,176,154 passengers, on which it earned $2,653,157. If the Intercolonial had enjoyed the benefit of the Canadian Pacific passenger rate, it would have added $203,968 to its earnings from ticket sales.

Joining the results of these calculations, it will be seen that if the Canadian Pacific had operated in 1910 on Intercolonial rates, its earnings would have been $17,035,236 less from freight and $1,743,918 less from passengers, or a total of $18,779,154.

Putting the case again the other way around, if the Intercolonial in 1910 had been operated on Canadian Pacific rates, its net earnings of $700,278 would have been increased by $2,485,000 from freight and $203,968 from passengers, making a total of $3,389,246, or total surplus of $4,000,000 or about 4½ per cent on total capital.

If the Intercolonial last year realized net earnings of $3,389,246 it would have done relatively as well as the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Northern.

We have in Canada the case of another government owned and operated line—the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario. Critics are sometimes in the habit of alluding to the results achieved by that road as indicating bad management, by comparison, on the part of the Intercolonial Now, I am not saying anything derogatory to the management of the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway. It is a well managed road. I had something to do with its inception, and I am proud to see its success. Again, referring to the remark of my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) that the classifica-

tion of its freight is very much higher than that of the Intercolonial railway freight one thing is, that it carries silver ore and we carry coal. That is a big difference. I will show, however, that mile for mile, the rates on the Intercolonial railway are much lower than mile for mile for the same classification are the rates on the Ontario road. I do this to show that the Intercolonial railway's earning power, owing to the low classification of its freight as well as to its lower rates per ton per mile, labours under great difficulty as compared with many of the other roads and never could be expected to earn as much money as other roads do, even if we put our rates as high as theirs on similar classification. The Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway received last year 1·543 cents per ton per mile, as against the Intercolonial rate of 533. At this rate it had earnings of $957,150 from freight. If it had been obliged to carry freight at the Intercolonial price, it would have suffered a deduction of $543,650, leaving its earnings only $422,500 instead of $957,150. Reversing the comparison, if the Intercolonial in 1910 had received for its freight traffic the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario rate, its net earnings would have been increased by $10,957,477. The Timiskaming and Northern Ontario rate on freight was 179·02 per cent higher than the Intercolonial rate for 1910.

The same thing is true with regard to passenger business. While the Intercolonial railway had a rate per passenger per mile of 1·691 cents, the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario had a rate of 2.485. Here was a difference in favour of the latter of 48·1 per cent. I want to bring that difference clearly before the House, and particularly those members from other parts of Canada, because I believe they do not understand the difficulties of managing a government road of this length and under the peculiar conditions and circumstances surrounding it. The rates on the Intercolonial railway are so much less than those on other roads, that the two cannot fairly be compared as to receipts owing to the difference in the conditions. The revenue quality of our freight is lower, and consequently, our rates are lower than those of any other road in Canada.

Mr. CROSBY. Are the rates on the Intercolonial railway from St. John and Halifax to Montreal any lower than those on the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. The rates from St. John to Montreal on the Intercolonial railway are the same as those on the Canadian Pacific railway, but we have to haul the traffic 250 miles for nothing, because our route is 250 miles longer.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. CROSBY. The minister made the statement that the rates on the Canadian Pacific railway are higher than those on the Intercolonial railway; but I understand that the rates from St. John to Montreal, and the rates from Montreal to St. John, for both passenger and freight, on both lines are exactly the same.

Mr. GRAHAM. That only confirms my argument. I have been showing that per ton per mile and per passenger per mile our rates are lower; and one of the difficulties under which we operate is what my hon. friend points out, that we have a haul 250 miles longer than that of the Canadian Pacific railway from St. John to Montreal, and get only the same rate.

Mr. CROSBY. When the Canadian Pacific railway runs from St. John to Halifax, who gets the traffic?

Mr. GRAHAM. We get the local traffic between St. John and Halifax.

Mr. CROSBY. Perhaps I do not make myself clear. If a passenger wishes to go from St. John to Montreal, he gets the same rate whether he goes by the Intercolonial railway or the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. If you like to haul him around by Moncton, that is no fault of the Canadian Pacific railway. If the Canadian Pacific railway takes the passenger from Halifax to Montreal, how far does it haul him for nothing? You get the money.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, we make an arrangement by which they pay us so much for hauling the traffic.

Mr. CROSBY. How much do they give you back?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot say at the moment. At all events, my hon. friend has made my point clear, that we have to carry the traffic 250 miles farther, or 50 per cent farther than the Canadian Pacific railway for exactly the same rate. That is one of the difficulties I have been explaining, and I am glad that my hon. friend has brought it out so well. Now, I come to the question of the cost per train mile, and I will try to make a fair comparison by taking the cost on the three railways, the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk railway and the Canadian Northern railway.

It might be said, and very frequently is, that the Intercolonial railway is conducted with great extravagance and an utter disregard of sound railway methods. The Canadian Pacific railway, for example, is popularly understood to acquire large net earnings by economical administration,

while the Intercolonial railway is believed to have occasional deficits because it is conducted in a wasteful way. In short, it is asserted that the Canadian Pacific is run on business principles, while the Intercolonial is not.

Is there any way of determining relative economy in the conduct of railways? There is. Look at it as you may, no matter from what standpoint, all the operations of a railway come down to one thing—the running of trains. If you stop the running of trains you stop everything for which a railway pays out money, no matter what it may be. Every penny of operating expenses goes out to that end. Now, the measure of a railway's operations is expressed in train mileage. Therefore, if you divide the total train mileage into the total operating expenses you have a figure which tells you the cost of running a train one mile.

This cost of running a train one mile is accepted by the entire railway world as an absolutely safe and sound standard for measuring economy of administration. The railway which is operated at the lowest cost is certain to have the lowest rate per train mile. It is known to the last farthing what it cost every railway in Canada to run a train one mile during 1910, and taking the cases of those roads to which reference has already been made the figures are as follow:

Intercolonial	$ 1.300
Canadian Pacific	1.504
Grand Trunk	1.817
Canadian Northern	1.581

This comparison is distinctly in favour of the Intercolonial railway. The figures are in each case taken from the sworn returns of the railway indicated, and are not open to question. They show beyond a doubt that the Intercolonial railway is not wastefully managed; but, in comparison with these roads which are regarded as types of the best conducted in Canada, is carried on in a way highly creditable to those who are in charge of its affairs.

The foregoing observations bring us back to the initial proposition, namely, that the Intercolonial does not earn a large surplus, despite its location and position as the product of confederation, simply because its freight and passenger rates are the lowest in the Dominion. This view, notwithstanding anything that may be asserted to the contrary, will be fully sustained by a comparison of the published freight tariffs of the railways to which allusion has been made.

The comparison I have made is very strongly in favour of the Intercolonial railway; but this much I want to admit, to be perfectly fair, that on account of our comparatively high grades, it may be that we do not haul on an average quite as much per train as the Canadian Pacific railway. But I think the difference will not be found to be very great; and it is a pleasure for me to announce to the House that such improvement is being made every year that our average number of cars per train is increasing, which shows that we are endeavouring to bring the operation of the road down to the lowest possible cost.

Now, I have pointed out that one of the difficulties under which the Intercolonial railway labours is its low classification of freight. I want to substantiate my contention that per mile the rates authorized by the Board of Railway Commissioners for the Grand Trunk railway and the Canadian Pacific railway are higher than the rates charged by the Intercolonial railway on the same articles. The rates I am about to give are the rates authorized by the Board of Railway Commissioners between Ontario towns, in thickly settled districts, where surely the rate ought to be as low as the rate on the Intercolonial railway, if the Intercolonial railway rate were on a commercial basis, which it is not and never has been. It has been said that for short distances the rates of the Intercolonial railway will be found to be as high as the others. That may possibly be true, but in comparing the Intercolonial railway rates per mile with the rates granted by the Board of Railway Commissioners between Ontario towns, I am going to start at 89 miles.

Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway Ontario town tariffs as ordered by the Board of Railway Commissioners, compared with Intercolonial Railway tariffs for similar distances.

		Classes.								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
89 miles	G.T.R. / C.P.R.	30	26	23	19	15	13	11	12	9
86 "	I.C.R.	26	23	20	16	13	12	10	11	10
135 "	G.T.R. / C.P.R.	32	28	24	20	16	14	12	13	12
137 "	I.C.R.	29	26	22	18	15	14	11	12	9
188 "	G.T.R. / C.P.R.	36	32	27	23	18	16	14	15	12
188 "	I.C.R.	33	29	26	21	17	16	14	14	11
243 "	G.T.R. / C.P.R.	40	36	30	25	20	18	16	16	14
243 "	I.C.R.	38	33	29	23	19	17	16	15	13
275 "	G.T.R. / C.P.R.	42	37	32	26	21	19	17	17	15
275 "	I.C.R.	38	33	29	24	19	17	15	15	13

That is a comparison of the rates confirmed by the Board of Railway Commissioners between Ontario towns, but in order that there may be no mistake I am going to come even closer home and shall compare the railway tariff of the Canadian Pacific railway as approved by the Board

of Railway Commissioners in New Brunswick and the tariff of the Intercolonial railway for the same distances on the same classification.

Canadian Pacific Railway tariffs in New Brunswick as compared with Intercolonial tariffs in same territory.

	Classes.									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
C.P.R. 84 miles..	32	28	24	20	16	14	12	13	12	10
I.C.R. 89 "	26	23	20	16	13	12	10	11	10	8
C.P.R. 137 "	40	35	30	25	20	18	15	16	16	13
I.C.R. 137 "	29	26	22	18	15	14	11	12	11	9
C.P.R. 223 "	48	42	36	30	24	22	18	19	19	16
I.C.R. 223 "	36	32	27	23	18	16	14	15	14	12

With respect to lumber rates, the allowance for excess weight and demurrage by the Intercolonial is much more favourable than the conditions imposed by other railways.

Mr. DANIEL. Was there any competition for either the Intercolonial railway or the Canadian Pacific railway at these places?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think there was practically no competition, but the rates I have read have been approved by the Railway Commissioners.

I shall now make a comparison with the rates on a railway now owned by the Canadian Pacific railway, the Dominion Atlantic, in the same territory:

Dominion Atlantic Railway tariffs in Maritime Provinces as compared with Intercolonial tariffs in same territory.

	Classes.									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
D.A.Ry. 90 miles.....	32	27	21	16	18	12	10	12	12	8
I.C.R. 90 "	26	23	20	16	13	12	10	11	10	8
D.A.Ry. 190 "	43	37	29	21	18	17	15	16	16	12
I.C.R. 190 "	33	29	26	21	17	16	14	14	12	11
D.A.Ry. 250 "	49	41	33	24	22	21	16	18	19	14
I.C.R. 250 "	38	33	29	23	19	17	15	15	15	13

By these comparisons with company owned railways I think I have maintained my position absolutely and I defy contradiction from the tariffs of any railway from which I have quoted.

In comparing the Intercolonial with the Ontario government owned road, the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario I find that after we get up to 20 miles the rate on every classification on the Ontario road is higher than the rate for the same classification on the Intercolonial railway. The rates are practically the same until we get between 15 and 20 miles, and then I find the Ontario rates are higher.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Distances.	Classes :—In cents per 100 pounds.									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Miles.										
Not exceeding 5—										
I.C.R.	8	7	6	5	4	4	4	3	3	3
T. & N.O.	8	7	6	5	4	4	4	3	3	3
Over 5—not over 10—										
I.C.R.	10	8	7	6	5	5	4	4	4	4
T. & N.O.	10	8	7	6	5	5	4	4	4	4
Over 10—not over 15—										
I.C.R.	12	11	9	8	6	6	5	5	5	4
T. & N.O.	12	11	9	8	6	6	5	5	5	4
Over 15—not over 20—										
I.C.R.	12	11	9	8	6	6	5	5	5	4
T. & N.O.	14	12	11	9	7	6	6	6	6	5
Over 20—not over 25—										
I.C.R.	14	12	11	9	7	6	6	6	6	5
T. & N.O.	16	14	12	10	8	7	6	7	7	5
Over 25—not over 30—										
I.C.R.	14	12	11	9	7	6	6	6	6	5
T. & N.O.	18	16	14	11	9	8	7	8	7	6
Over 30—not over 35—										
I.C.R.	16	14	12	10	8	7	6	7	7	5
T. & N.O.	20	18	15	13	10	9	7	8	8	6
Over 35—not over 40—										
I.C.R.	16	14	12	10	8	7	6	7	7	5
T. & N.O.	22	19	17	14	11	10	8	9	8	7
Over 40—not over 45—										
I.C.R.	18	16	14	11	9	8	7	8	7	6
T. & N.O.	24	21	18	15	12	11	8	9	8	7
Over 45—not over 50—										
I.C.R.	18	16	14	11	9	8	7	8	7	6
T. & N.O.	24	21	18	15	12	11	9	10	9	7
Over 50—not over 55—										
I.C.R.	20	18	15	13	10	9	7	8	8	6
T. & N.O.	26	23	20	16	13	12	10	10	10	8
Over 55—not over 60—										
I.C.R.	20	18	15	13	10	9	7	8	8	6
T. & N.O	26	23	20	16	13	12	10	11	10	8
Over 60—not over 65—										
I.C.R.	22	19	17	14	11	10	8	9	8	7
T. & N.O.	28	25	21	18	14	13	11	11	11	9
Over 65—not over 70—										
I.C.R.	22	19	17	14	11	10	8	9	8	7
T. & N.O.	28	25	21	18	14	13	11	12	11	9
Over 70—not over 75—										
I.C.R.	24	21	18	15	12	11	8	9	8	7
T. & N.O.	30	26	23	19	15	14	12	12	11	10
Over 75—not over 80—										
I.C.R.	24	21	18	15	12	11	8	9	8	7
T. & N.O.	32	28	24	20	16	14	12	13	12	10
Over 80—not over 85—										
I.C.R.	26	23	20	16	13	12	10	11	10	8
T. & N.O.	32	28	24	20	16	14	12	13	12	10
Over 85—not over 90—										
I.C.R.	26	23	20	16	13	12	10	11	10	8
T. & N.O.	34	30	26	21	17	15	13	14	12	11
Over 90—not over 95—										
I.C.R.	28	25	21	18	14	13	11	12	11	9
T. & N.O.	34	30	26	21	17	15	13	14	11	11
Over 95—not over 100—										
I.C.R.	28	25	21	18	14	13	11	12	11	9
T. & N.O.	36	32	27	23	18	16	13	14	13	11
Over 100—not over 110—										
I.C.R.	30	26	23	19	15	14	12	12	11	10
T. & N.O.	36	32	27	23	18	16	14	15	14	12
Over 110—not over 120—										
I.C.R.	32	28	24	20	16	14	12	13	12	10
T. & N.O.	38	33	29	24	19	17	14	15	14	12
Over 120—not over 130—										
I.C.R.	32	22	24	20	16	14	12	13	12	10
T. & N.O.	38	33	29	24	19	17	15	15	15	13

Distances.	Classes :—In cents per 100 pounds.								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Miles.										
Over 130—not over 140—										
I.C.R.	32	28	24	20	16	14	12	13	12	10
T. & N.O.	40	35	30	25	20	18	16	16	16	13
Over 140—not over 150—										
I.C.R.	34	30	26	21	17	15	13	14	13	11
T. & N.O.	40	36	30	25	20	18	16	16	16	14
Over 150—not over 160—										
I.C.R.	34	30	26	21	17	15	13	14	14	11
T. & N.O.	42	37	32	26	21	19	16	17	17	14
Over 160—not over 170—										
I.C.R.	34	30	26	21	17	15	13	14	13	11
T. & N.O.	42	37	32	26	21	19	17	17	17	15
Over 170—not over 180—										
I.C.R.	36	32	27	23	18	16	14	15	14	12
T. & N.O.	44	39	33	28	22	20	17	18	18	15
Over 180—not over 190—										
I.C.R.	36	32	27	23	18	16	14	15	14	12
T. & N.O.	46	40	35	29	23	21	17	18	18	15
Over 190—not over 200—										
I.C.R.	36	32	27	23	18	16	14	15	14	12
T. & N.O.	46	40	35	29	23	21	18	19	19	16
Over 200—not over 210—										
I.C.R.	36	32	27	23	18	16	14	15	14	12
T. & N.O.	48	42	36	30	24	22	18	19	19	16
Over 210—not over 220—										
I.C.R.	36	32	27	23	18	16	14	15	14	12
T. & N.O.	48	42	36	30	24	22	18	19	20	16

Distances.	Classes :—In cents per 100 pounds.								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Miles.										
Over 230—not over 240—										
I.C.R.	38	33	29	24	19	17	15	15	15	13
T. & N.O.	50	44	38	31	25	23	19	20	21	17
Over 240—not over 250—										
I.C.R.	38	33	29	24	19	17	15	15	15	13
T. & N.O.	52	46	39	33	26	24	20	20	22	18
Over 250—not over *252										
I.C.R.	38	33	29	24	19	17	15	15	15	13
T. & N.O.	54	47	41	34	27	25	20	21	23	18

*Cochrane, terminal of line.

I say again to the House that if the Intercolonial railway had received per ton per mile the same revenue as the Ontario road, we would have had a surplus last year of $11,000,000 on the Canadian owned road, known as the Intercolonial. It may be of interest to the House to put a statement on 'Hansard' to show the difference in expenditure in the last four years under certain important heads. The following are the figures:

Comparative Statement of Operating Expenses for Nine Months ending December 31, 1907, 1908, 1909 and 1910.

——	1907.	1908.	1909.	1910.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Maintenance of way and structures	1,343,465 96	1,470,846 31	1,186,107 09	1,416,428 64
Maintenance of equipment	1,497,465 98	1,566,585 34	1,330,638 29	1,467,447 17
Traffic expenses	142,773 62	135,568 92	125,931 45	140,892 90
Transportation expenses	3,667,221 02	3,724,465 45	3,515,421 01	3,656,147 20
General expenses	185,615 11	170,534 32	152,814 52	163,071 63
Total operating expenses	6,836,541 69	7,068,000 34	6,310,912 36	6,843,987 54

During the past few years, we have inaugurated the system of having a special account, to which I shall refer a little later on. During the nine months ending 31st December, 1910, out of revenue, we have laid 55⅛ miles of 80-pound rails, we have ballasted 135½ miles of track; we have put in track 627,711 ties, and have put in track 314 sets switch ties. We have made heavy repairs out of revenue of $153,446.16. Within the same period we have paid out of maintenance for locomotive repairs. We have spent, in excess of the same period of 1909, under the following heads:

Locomotive repairs	$24,000
Passenger car repairs	2,000
Freight car repairs	70,000
Total	$96,000

In this period of nine months ending 31st December, 1910, we have increased the expenditure of maintenance of way and structures over the same period of 1909 by $236,000. This, with the locomotive and car repairs just given, make a total of $332,000, which means, of course, the keeping up of the equipment and the betterment of the road. Out of this maintenance of equipment fund, we have ordered, to be paid for as delivered, the following:

3 passenger (Pacific type) engines at $22,340	$ 66,720

50 steel frame box cars, 30 tons capacity (wood sheathing to be applied in Moncton shops), estimated at $1,200 each..	60,000
21 steel coal dump cars, 50 tons capacity, at $1,500 each..	23,550
100 box cars (wood), 30 tons capacity, 30 at $1,015, 70 at $1,085.. ..	106,400
50 box cars (wood), 30 tons capacity, to be built at Moncton shops, estimated at $1,100 each..	55,000
Total..	$320,670

This is paid out of renewal equipment fund, made up of a contribution from the revenue of $25,000 a month. In this connection, I may say that we have been allowed to establish two accounts, the rail renewal account and the equipment renewal account. On the rail renewal account we have been putting aside $12,500 a month and on the other $25,000 a month. At the end of the year, the balances in these accounts are not handed back to the Receiver General, but we use the funds to renew rails and equipment as necessary. The amount in these accounts does not appear as part of the net revenue, as they are charged against the revenue. I think of asking the House to allow me to establish another account. It would mean practically an insurance account. The ordinary railway is managed on these lines: Where a large fire occurs, they take out of revenue the value of the property as it was before destruction, and, in the construction of the new buildings they charge to capital account only the difference between the value of the old and the value of the new. I am endeavouring to adopt that principle thoroughly on the Intercolonial railway. I had some correspondence with Mr. Knapp, who is chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has adopted very strict rules in this connection, and he informed me this was the method the Interstate Commerce Commission adopted, and Mr. Hays of the Grand Trunk tells me the same thing. We had a big fire at Campbellton. I had an estimate made of the value of the buildings that were destroyed, and the amount given was $76,000. We purpose enlarging our yards at Campbellton, and providing for a connection with the International railway, which, we expect, will lead to the handling of quite a lot of traffic. We are changing the location of our yards—I think at the request of the town—and the new yards, station and sidings will cost $250,000. What I propose to do is to pay out of this year's revenue $76,000, the value of the property destroyed. This may be considered a departure. But it is strictly along the line on which railway companies are run, and I think that is the way we ought to run the Intercolonial, even if we do not come out even in so running it. But, as traffic is rapidly increasing, if the Auditor General will allow me, I propose this year to take a further account from net revenue of $100,000 and put it into renewal equipment, so that we may have the funds to buy the additional equipment we so much need. In order that there may be no mistake about having authority to do this, I propose, a little later in the session, if I can possibly do it, with the consent of the Auditor General's Department and the Finance Department, to introduce an amendment to allow us to establish and maintain these funds which we have been maintaining to a certain extent without statutory warrant, but with the consent of the Auditor General. This will make the procedure perfectly legal.

Companies having large fire losses are able to spread these losses over a term of years. An act to be introduced will enable the Intercolonial railway to do the same.

Another question arises: There are differences of opinion as to what ought to be charged to capital and what ought to be charged to revenue. We have endeavoured to make the line distinct and clear, that whatever a railway company would charge to capital or to revenue, we ought to so charge. And I believe that during the past year, the Intercolonial has actually leaned backwards in this matter and has charged several things to revenue that a railway company would have charged to capital, and would be authorized to charge to capital under the Interstate Commerce rules. Possibly I may introduce a measure to make clear the distinction between revenue and capital expenditure and to give us authority to say which is revenue and which is capital should any question arise between the Audit Department and the board of managers. At the end of this year we will have a little money left, by the looks of things. I am not prepared to say so absolutely, but from the figures I have in my hands, and those I have been able to see, if we were not to take the $76,000 for Campbellton, and if we were not to ask for the other extra $100,000 on equipment and renewal account, which I am going to ask for, if I did not make these two deductions, I think possibly at the end of March this year the Intercolonial would show a net revenue of $700,000. It is not the object of the Intercolonial to have a big surplus, we want to give the people a good service, and the situation is such that we never expect to have a very big surplus at the end of the year.

Mr. RHODES. How much will the minister have on equipment account?

Mr. GRAHAM. If we omitted the diversions at Chatham and George's River, which are practically new lines, the service this year would pay probably all the running expenses and all the capital expenditure of the Intercolonial. We have spent money on revenue account that a company

road would not have to expend on such account but would have charged to capital, and we have not spent one farthing that a company road would not expend.

Mr. MARSHALL. What do you write off for wear and tear?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is written off under the same rules and regulations that prevail on company roads under the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. MARSHALL. The reason I ask that question is that a few days ago I saw a number of locomotives which I thought were ready for the scrap heap, and I was wondering if you regarded them still as an asset. I suppose there were 25 locomotives.

Mr. GRAHAM. We set aside $300,000 per year to renew equipment. I had an estimate made at one time and I found that our percentage of rolling stock out of commission and waiting for repairs or ready for the scrap heap, as the hon. member says, was a trifle less than the rolling stock of other companies in Canada, by percentage. A good many of our engines are light; we will use some of our lighter engines, that otherwise might not be of much use on the main line, should we take over some of the branch lines where lighter rolling stock can be used.

There is another thing of interest, and that is our relations to the Grand Trunk railway at the city of Montreal. We have been asked what that traffic amounts to. A few years ago an arrangement was made for the Intercolonial to run into Montreal, and by agreement with the Grand Trunk railway their terminals are used, and their line is used from Ste. Rosalie into Bonaventure station, and we have an arrangement for interchange of traffic. Now the total revenue in 1910 from the freight handed to the Intercolonial by the Grand Trunk, gathered up in Ontario largely—and I want the Ontario members to remember this when they talk of the Intercolonial—that freight in Ontario was gathered up by the Grand Trunk and handed to the Intercolonial, making earnings for the Intercolonial of $908,066.35. The Intercolonial handed to the Grand Trunk freight traffic on which the Intercolonial earned $753,452.28. So the total of the interchange would be about $1,660,000. That arrangement has been a good one. But I want to impress on our Ontario friends that more of that traffic is carried over the Intercolonial east than there is of maritime provinces and Quebec traffic carried from the east to the west. So the advantages that may be gained by having the Intercolonial railway run as cheaply as possible go a little more to the province of Ontario, possibly, than they do to the people through whose territory this railway runs.

Mr. STANFIELD. How much has the Intercolonial handed over to the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. By the arrangement with the Grand Trunk we have to hand all our traffic to them that is not otherwise routed, and they have to do the same with us. The most of our traffic is handed over to the Grand Trunk, Montreal being the junction point. I think there is more freight comes from the west to the east over the Intercolonial than comes from the east to the west.

Now, I want to say a few words about the Prince Edward Island railway. For the nine months ending December 31, 1910, the Prince Edward Island railway had a net loss of $53,294.11. That was a decrease in the loss for nine months over last year of $11,114.93. The Prince Edward Island railway does not pay, never will pay, and no one need ever try to make it pay. It is not the intention of the department to try to make it pay. When the island came into confederation we took over this railway, and it is the duty of the parliament of Canada to give the Prince Edward Island people a good railway service so far as that is possible. Although it is a certain contribution from the federal government to the people of that island, I am prepared, so far as I am concerned, and so long as I am a minister, to advocate a liberal treatment of the people in Prince Edward Island in reference to their transportation facilities.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). What was the capital expenditure on that road last year?

Mr. GRAHAM. Approximately $185,000. We are building a new branch line in Prince Edward Island, which is not yet completed. Last year we spent $206,397.

Now, I have been asked: What is the future of the Intercolonial? It stands to reason that it will not be very long, at least it cannot be very long before the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk will come to the government, or to the management of the Intercolonial, and ask to be relieved from their arrangements with us at Montreal to hand us over their traffic. That traffic is very heavy, and they will undoubtedly come to us when the Grand Trunk Pacific is completed and say: We want to take our own traffic down from Montreal to Lévis and hand it over to the Grand Trunck Pacific. I do not know what will happen in the years to come when they make that request. I am not prepared to say it will ever be granted; it will not be unless the terms are right. I believe the future of the Intercolonial is bound up in getting an exchange of traffic with a western through line that runs from the Pacific to the Atlantic, and from the Pacific to the St. Lawrence at least. I believe that is what will make the Intercolonial of still

greater benefit to the people of Canada than it has been in the past. The Canadian Northern must shortly have a through line from the Pacific ocean down to Montreal and Quebec, it must get down to the sea-board in some way. I have an idea that in years to come, perhaps before long, the Intercolonial ought to get traffic from the Canadian Northern railway, its through traffic as well as its local traffic; and if the time ever comes when we have to release our arrangement with the Grand Trunk, which may not be for many years, then I think the proper thing for the Intercolonial would be to link up with the Canadian Northern railway, and hand its traffic from Montreal and Quebec, its through as well as its local traffic, over the Canadian Northern as far as possible for transportation west.

Now, I have talked altogether too long. The government railway is not easy to manage. I have to thank hon. members on both sides of the House for the courtesy that they have extended to those in charge of that railway. I live in a town in which are the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific railway and Canadian Northern, and I know the applications which are made to members of parliament and the difficulties that arise sometimes in members being able to have matters adjusted exactly as they would like them to be, in the interest of the locality, and in the interest of the road as well. I have received a great deal of valuable advice from hon. members on both sides of the House, living along the line of railway not for the benefit of any particular individual, but for the benefit of the road and the people whom they represent. In future, we propose to manage the Intercolonial railway for the greatest benefit of the people who travel on it, or whose traffic is carried on it. I believe that the people of Canada have received great benefit from this road in the past and that in the future they will receive even greater benefit so long as we are able to manage it so that it will give them a good service at a reasonable rate and at the same time not put a burden upon the treasury of the Dominion government as it is not doing to any great extent at the present time.

In conclusion let me say, Sir, that there is no danger to Canadian transportation companies or our carrying trade, if we continue in the courageous course already outlined, and develop the national routes with which providence has endowed this country.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, it is rather late in the evening to commence a detailed reply to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham). He perhaps could not help it, but I should judge that he was rather long in making his speech.

Mr. GRAHAM. I agree absolutely.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). It is not customary to present to the House the details in the form in which he gave them to us to-day. It is sufficient that they appear in the reports of his department without wearying the House with a continuous recital of details that it is impossible to consider or to answer at the time. The hon. gentleman began his remarks by pronouncing a eulogy upon the Board of Railway Commissioners. He said that they were the finest body not only on this continent, but in the world, and perhaps the ablest. I do not know all these gentlemen, but I should judge they are fully competent for the positions which they fill. Their duties do not require the most ardent attention or the greatest ability, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. minister, but just such common sense as is requisite for the Minister of Railways and Canals himself. I think they have filled their positions well.

The hon. gentleman verged from that to the question of transportation. He stated that it was the important question of this country, that the tariff was a secondary consideration. I say that the two of them have to go together. In order that we may have transportation, we must carefully look after our tariff arrangements. I agree with the hon. gentleman to a certain extent with reference to what we must do with our canals. He has the modern idea. The modern idea is, that no railway transportation can compete successfully with water, that the two should go together that a railway along a river like the St. Lawrence or the Mississippi is not a paradox. One is essential to the other. The very fact that by a waterway you can carry a certain line of freight in the cheapest manner, gives added value to the railway which parallels it. Railway companies in the United States are advocating the development of canal navigation along the line of their own railways for the purpose of handling such freight. That question has been most fully dealt with in Germany. The Germans are going ahead and developing what was thought a few years ago to be the antiquated system of canal transportation for freight of a certain kind. In order to maintain our position on this continent, as the minister very well observes, we have to look after our transportation facilities. We are placed by nature in the most advantageous position of any nation on the continent of America. Nature has given us facilities for the development of our waterways superior to those of any other nation on this continent. We ought

to make full use of them because that nation through which the goods of another nation passes in going to market, virtually controls the political existence of the country which owns the goods. We are now in a position, if we maintain what we have at the present time, to be the controllers of the destinies of that part of North America which lies along our beautiful water system. How can we best do it? The minister suggests two plans with reference to water communication—the building of the Welland canal and of the Georgian Bay canal. It is not

> How happy could I be with either,
> Were t'other dear charmer away.

with the Minister of Railways, but he loves both of them. He loves the banks of the St. Lawrence, and I do not blame him for favouring the development of what is to my mind, the most magnificent waterway in the world. To live on its banks is something, because it is a beautiful river, but I must cease this flight of eloquence, and try to get down to something more practical. If the minister will take my advice, and I intend to give him reasons, he will be very careful about embarking upon an expenditure upon either of these great undertakings without the fullest possible information. He has the fullest possible information as to what the Georgian Bay canal will cost, while he has not to such an extent information with reference to the St. Lawrence river and the cost of its improvement. I made a statement which I am prepared to corroborate this evening, that the enlargement of the St. Lawrence canals to the capacity which is proposed—21 feet of navigation, or 24 feet on the mitre sills of the locks—will cost double the amount that will be required to build the Georgian Bay canal. Now, that is a strange statement. The building of that canal from the waters above to Lake Ontario, and thence down to Montreal, will cost nearly double what it would cost to build the Georgian Bay canal. I will give the figures and details with reference to this afterwards. What do you gain? The Georgian Bay canal route is 280 miles shorter than the other. It requires the most serious consideration why we should expend a large sum of money for making a ship canal down to Lake Ontario and from Lake Ontario to Montreal, if we do not require it.

We see in the newspapers that a proposition has been made to the Canadian government by the President of the United States for the joint building of a canal from the St. Lawrence river to New York, and of course joint ownership. I am glad the minister has given no intimation that the government will pay heed to such a proposal. We have got into trouble already by making an arrangement with the United States, and if you allow joint ownership of a single mile or a single inch in our territory for the purpose of navigation, you might as well give the Americans the whole country. If they had joint ownership they would have the right to police it, and if they had the right to police it and line it with their troops, they would pretty soon own it. This government has had warnings enough and I do not think they need more, but I solemnly warn them not to enter into any arrangement of that kind. If it is necessary in the interests of the trade of the North American continent that a canal should be built, let us, poor as we are, build it ourselves. With 8,000,000 population we are in the position of the toad under the hat, but Sir, when we are 20,000,000 people in Canada, we can treat with any nation in the world on equal terms, which we do not at present. Let us keep to ourselves what belongs to us; let us keep our waterways and our navigation system for ourselves, and then we can virtually control the destiny of the whole North American continent. Now, to build the Georgian Bay canal it will we are told cost about $120,000,000 as estimated by the engineers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A little over $100,000,000.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Well, we will put it at the extreme and say $120,000,000, and to build the new Welland canal into Lake Ontario, it would cost about $40,000,000. To build the Georgian Bay canal it would take about 12 years, and five years to build the other canal, the great cost of that work being the deepening and locking of the St. Lawrence river from Kingston to Montreal. The minister is right in having a thorough survey made. Time is a very important thing in transportation and if by any modern engineering device we can save hours and hours in locking, we will divert the traffic to that route. I would advise the minister to make the locks large and, although I do not know how the lift lock we have constructed, is working, something of that kind might be adopted to save time. If you are bound to build the Welland canal from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario, see that it is done on the best possible lines and on the most modern engineering principles. What is the object of getting freight from Lake Erie into Lake Ontario. If you have to scow it from Kingston down to Montreal cannot you carry it by boat or scow as easily as they do now from Port Colborne to Montreal. What is the great advantage of building a canal into Lake Erie unless you continue it down to ocean navigation. I can see no advantage for my part, and if the minister is going

to adopt that scheme the $5,000,000 we have spent on elevators and deepening the harbour at Port Colborne will be entirely wasted. That canal if built, will be a mutual benefit to Canadians and to Americans, and does the minister not realize what a large percentage of the traffic from west to east now goes via New York. That cannot be, because the facilities are not good in Montreal because we are told the capacity of Montreal harbour is two or three times greater than the present requirements. I believe, Sir, that the whole effort and energy of Canada should be directed towards intercommunication between the different portions of the Dominion. Without social intercourse, without commerce, without trade between the different provinces you need not have a Dominion at all. What we want to build up in the maritime provinces, in Quebec, and in Ontario, is a feeling of sympathy with the people of the Canadian west so that we may trade between each other, we taking as much as we can of their surplus products, and they buying what we manufacture. Let us have a closer union between all the people of Canada so that we may build up on this northern part of the continent a strong and prosperous nation, which I believe to be the aspiration of every young man in this country. What was it that brought our fathers to the territory north of the St. Lawrence, cold and inhospitable as it was then thought, in comparison with the land they left. Why did they come here, if not with a determination that they and their children and their children's children should build up here a portion of that mighty British Empire of which they were so proud. And that Sir, I believe to be the destiny of the Canadian people.

That ought to be the object, and, as my hon. friend says, it can only be done by improving the means of intercommunication between the different parts of this Dominion. I will not trouble you with many details, but I would like to place upon 'Hansard' my reasons for thinking that the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal will be a great benefit to the people of this country. The waterway will pass from Lake Huron at the northeast corner of the Georgian bay, and, following the French river, Lake Nipissing, the Mattawa and Ottawa rivers, will enter the St. Lawrence river at Montreal. In this manner connection will be made between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic ocean for large vessels up to 13,000 tons capacity. The canal will be 440 miles long, 22 feet deep, with a minimum width at the bottom of 200 feet. The rise and fall of the land will be overcome by 25 locks, each 650 feet long. I may state, too, that the whole of the excavation in this 440 miles will not be more than in the neighbourhood of about 25 miles. There may be a little dredging of 25 or 30 miles more, but the water between these excavations is deep, where a vessel can sail at full speed just as she can on the lakes. This was the route by which the people belonging to the Hudson Bay Company, Champlain and others travelled to the northwest; it was the old Indian route, and the shortest route from the east to the upper lakes and Hudson bay. I have not had the pleasure, like the hon. Minister of Railways, of living for any great length of time on the banks of the River St. Lawrence, but though I have a strong feeling of sympathy for that river, I am not speaking from sympathy, but from what I believe in my inmost soul to be in the interest of the people of this country, when I say that we shall never obtain the development we ought to obtain until we build that canal. I do not live near its banks. I am considering the future of this country, and the nation that commands that canal, secure from foreign interference unless by an act of war, will command the shortest possible route into the centre of this continent, and if we want to utilize our waterways we must build that canal. There is no railroad communication that can compete with water communication. You can carry freight by water for one-eighth per ton mile what you can by rail. It is the people's mode of transportation. It is true, companies may be formed to control transportation on water, as anywhere else, but any man can get a boat of his own. It is the mode of transportation that appeals to what the Minister of Finance speaks of as the horny-handed son of toil, as against the millionaire owner of railways and automobiles. Let us all unite to build this canal. It is not a political question, or one that ought to divide the parties in this House. We ought all to agree on some principle of developing this country. If we had used for this purpose some of the money that we have expended uselessly, as, for instance, the $50,000,000 which we have spent on capital account on the Intercolonial railway since 1897, the Georgian Bay canal would have been half finished at the present moment. This canal will give us, as I have said, a national waterway entirely within our own territory, far removed from the international boundary, and free from international complications, a waterway, which, under no conditions, can be used by the United States to assist them in wresting out of Canadian hands the trade of Canada's own Northwest, and it will secure, without possibility of competition, Canadian traffic for Canadian ports. It will foster existing and create new interprovincial trade both east and west, thus drawing closer the bonds of confederation and enormously increasing the national wealth and the power of the

whole Dominion. It will greatly reduce the cost of carrying grain. It will open up Canadian Lake Huron and Lake Superior ports to Nova Scotia coal, thereby providing a market for a Canadian product to the extent of over 3,000,000 tons a year. It will very much assist the shipping of grain in winter. It will assist in the development of a million horse-power. As the hon. minister says, the possession by the people of Canada of our enormous water-powers gives us the facilities for being the greatest manufacturing country in the world. There is no doubt the time will arrive when heat as well as power will be developed by electricity, and if we have no coal in this section of the country we have what is more than its equivalent, the power which will produce heat and everything else that coal will produce. Canada to-day is paying away to the United States millions of dollars annually, which ought to be retained in the country for the upbuilding of our own industries. If this is the case to-day, in a few years this state of affairs will be very much accentuated. Every Canadian will agree that Canadian grain exported to Europe should pass through Canadian channels, but what are the facts? In 1909, out of 56,000,000 bushels of Canadian-grown grain exported to Europe, 32,000,000 bushels, or 57 per cent, were carried over United States transportation routes for export at United States Atlantic seaports, which meant a loss to Canadian interests of over $2,000,000 for carriage alone. Why is this? There are many reasons. To state the matter briefly, the existing Canadian routes cannot handle this traffic either as cheaply, as quickly, or in such quantities as the United States routes can.

Take the St. Lawrence river route, this only carried in 1909, 18 per cent of the total grain exported from this country.

That is a disgrace to the country, a disgrace to the conditions of transportation in Canada. If it can be remedied only by the deepening of the St. Lawrence system, perfect that route, if it can be developed better by the plan I propose, build the Georgian Bay canal. I would not like to see the money of the country expended on that canal if I did not believe from the bottom of my heart that it is the cheapest, the best and the only plan by which we can control the exports of the Northwest, and of that part of the United States bordering on the Great Lakes.

We are paying to-day about $13,400,000 annually to the United States coal interests. The greatest portion of this could with proper transportation facilities be retained to our own people, although it might be necessary to put a higher duty on coal and that section of the country which I represent would perhaps suffer the most. Utilize the water-powers we have in this section of the country, do everything that is necessary for the industrial life of the country, encourage the growth in Canada of the necessaries of life, the building of machinery, and the development of every industry that can properly be carried on; finish all our products as nearly as possible to perfection before exporting them from this country. That is the policy that ought to be followed by this and every other government, and I thought it was the policy that was followed by my hon. friend. I might give reasons for the building of the Georgian Bay canal although the hour is late. But there is one thing that sticks out boldly and meets the view. We have surveys of the Georgian Bay canal, we know what it can be built for, we know that it will have the result of benefiting nearly every part of the country. It is not a party question, many of the foremost supporters of the project are on the minister's side of the House; let us unite and add one great scheme of water transportation from the Great Lakes. How the Americans see it! The President of the United States says that what is in the interest of the New York section of the country is the development of the waterways, and if possible the building up of oceanic communication, having ship communication between the Great Lakes and New York, if it is to retain even a moiety of the trade of that country. The Americans see that the only way to do this is not by building railways, but by the far cheaper mode of transportation with which Providence has so greatly favoured us, that of water communication. I earnestly entreat all my friends on both sides of the House—for I have arrived at the stage of life when I have no very bitter political opinions on any subject, I think perhaps good might come even from the Minister of Railways—and I ask him as I ask my friends on this side of the House to do all that they possibly can in developing what I think is of the greatest use to the people of this country.

The hon. gentleman talks about the Hudson Bay railway, and says he is going to build it for the small amount of $20,000,000, I presume exclusive of terminals and steamboat communication between Canada and the old country. The minister must have a power in this House when they talk so lightly of an expenditure of $20,000,000 as nothing at all, and the manner in which my friend introduced it showed that he expected no opposition to it. If he wanted no opposition he should have had a different report laid on the table of the House. His deputy and the gentlemen who examined and surveyed that section of the country reported that they found a good enough

route nearly fulfilling the description of my friend the late Mr. Wood, who in discussing the building of the Canadian Pacific railway spoke of Manitoba as being amongst the eternal snows, still further up amongst the avalanches of the eternal snows where woman's sweet voice is never heard nor even the hum of the mosquito. I hope the event will be as opposite to my prophecy as the result of the building of the Canadian Pacific railway has been to Mr. Wood's. The minister's deputy says we may expect a full traffic on the road for a couple of months in the year, and a less amount for three months. He is very chary about what we will have for the remainder of the year. Has the minister, before making an expenditure of $25,000,000, considered how the cost is to be repaid to the people of this country? If it is a thing of benefit that the people of the Northwest expect in cheapening transportation and increasing the value of their farms and products I would have no objection to it. I do not know what the result may be, but I once applied with some others for a charter to build a railway from Winnipeg to Hudson bay. Looking at the map that seems an elegant thing. There were a couple of rival charters, and we came to inquire into the navigation of Hudson bay. We found that the description was very much that of the deputy minister's report, that the navigation ends about October 15, and begins somewhere about the first of August. You would have two or three months of navigation during the year, but even two or three months, if possible and continuous, might be of immense benefit to the country. I remember when it was thought that the navigation of the St. Lawrence would be only four or five months in the year.

I hope to see the day in the near future when, under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries we shall have ice breakers in the St. Lawrence, so that the river may be navigable at least as far up as Quebec for about eleven months of the year. I believe that it is quite possible. And I hope the navigation of Hudson bay will be found such that the evil forebodings of the present may be dissipated. However, the Hudson bay scheme is a large undertaking—$25,000,000 spent for a purpose which is still not beyond the range of doubt. I think the deputy minister says that it is the same distance from La Pas to Churchill as from Winnipeg to Lake Superior. The calculation was made, when I was Minister of Railways, that it would be cheaper to take grain down by the Canadian Pacific railway to Port Arthur, ship it by water to Montreal and thence to Great Britain than to take it by way of Hudson bay. It would cost about the same to leave grain on the shore of Hudson bay as to leave it at Port Arthur. The advocates of the Hudson bay scheme said: You will be in a better position by four cents a bushel than you are at Port Arthur; from Port Arthur to Montreal, it will cost you four cents a bushel, and it will cost you as much from Montreal to Liverpool as from Nelson or Churchill to Liverpool. But it will cost double as much to take grain from Churchill to Liverpool, under any system and with any equipment now known to navigation, as to take grain from Montreal to Liverpool. The minister says that the steamers can be employed for five months in the year. But it was thought in my time that it would require specially constructed steamers, and that they could not be profitably employed for more than three months in the year. That may not be true to-day. All that information the minister should be possessed of before he enters upon this expenditure of $25,000,000; and when he is fully satisfied he should see to it that the thing is done in a way to bring the best results for the people of the great and growing west. For the time will come, development proceeding as at present, when the exports of that country will be immensely in excess of what they are now; and every effort of the people of this country should be put forth in the direction of providing means to carry our surplus products to market. If these products are not to go down by Lake Superior and Montreal, St. John, Halifax and Quebec to the mother country, then, let them go by way of Hudson bay. In any case, let the transportation be over our own routes. As I said before, the country that controls transportation of the surplus products controls political destiny. If our surplus is to go to a foreign country to build up foreign transportation systems and industries, then we may say good-bye to the dreams of our young men for the building up of this country. Your regulations in reference to grain inspection, elevators, and transportation will be useless, for, in case of certain events, which, I hope in my soul will not come to pass, we shall not have a bushel of wheat to put into these elevators and your regulations will be idle wind. I was speaking to-day with a man who is engaged up to the eyes in industries of that kind, and he has come to the conclusion that the industries in which he has such large investments are worthless under certain conditions. But I hope for better things; I hope that something will happen in the meantime to save our country from the disaster which might overwhelm it. And I hope the Minister of Railways will use his influence in that direction. He seems to take an interest in these subjects and studies them up; I must say he does as well as I could expect him to do under the circumstances: He does very well anyway.

Now, a few words as to the Intercolonial railway. You must remember one thing

in making comparisons with the past, and that is that you have added $50,000,000 to the capital account of the Intercolonial since 1867. So, if you are making a comparison of two or three years back you should add interest on that $50,000,000. We were promised beautiful results from the acquisition of the Drummond railway with the large expenditure on capital account that was involved. The predecessor of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Graham) gave glowing accounts of how this railway was to be no longer a backwoods railway but was to be a first class road with its terminals in a first class city. And what has been the result of all this? The minister does not even make mention of the past in this connection. And I think he is perfectly right, because after all, the people of Canada—certainly the young men of Canada—do not care a cent for anything that is more than four or five years old; they want something of the present and of the future, what the railway is doing and what it may be expected to do. The minister states that the Intercolonial affords the cheapest transportation of any railway on the continent. He makes comparisons with the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Northern, and, last of all with the Ontario system of railways. Does he think that a railway which has been in existence for about forty years should be compared in freight charges or anything else with a railway which has only been constructed and which is only struggling into existence as a backwoods road? Does he think that it is fair to make a comparison of freight and passenger rates with the Canadian Pacific railway? That road has a similar condition from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast. It is in great part what is called a mountain railway and has exceptional rates. And the Canadian Northern is in the same category. The only fair comparison is with the Grand Trunk. And the rates of freight on the Intercolonial, taking them all in all, are about the same as on the Grand Trunk. In all communications under twenty miles the passenger rates for both roads are practically the same.

I do not know the classification as to freights. What brings down the rate per ton per mile, even in the classification on the Intercolonial, are two or three exceptional things. One is the carriage of coal, which we carry at the least possible rate for the purpose of fostering that industry. The other is the carriage of timber, sawn lumber and shingles, which are carried at a very low rate. But for ordinary traffic, I make the statement in this House that the rate for passenger traffic between way stations on the Intercolonial is as high as the ordinary charge on any other railway. It is as high as the New York Central, as high as the Erie, as high as the Grand Trunk. It is not as high on the whole as on the Canadian Pacific railway or the Canadian Northern. The freight rates that apply in that country are fair freight rates, and so are the passenger rates. I think the minister ought to give other reasons for a shortage in the accounts, or for a failure to balance the two ends. There is one thing I am glad to see, and that is the prosperity in the maritime provinces, as shown by the traffic on the Intercolonial which they afford. In 1909 the collections amounted to $9,600,000, whereas the collections in 1897 were only about $3,000,000 a year. There must have been an enormous development in the wealth of the people of the maritime provinces to enable them to pay to the Intercolonial railway the amount they are now paying in collections.

The minister says that the railway is handicapped by water competition. Water communication between two points develops a trade which railroads cannot do, because you can carry freight by water communication for one-eighth of what it costs to carry it by railway. If you are to build up industries, if you are to develop the resources of that country, you must have cheap communication, a cheap communication which the railroads cannot give. I congratulate the minister on the better showing the Intercolonial is making. It is to the interest of the people of Canada that that road should be prosperous, and that the maritime provinces should be prosperous. It is more necessary now than ever that the central and western provinces should have the closest alliance with our sister provinces down by the sea. The fate of this Dominion depends upon the existence of a similarity of ideas between the people of middle and western Canada with the inhabitants of the maritime provinces. This is absolutely necessary to enable us to build up the nationality on which we have all set our hearts. Mr. Speaker, I have a good many more things that I wish to say, and I may take another opportunity of outlining my scheme for the development of transportation in Canada.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). I trust that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) who has just taken his seat will not regard me as displaying any lack of courtesy if I fail to follow him in his remarks. Let me say that I share with him in his enthusiasm for the development of a transportation system in this country. I join with the greatest pleasure in his support of the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, which I think deserves immediate consideration at the hands of the government, and which is absolutely necessary in the interests of every part of this country. I am sure the House listened with a great deal of pleasure to the remarks of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) in his review of the condition of the Intercolonial railway. On this side of the House we all regard with the greatest respect the vener-

able representative of Lanark, who in days past has filled the position of Minister of Railways, and who enjoys in a high degree the esteem and respect of those who sit on the right hand of the Speaker.

Now, let me refer briefly to some phases of the situation in regard to the Intercolonial as outlined by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham). Let me say, as I said last year, that I think the surplus which the minister makes out as somewhere in the vicinity of $700,000, is about $650,000 too large, and I will give my reason for saying so. It is a reason not generally understood at first sight; but let me point out that when you make a comparison in the operation of the Intercolonial with the operation of any company road in this country, there is a marked difference between the application of the revenues. At the close of the financial year of any company, if they have a surplus of a million or two, that money is available during the succeeding year for the purpose of renewals, extensions or repairs which are necessary in the interest of revenue. Not so in the case of the Canadian government railway. On the 31st of March next it will be the duty of the accountant of the Railway Department to place to the credit of the Receiver General of this Dominion that surplus of $700,000. It has gone forever from the Intercolonial, it is not available in the succeeding year for any purpose for the improvement of the road. The reason I say that the surplus of $650,000 is too large, is for that reason to begin with, but let me give you another reason. The Intercolonial railway was an interprovincial work. As my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) well knows, it was one of the propositions that was essential at the time of confederation, included in the British North America Act as one of the very conditions upon which these four provinces decided to group themselves together to form the nucleus which was in time to be the Canada of to-day. It was not on account of it benefiting merely the people of the maritime provinces that the expenditure for that road was contemplated or made, but it was made for the unity and benefit of Canada as a whole. When you come to consider the Intercolonial railway you are coming to deal with a proposition which intrinsically differs from that of any other railway in the Dominion. Had you had no Intercolonial railway you never would have had any confederation. It is at the very basis of the whole system, quite as essential as one of the corner stones of the edifice which was afterwards constructed as any of the other provisions fought for and discussed at great length in arriving at the terms of the British North America Act. It is in the same position as the canals which were constructed in the central portion of Canada and which were then taken over. It was what the transportation system by water was to the centre of Canada; it was essential that we should have communication with the different parts of Canada in order to make confederation a possibility.

The minister has told us the amount which has been expended upon the Intercolonial railway since that time, and which is somewhere in the vicinity, according to the last railway returns, of $82,000,000. During the same period there has been expended $96,000,000 on account of the canals. I am aware that this argument has been made before in this House, but I may be pardoned if I refer to it again. There is this difference, that while nobody in this country expects any revenue from the canals, while they are run absolutely free, while no tolls are charged on the traffic that goes through them, and nobody wants to have tolls charged, we have this remarkable fact that it is regarded as a sin and a disgrace that the minister does not come in and announce a great big surplus on the Intercolonial railway. For that reason, and on account of these conditions, the surplus is altogether too large. If government ownership is of any value, why should it be that the people who are operating a government utility, and more particularly a government utility of that peculiar character, it being an ante-confederation essential, be expected to show a large surplus? That $650,000 of a surplus cannot be used for capital expenditure if it is not spent before the 31st of March of this year, it goes into the treasury and is voted out again by way of capital, if not for revenue. Now, it is a gratifying thing, as the ex-minister has said, that the development of the maritime provinces has produced a condition of affairs in which the road has a revenue three times what it was worth fourteen or fifteen years ago. The extension of the road from Quebec to Moncton was one of the essential things which contributed to that condition. The original road consisted of the smallest kind of a local proposition, ending at Rivière du Loup. Gradually it was extended to Quebec; only within the last twelve years has it run to Montreal, and even to-day it is a local road. It does not share in any of the advancement which has come to western Canada, or to the largest province in the Dominion—Ontario. We never tap directly any part of your business, simply because, when it comes to Montreal, the Intercolonial railway can only get what the Grand Trunk railway or the Canadian Pacific railway give it, and what it gathers from the other railways, local or large as they may be. Being only a local road on that account, that the country should be clamouring for a surplus of half a million, or of any amount, is altogether absurd. It seems to me that

the proper view to take of this proposition is that if this road is run so that both ends meet and the country is not called upon to contribute anything for any deficit that may arise you have a proper condition of affairs with regard to the Intercolonial railway. The minister deserves to be congratulated upon the intelligent appreciation of events from the railway standpoint which he has displayed in dealing with railways. But there are one or two things to which I want to call his attention. It is no answer for my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, or for myself as the representative of a constituency supporting him, to go to a district in my county which has had a telegraph station for the last twenty-five years, and which was closed up a year ago, and say: It is true that you have had your station closed up and you have not now the facilities which you have had for twenty-five years, but we have a surplus of $700,000, which goes into the treasury, and which is no good to the Intercolonial railway after March 31. I say that there is a situation where my hon. friend could use a surplus. That is a simple case. Why take away the facilities which have existed in the past, when, by this small expenditure, the whole country would not be affected in any way whatever, and you would have a substantial condition under which both ends would meet?

With regard to the question of freights, my hon. friend the minister produced figures which, as the ex-Minister of Railways says, require a good deal of study to ascertain just what they really mean. There has been an increase of freights on the Intercolonial railway in the last three or four years. With regard to certain local freights for short distances, the freight rates are rather too onerous. It must be remembered that the real manufacturing, or producing, portion of the Intercolonial railway is the extreme eastern part of it, and that there are intermediate agricultural districts which do not produce exportable manufactured articles, or any articles upon which high classification exists. Therefore, it is difficult to make a comparison with the business of other railways, or to ascertain accurately just how these rates work out when applied to the trade of the people who use the railway the most. But it does seem to me, having regard to the premise that I have attempted to lay down and having regard to all the conditions, that it should not be expected that a surplus should be obtained from this road. It may be said it is an anomaly that a representative of the people should stand up in parliament and say with regard to an important public utility that you should find fault with the size of the surplus. But Sir, I seriously contend that the proposition I make is absolutely sound, and that it cannot be questioned from any reasonable standpoint.

There is another thing with regard to the administration of the road that I would like to take the opportunity of referring to. The men who are working on the Intercolonial railway are servants of the Crown, and they ought to be treated as servants of the Crown. When increases in wages are to be given they should be given by the government through the minister, and by the minister through his officials, having proper regard to the best administration of the road. The minister should not give assent to the proposition that conciliation boards would be appointed for the determination of such questions on the Intercolonial railway. Not long ago I was told by the government in answer to a question, a fact which I well knew, that there was no statute which provided for a conciliation board in connection with the Intercolonial railway. Suppose that in the Marine Department the right of the servants of the Crown to strike is recognized (and that is the basis of the Conciliation Act), and you are going to assume they will strike, by appointing a conciliation board, (which is another feature of the Conciliation Act), you have from every standpoint of the administration of the law a most anomalous position. Suppose our friends the men of our fishery cruisers made up their minds when they came to port that they were not getting enough wages, and some enterprising gentleman who was interested in promoting these boards came along and said: Demand an increase of wages from the minister, and if he does not give it have a conciliation board, and the whole operation of the ships was dependent upon the decision of that board, how absurd the situation would be. But it is no more absurd than it is in the case of the Intercolonial railway, because every man working on the Intercolonial railway is a servant of the Crown, and he accepts employment as such, and if he wants to have the advantages which accrue from company operation of a road he should seek employment on a company road. The responsibility of determining what should be done in regard to the servants of the Crown whether employed on a railway or elsewhere, should be exercised by the responsible minister. Suppose the minister had to announce to parliament that by reason of a decision of a conciliation board which compelled him to pay $100,000 more to a certain class of employees there was a deficit on the road, parliament would have a perfect right to say that the minister had no business to accept the decision of such a board, because it does not bind parliament.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Could not the minister delegate his powers to a conciliation board and ask it to make inquiry?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). That is another thing altogether. I say that the minister acting through his commission who are the best judges in this matter ought in proper cases to increase the salaries of the employees, and whether he did so or not he should assume the responsibility. There is another thing in connection with this comparison between the Intercolonial railway and the Canadian Pacific railway, and the Grand Trunk railway; the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk railway have ocean connections, they have steamers in connection with their railway, they have booking agencies in Europe and every facility for inducing passengers to take their lines, all of which the Intercolonial railway does not possess. Our industries in the maritime provinces seriously complain that ocean steamers will carry iron and steel and other commodities from Liverpool right across the ocean and as far west as Toronto, and that the freight including steamer and railway will be less than the industries in the maritime provinces have to pay for the transportation of similar articles for the land journey alone. Why that should be I do not know, but it is a thing the minister should look into.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Did we not give the commission power to control the rates on railways and ocean connections?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Not the steamship rates. The question was discussed, but it never was legislated upon. Now, in the last parliament attention was directed to a proposition that the British preference should be extended to only such goods as were brought to Canada through Canadian ports, and hon. gentlemen opposite who three or four years ago took strong ground against that because they wished to get their goods through New York and Boston rather than through Halifax and St. John in winter are the men who to-day are very much excited about the danger to Canadian autonomy and Canadian loyalty, because they claim that under the agreement with the United States goods are likely to go through American ports. These are the men who four years ago opposed a resolution proposed in this parliament by a Nova Scotia member which said that the British preference should only be given to goods which came in through Canadian ports. If, such a regulation were put in force and Canadian imports went through the maritime province ports in winter we would have an advantage for the Intercolonial railway which we have never had since it was built.

Mr. BEATTIE. The maritime ports were objected to because when goods were landed in them, it was two weeks before they reached upper Canada. I know that from my own experience. I shipped my goods for many years through New York and Boston simply on account of the delay in the lower Canadian ports. That was the whole trouble.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). I do not feel like giving to my hon. friend from London the retort I might.

Mr. BEATTIE. Do not be afraid.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). There are some gentlemen so excited about sending goods through American ports that their loyalty ought surely to be strong enough to permit them to wait a week or two in order to get their goods through Canadian ports.

Mr. BEATTIE. Sometimes three weeks.

Mr. FIELDING. What is three weeks for the sake of the old flag?

Mr. BEATTIE. I have been in the field sixteen weeks for the flag. If you are in business, and your customers want goods, and you cannot get them by one route you must have them brought in by the other.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). I do not want to be turned into that discussion, further than to say that I hope that our good friends on the other side will now be found supporting us on this side when we ask the government to put into effect legislation which will give us trade through Canadian ports not only in summer, but for the whole twelve months of the year and satisfied they can get them as quickly through our ports as through New York or Boston. That it seems to me would afford one solution of the Intercolonial railway problem.

Mr. STAPLES. Why did not the government, who had the majority behind them, put it into effect?

Mr. MACDONALD. Because certain business interests of the country, some of whom are allied very closely with my hon. friend and his associates, represented that it would be such an injury to them that the government did not carry out the request made to them by gentlemen on this side of the House. If the hon. gentleman looks at 'Hansard,' he will find the names of the gentlemen who made that complaint.

Mr. GRAHAM. Some of the Toronto gentlemen who are making the greatest noise now came to me and asked me not to do it, as they wanted their goods to come in by way of New York.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am speaking as a Canadian who comes from the maritime provinces, and I say that the problem of

railway transportation in this country will not be solved until we see the necessity of applying that preference so as to give the advantage to Canadian ports the whole year round. Following the same line, I think that many of these discussions in parliament would be saved and a great many heart-burnings on the question of the Intercolonial railway would be avoided, if our transcontinental systems were extended to the extreme limit of Canada and were permitted to operate on the lines of railway which are now called the Intercolonial. In the statute which provides for the construction of the Transcontinental railway, there is a covenant under which running rights over the Intercolonial from Moncton east, are accorded to the Grand Trunk Pacific upon arrangements to be effected. Here is the Canadian Pacific railway at St. John, and we have on our Atlantic coast, some 200 or 300 miles nearer to Liverpool, available ports which can be reached at all seasons of the year without any difficulty. Therefore, it seems to me that it would be in the interests of Canadians that the Canadian Pacific railway should also be given the right to run freight and passenger trains over the rails of the Intercolonial railway under conditions fair to the country and to the company. If in this way we had immediate connection with the various transcontinental lines, so that a man in the extreme east of Canada could go on any one of our transcontinental lines to the extreme west, and come back on any one of them without that dislocation which necessarily exists as an impediment to traffic when you have to transfer from one railway to another, and go into the division of payments and the allocations of freight incident thereto, it seems to me that the maritime provinces would be satisfied, and the whole interests of Canada would be advanced.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). We had that in 1897. The Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific railway both had running rights over the Intercolonial.

Mr. MACDONALD. I think my hon. friend must be mistaken. The Canadian Pacific railway trains still run on the Intercolonial between St. John and Halifax, under a working arrangement with the government; but these are really government railway trains making connection with the Canadian Pacific railway at St. John.

Mr. HAGGART. (Lanark). The hon. gentleman will remember that the late Mr. Blair, when Minister of Railways, pointed out the monstrosity of the agreement which the late government had made with the Canadian Pacific railway, giving it running power over the Intercolonial to Halifax.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They took the cream of the local traffic.

Mr. RHODES. According to the Minister of Railways, there is no cream down there.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am one of the younger men who look to the future rather than to the past, and I trust that the minister will regard favourably the proposition which I make, which would afford the people of my province the advantages of these transcontinental railway systems. From the point of view of trade and transportation, an immediate connection with the various transcontinental lines operated through the whole of Canada would be an advantage which it is desirable to obtain if it is possible to obtain it on fair terms.

Mr. C. A. MAGRATH (Medicine Hat). I do not intend to deal with any of the questions that have been dealt with by the Minister of Railways, or those who have followed him. The railway question is a very important question in western Canada. Ever since I have been in this House I have not been in sympathy with the methods that are employed here in the granting of railway charters. I remember very distinctly my first visit to the Railway Committee, a little over two years ago, when certain interests were looking for a charter for a railway through the constituency which I represent in this House. I remember asking the gentleman who had charge of the Bill, what his clients proposed doing, when they proposed doing it, and the amount of money they proposed expending. He was very emphatic in his answers. He told me that they were going to commence work at a very early date, that they practically had the money arranged for. I suggested that it would not be amiss to ask those interested to put up say 5 per cent as a guarantee of good faith. The committee did not, however, appear to see eye to eye with me in that respect. Now, I have heard it said in this House that we should not demand from people applying for railway charters any evidence of their good intentions—that there was free trade in railway charters.

Now, I wish to point out to the House the situation in the west. Settlers are going many miles from railway lines. They learn of these charters being granted, and the moment they are granted they begin to look forward to the construction of the roads, and it is easily understood that they are disappointed when year after year passes by and they do not get any portion of the roads for which the charters have been granted. Those interests come back here and get renewals of charters. I remember asking two years ago for a return showing the mileage for which railway charters

were granted outside of the three active railway-builders in this country. Between the years 1900 and 1907 we granted charters for a total mileage of something like 37,000 miles, of which something in the neighbourhood of 400 miles were constructed. In the first session that I was here, two years ago, we dealt with some 56 charters, of which 43 were renewals, and 13 new applications. Last year we dealt with 52 charters; 37 were renewals and 15 new applications. I understand that there is a Bill before the Senate which is designed to improve that situation. It appears to me that the question of improving the method of granting charters in this country is a matter that should be dealt with entirely by the government. After the charter is granted the next move is for the railway company to file its route map. That is done with the Department of Railways. I have been present when the Minister of Railways has dealt with these route maps, and I must say, in fairness to him, that he deals fairly with those who come before him. The moment, however, that these route maps are approved, the information goes back to the country where the people are and then they believe, knowing the procedure which is that the maps of location have to be filed with the Railway Department and that these plans cannot depart more than one mile from the line as shown on the route map, they believe they know where that railway is to be constructed, they make their plans, they have been known to buy land and locate along the line where the route is shown on the route map and then we have instances in which these active railway corporations, I know that the Canadian Northern, and I know that the Canadian Pacific railway have come back with amended plans which they present to the Minister of Railways for reconsideration. The minister gives us notice and we are permitted to be present at the time, but in that immense country it is impossible to get at the people in sufficient time to see to what extent they have been led to locate along the line as shown upon the route map. No railway company can undertake to lay down a route on a map from which they cannot deflect more than one mile without making a survey of that route, and I say that something should be done to give these railways to understand that when they come here with their route maps for approval these route maps have to stand or if they are to be allowed to change their route maps and have them amended from time to time I think it would be better to do away with route maps altogether. I know two or three cases where serious injury has been done to individuals in that way, the route map has been changed some six or seven miles. I feel that it is my duty to bring this matter to the attention of the minister in the way I am now doing.

Mr. MAGRATH.

I would say a few words on the general question of railway development in western Canada. What is the situation, for instance, in southern Alberta, and all over the west. We invite settlers to come into that country; they take up our lands, they go very many miles from railways in order to get those lands. The constant cry which I have been receiving from my constituency ever since I have been in this House has been: When are we to receive better railway facilities? Had I known this question was coming up I would have collected some of these letters and placed them on record. We have three active railways operating in that country. They bring into the country large sums for the building of railways. I claim that the railway mileage is not distributed over that country so as to do the greatest good to the greatest area in the shortest possible time. No one would question that statement who knows anything about the situation in that country. I claim that these railways are, to a certain extent, jockeying each other. One railway comes into a certain locality, and the two others appear to think it is necessary that they should come in and run alongside of it. I claim that we have railways bonused, or with bonds guaranteed by the people, running within two or three miles of each other. My view is that as one railway invades a certain territory the other comes in behind it, and possibly the third behind that, and if by any accident there should be a few townships left the first loops back and gets in behind the other two. That is a problem the Department of Railways might take hold of. I see no reason why the Minister of the Interior, who is looking after the lands in that country, should not associate himself with the Minister of Railways and get the heads of the active railways here at the beginning of the year and discuss with them their plans for the current year, and by that means endeavour to get them to spread their energies over a larger territory. For instance, in southern Alberta the Canadian Pacific railway is in the best position to, in a measure, meet the needs of that part of the west, whilst in some other parts of the country the Grand Trunk would be best able to supply better facilities, and the Canadian Northern, in all probability, could pick up another section of country. Then, when these roads had fairly met the needs of the several districts, they could invade the territory of each other as fully as they wished. I venture to question if the Minister of Railways, having given us vast masses of statistics here to-day, is in a position to cite to this House what the Canadian Pacific railway is going to build in the prairie provinces this year, or the Canadian Northern, or the Grand

Trunk Pacific. I have been here for two years, and I have never been able to get information of that character. It is all very well to be looking over our shoulder at the past and gathering information of the character we have been receiving to-day from the minister I would like to see more interest taken by looking into the future and knowing something of what these roads propose doing and where. They receive charters from the people. I am not here as being opposed to railway corporations. I believe in bringing the railways and the people together. The farmers cannot do without the railway any more than the railway can do without the farmers. The cry of the farmer in the west is that he is not getting proper attention in that respect. I hope that the minister will take my suggestions in the spirit in which they are given. This is not a political question at all, and I merely say I feel we should know more about what these railway companies are doing, and I see no reason why the government should not, at the beginning of each year, find out from those roads what they are doing, and at the same time endeavour to pull them apart thereby distributing their energies, because looking at their work in the west, it appears that they appear to wish to run in the same channel.

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

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up on Monday?

Mr. FIELDING. It was arranged that the motion for Supply should be made, and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) would make a statement concerning the affairs of his department. This was arranged between the Minister of the Interior and the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. U. Wilson). That hon. gentleman expressed a desire that the minister should make a statement very much in line with that which the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) made to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. And if the House goes into Committee of Supply?

Mr. FIELDING. We shall proceed with the estimates of the Minister of the Interior.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.38 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 13, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PULP WOOD EXPORTS.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I desire to put in an amended answer to a question asked by Mr. Paquet and reported at page 2732 of unrevised 'Hansard.' We made a mistake in putting in the figures of the total export, while the question related only to the exports to the United States alone. The question was as follows:

Mr. PAQUET:

1. To what amount in money did we export pulp wood to the United States during the fiscal years 1908-9 and 1909-10?
2. To what amount in money did we export wood pulp to the United States in 1908-9 and 1909-10?
3. To what amount of money did we export paper to the United States in 1908-9 and 1909-10?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The exports of pulp wood from Canada to the United States during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1909, amounted to $4,356,-391; and during the fiscal year 1910 to $6,-076,628.
2. The exports of wood pulp from Canada to the United States during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1909, amounted to $3,064,819; and during the fiscal year 1910 to $4,175,309.
3. The exports of paper from Canada to the United States during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1909, amounted to $958,-870; and during the fiscal year 1910 to $1,-297,052.

LORD STRATHCONA—CORRECTION. OF ERRONEOUS REPORT.

On the orders of the day being called.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I crave permission to lay before the House a cable received last Saturday from Lord Strathcona in regard to a statement made by an hon. member of this House in the course of the discussion on reciprocity:

London, March 11, 1911.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Premier,
Ottawa.

The statement attributed to me by Mr. Goodeve in the House of Commons, Ottawa, on ninth instant, as reported in to-day's London 'Times' by their Ottawa correspondent that I had said 'that Canadian ministers had been hypnotized by the brilliance of the American offer and had fallen into a trap,' is

entirely baseless and without foundation in fact. It is unwarranted by anything I have ever said in connection with the reciprocity agreement which I have refrained from discussing. Will you kindly make this known in the House.

STRATHCONA.

DOMINION DEVELOPMENT RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 113) to incorporate the Dominion Development Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

Mr. McCRANEY. I have been spoken to by the promoter of this Bill who tells me that there has been some discussion with regard to the name. He consents to the name being changed to the British Columbia and Central Canada Railway Company. I move that the section be so amended.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Has there been notice of the proposed amendment?

Mr. McCRANEY. I am not aware of that. If there has not been notice, I suppose it would be better that the Bill should stand.

Mr. PERLEY. This matter was discussed at the Railway Committee, where the desire was expressed that the name should be altered, and I understand that the parties are agreed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the change of name is a greater amendment than should be allowed without notice.

Mr. SPROULE. As I understand it, the name could not be changed by the committee, but only by the House, and such changes are usually made in the last stages of the Bill and notice is not required.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is it not customary to change these names on the third reading?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the change would require to be made in the committee, as the name is given in the section of the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let it stand, and this proposed change of name can stand as a notice.

Progress reported.

THE GLOBE PRINTING COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 121) respecting the Globe Printing Company.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

Mr. BLAIN. Seeing this is in connection with the Toronto 'Globe,' I think we should have some explanation of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. GRAHAM. The 'Globe' is generally able to explain itself. This Bill relates to matters of internal economy—not political economy—in the management of the business of this company. The Bill affects only the shareholders who are thoroughly protected.

On subsection 3 of section 3: Increase of capital stock.

Mr. SPROULE. It has always occurred to me that there is something defective in the manner of allotting stock. This provides that the directors may make by-laws to allot stock, and it has this redeeming feature that these by-laws must be confirmed by the shareholders. I think the Bill ought to go further and provide that when stock is to be allotted it should be allotted according to the present holdings. There is nothing in this or in any of these Acts to prevent the directors allotting that stock to any one they choose although, the stock may be worth much more than par. The only time at which the shareholders could discuss the allotment of stock would be when they were asked to confirm the by-law, and I do not know if a discussion at that time would be effective.

Mr. NESBITT. I think subsection 3 of section 2 covers that.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). It is only in the event of default being made as to the manner of allotting stock in the by-law.

Mr. BARKER. If subsection 3 is not acted upon in the mode prescribed the directors may do as they please.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The by-law has to receive the consent of two-thirds of the number of shareholders.

Mr. SPROULE. A by-law is submitted for the approval of the shareholders. Once the by-law is approved the shareholders have no control over it whatever, and the directors can go on and allot the stock as they see fit.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the Imperial Traction Company—Mr. Rankin.

Bill (No. 110) respecting the People's Railway Company—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 130) for the relief of Matilda Emo.—Mr. Hodgins.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 133) to incorporate the Alberta-Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Rutan.

Bill (No. 134) to incorporate the Canadian Inter-Mountain Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 135) respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ST. JOHN HARBOUR.

* Mr. DANIEL:

1. How many cubic yards of material has the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company removed under their Beacon Bar contract in St. John Harbour, and at what cost?
2. What quantity has been removed since March 31, 1910, to the present time, and at what cost?
3. How many square feet of area under this contract has been dredged to a depth of 32 feet, L.W.S.T.?
4. How long at present rate of progress will it take to finish contract?
5. Is it the intention of the department to require employment of more dredges of capacity of 'Cynthia,' or greater, to hasten completion of this work?
6. Is the dredging work being done at outer berth in Rodney Slip done as part of Beacon Bar contract, and at same prices?
7. If not done as part of Beacon Bar contract and the prices of that contract, at what prices is the work being done?
8. Were tenders called for the dredging at Rodney Slip? If not, why not?
9. How many cubic yards of material has been removed from this locality, Rodney Slip, and how many more have to be removed to complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Stand.

Mr. DANIEL. How long will it stand?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question involves the obtaining of a good deal of information. I am expecting it daily. I hope, within a day or two, to answer the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

* Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe):

1. What were the gross earnings per ton mile of freight moved on the Intercolonial railway last year?
2. What was the cost per ton mile for fuel?
3. What was the cost per ton mile for train crew?
4. What was the cost per ton mile for handling?
5. What was the cost per ton mile for overhead charges?
6. What were the gross earnings per passenger mile?
7. What was the cost of operations for passenger mile?
8. What was the cost for fuel, also for train crew for passenger mile?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Freight revenue per ton mile, in cents, .00561.
2. In cents, .00101.
3. Freight in cents, .00065.

4 & 5. The records are not kept in such a way as to get this information. The cost per ton mile of operating expenses (freight) less road enginemen, freight, road trainmen, freight and fuel less road locomotives is in cents, .00368.

6. Passenger revenue per passenger mile, in cents, .01711.
7. In cents, .01937.
8. The cost of fuel (passenger) per passenger mile, in cents, .00273. Cost of train crews (passenger) per passenger mile, in cents, .00274.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

* Mr. LENNOX:

1. In the figures given by the Minister of Railways as the total cost of the eastern division of the Transcontinental railway, down to the 31st December, 1910, viz., $93,920,956.10, is there anything included for interest? If so, what sum?
2. Is there anything included in respect of the Quebec bridge? If so, how much?
3. From what sources does the government obtain the money?
4. If by loans, how much money has been borrowed, in what sums, at what dates, and at what rates of interest?
5. How has the interest been met, out of revenue, out of borrowed capital, by new loans, or in what way?
6. What is the total amount paid to date for interest?
7. What sums have been paid in placing the loans, for agents' fees, commissions, brokerage charges, and other expenses of this kind?
8. Does the Railway Commission make all payments? If so, what is the total amount furnished or transferred by the government to the Commission to 31st December, 1910, and how much since?
9. What is the total amount to the 31st December, 1910, debited against this eastern division in the books of the Department of Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, or in the books of the Department of Finance, and what is the total amount debited in the books of the Railway Commission?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. No.
2. No.
3. Partly from revenue and partly from proceeds of loans.
4. No loan was issued for the National Transcontinental railway exclusively. Two 3½ per cent loans 1930-50 were issued,—one dated February, 1908, for £3,000,000 (or

$14,600,000 currency), to provide for maturing liabilities and obligations in connection with the construction of the National Transcontinental railway and for other purposes; and one, dated October, 1908, for £5,000,000 (or $24,333,333.33 currency), for obligations in connection with the construction of the National Transcontinental railway and for other purposes.

5. Interest on all loans is paid out of revenue and charged to 'interest on public debt.'

6. The total amount of interest paid to date on the two loans referred to, being for National Transcontinental railway and other purposes, as stated is $3,534,366.65.

7. $947,689.50 for the two loans referred to in answer to question No. 4.

8. Yes, by means of Letters of Credit obtained from the Finance Department through the Department of Railways and Canals. On such Letters of Credit the Commission drew to 31st December, 1910, $89,553,740.32, and from that date to 6th March, 1911, $3,863,244.83.

9. In the books of the Transcontinental Commissioners $89,553,740.32. In the books of the Departments of Finance and Railways and Canals, $87,556,522.47. The difference of $1,997,217.85 is accounted for by the system of Letters of Credit payments under which expenditures made by departments are not brought to account in the books of the Finance Department until the beginning of the month following the one in which the expenditure is made by Letter of Credit cheques.

ADULTERATION OF MAPLE SUGAR.

* Mr. MONK:

1. Is it the intention of the government during the present session, to amend the Foods Adulteration Act so as to protect those engaged in the maple syrup and maple sugar industry, against the alleged adulterations of their products, which is said to be openly carried on, to the detriment of their business and the public interest?

2. Will the government cause a proper inspection of maple syrups and sugar to be made, so as to prevent the alleged frauds at present said to be carried on by the marketing of imitations and compounds, which seriously interferes with the progress of the maple industry?

3. What steps has the Minister of Agriculture taken to satisfy, in regard to the above, the petition presented to him by the 3,200 farmers engaged in the said industry?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. It is not the intention to introduce during the present session an amendment to the Adulteration Act for the reason that the provisions of that Act as now constituted, together with the establishment of standards which are now being prepared, provide all the machinery necessary for the protection of the industry referred to.

2. The Department of Inland Revenue purposes having a proper inspection of maple syrups and sugars made this year as it has done in many cases in the past.

3. The Minister of Agriculture states that he has no knowledge of the petition referred to.

LORNEVILLE WHARF.

Mr. DANIEL:

1. Have tenders been asked for the building of an extension to the wharf at Lorneville, St. John county, N.B.?

2. If so, who were the tenders and what was the amount of each tender?

3. Has any tender been accepted? If so, who was the tenderer and what was the amount of the tender?

4. If no tender has been accepted and the work not proceeded with, what is the reason for the delay?

5. Is it considered that the necessity for the work no longer exists?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes, tenders were called for on October 25, 1910.

2, 3 and 4. Tender not yet accepted as information is being procured with a view to reducing the size and cost of the work.

5. No.

CHATHAM PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. DANIEL:

Referring to a statement of the Minister of Public Works with regard to the purchase of two lots of land for Chatham public building, one for $2,800 and the other for $200, as shown in the 'Revised Hansard,' page 1610, January 12, 1911, from whom were these lots purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. S. Johnson and the estate of the late James Kerr.

NIAGARA FALLS WATER-POWER.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Under the Statutes of Canada permitting development of power at Niagara Falls or on the Niagara river, what quantity of power has been developed?

2. Of the power developed on the Canadian side, what quantity can lawfully be exported to the United States?

3. Of the power developed on the Canadian side, what quantity is being exported to the United States, and what additional quantity is under contract for export?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1. The total quantity of power developed on the Niagara river at Niagara Falls is 272,000 horse-power.

2. Of the total power developed on the Canadian side 153,921 horse-power may be lawfully exported to the United States.

3. Of the power developed 72,628 horse-power was exported to the United States

during the fiscal year 1909-10. The department is not aware that any additional quantity is under contract for export.

TADOUSAC POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. MONK:

1. Who was, on the first day of January last, the postmaster of Tadousac, P.Q.?
2. Have the services of said postmaster been dispensed with? If so, on what date was he dismissed and for what specific reasons?
3. By whom was said postmaster replaced, on what date, and upon whose recommendation?
4. Was any petition sent to the government recommending, for the position, any other person than the one appointed?
5. Did the said petition contain more signatures than any other?
6. Is the new postmaster the son of the postmaster recently dismissed, and was the said son previously assistant postmaster?
7. Did the said son and assistant postmaster participate in the acts which brought about the dismissal of his father?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Mr. Eugene Caron.
2. The postmaster tendered his resignation, which was accepted. It became necessary to make a change in the postmastership, owing to the fact that the postmaster had made use of a stamp, which had already been used in prepayment of postage.
3. Mr. Joseph Eugene Caron was appointed to the office on the 6th instance, upon the recommendation of Mr. Joseph Girard, M.P.
4 and 5. One petition was received by the department in favour of Mr. Joseph Eugene Caron, signed by the parish priest and 58 of the most important citizens of Tadousac. Another petition in favour of Mr. August Gingras was addressed to Mr. Girard, M.P. 12 days afterwards, signed by 60 citizens, 20 of whom had already signed the petition in favour of J. E. Caron, and had not withdrawn their signatures therefrom. Therefore, the department concluded that there were 20 more names in favour of Caron.
6. The new postmaster is the son of the late postmaster, and the department is not aware that he was assistant postmaster.
7. No.

RECIPROCITY—COASTING LAWS; HOG QUARANTINE.

Mr. THORNTON:

1. If the proposed reciprocity agreement goes into effect, will the Canadian vessels under the United States coasting laws, be allowed to carry Canadian grown grain from Duluth to Buffalo, or from one American port to any other American port?
2. If the proposed reciprocity agreement is passed and goes into effect, what will the government do about removing the Canadian quarantine against American hogs?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. The proposed reciprocity agreement does not deal with the coasting laws of the United States in any manner.
2. Quarantine regulations are not affected by trade agreements. They depend upon the conditions as to the health of the countries respecting which they are made.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—HAY CARRIED FREE.

Mr. RHODES:

Has the Intercolonial railway ever carried hay free from Quebec or elsewhere to the maritime provinces? If so, when, for what reasons, what quantities were carried, and to whom were deliveries made?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.
2. 6th October, 1904, till 31st December, 1904.
3. On account of hay famine in eastern Nova Scotia and in portions of Quebec, and Prince Edward Island; it being represented that unless relief was afforded to the farmers in these districts, their live stock would either have to be slaughtered or would die of starvation. This was approved by order in council, dated January 18, 1905.
4. 1,691 cars were carried; deliveries being made to the municipalities of Pictou county, Colchester, Victoria, Antigonish, Inverness, Guysborough, Hants, Bonaventure and Gaspé.

A complete return, with all correspondence, in connection with this matter, was laid upon the table of the House of Commons on March 31, 1905.

THE COPYRIGHT LAW.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Did the government of Canada participate in the Imperial Copyright Conference of 1910?
2. Did the government agree to the memorandum of the proceedings of the said conference as presented to the Imperial House of Commons, and was a Bill for the consolidation and amendment of the law of copyright, embodying the conclusions of the said conference, introduced into the British House of Commons? If so, when and what has been the fate of the Bill?
3. Will the said Bill, when it becomes law, have effect and operation in Canada, or will it be necessary to pass an Act of the Dominion to give effect to such imperial Act?
4. If the government intends to pass an Act declaring the said Imperial Act to apply to Canada, when is the Act to be put into force with or without any modifications or additions? If so, what are such modifications and additions?

Mr. FISHER:

1. Yes.
2. Yes. 26th July, 1910. The dissolution of the imperial parliament prevented fur-

ther action on the Bill introduced. We have reason to believe that the Right Honourable Mr. Buxton, President of the Board of Trade, is introducing another Bill in this session of the imperial parliament. We have not yet received a copy of this Bill.

3. The Bill, as introduced, contained a provision that it should not extend to a self-governing dominion unless declared by the legislature of that dominion to be in force therein.

4. The government does not intend to introduce a Bill declaring the imperial Bill to apply to Canada, but does intend to introduce a Bill dealing comprehensively with the question of Copyright in Canada, and following on general lines the resolutions of the Imperial Conference.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—TOTAL COST.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. In the estimated amount, $55,786,000, required to complete the construction of the National Transcontinental railway, counting from 31st December last, is everything included; for instance, do these figures include amounts required for steel superstructure of bridges, right of way, ties, rails, fastenings, switches, stations, and divisional point buildings, engineering expenses, Red river bridge, locomotive shop, plant and equipment east of Winnipeg, and reservoir pumphouse and other buildings and structures there, entrance to and terminals at Winnipeg, terminals at Moncton and Quebec, expenses of and incidental to the commissioners, legal expenses and all other necessary expenditure before the road is handed over to the company; and what is the estimated amount to complete under each of these headings?

2. What was the cost under each of these headings down to the 31st December, 1910, and if there are any of these items not included in the $93,920,956.16 returned as cost to 31st December last, what are they?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think all that detail will be found in the 'Hansard' covered by a statement which I gave to the House.

Mr. LENNOX. The question might stand until I have time to look it over.

Mr. GRAHAM. Look and see if it is what you want.

MORMON PROPAGANDA.

*Mr. STANFIELD:

1. Is the government aware that a band of Mormon Elders are said to be travelling through Canada preaching their doctrines and endeavouring to obtain converts to their faith?

2. Is the government aware, that according to newspaper accounts, these men have obtained several converts in the city of Montreal?

3. In view of the fact that polygamy is contrary to the civil and moral law of this country, will the government take immediate steps to prevent these elders from preaching their doctrine and personally canvassing in order to obtain converts?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no information upon that subject.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY, EASTERN DIVISION.

Mr. LENNOX moved for:

A return prepared upon the lines of sessional papers No. 46i of the 26th April, 1909, relating to the eastern division of the Transcontinental railway, showing the actual expenditure upon each of the scheduled items upon each of the 21 contracts for construction of this division, down to the latest estimate made upon each contract, and the estimated quantity of work to be done and material to be furnished as to each of these items, and the estimated cost to complete the contract in each case.

He said: I may say to the Minister of Railways that if one of his officers would call on me I could probably tell him exactly the things I require, and it might save some work.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copy of all correspondence, telegrams, &c., during the past twelve months between Mr. E. J. Walsh, C.E., and the Minister or Department of Railways and Canals in regard to the Newmarket canal.—Mr. Wallace.

TREASURY BOARD MINUTES OF 30TH NOVEMBER, 1906.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called I want a little more information from the Minister of Finance if I can get it. I have a transcript of the Treasury Board minutes for November 30, 1906, and I would like the Minister of Finance to supplement it by having the hour at which the Treasury Board met, put upon it.

Mr. FIELDING. That cannot be done.

Mr. FOSTER. It cannot be done?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. FOSTER. 'Cannot' is a very hard word.

Mr. FIELDING. We would not be able to give my hon. friend that.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very important that it should be given. I do not see why it cannot be given. Perhaps the minister has a reason—the minister does not choose to answer.

Mr. FIELDING. I thought I did answer. I said I did not think it could be done. I did not mean to be discourteous.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has a reason?

Mr. FIELDING. No. I have no particular reason.

Mr. FOSTER. It is refused without a reason then. I would like also to ask the Minister of Finance if he has yet got the curator's report from the Yarmouth bank?

Mr. FIELDING. No. We have made a request to the Bankers' Association and I expect a statement.

Mr. FOSTER. The other day when the Minister of Finance was not here I put some additional questions on the 'Hansard.'

Mr. FIELDING. My attention has been called to that and I have given directions to the department to endeavour to meet the hon. gentleman's wishes so far as we can.

FISH HATCHERIES, EAST ELGIN.

Mr. MARSHALL. We have three very large fishing centres in East Elgin and the fishermen are very much handicapped for want of a fish hatchery. Is it the intention of the minister (Mr. Brodeur) to place a fish hatchery at one of these places?

Mr. BRODEUR. The matter has been under consideration, but, in as much as the revenues accruing from the fisheries are collected by the provincial government in Ontario, they claiming property rights in the fisheries and especially in the rivers under the judgment of the Privy Council, there is some difficulty as to the establishment of fishery hatcheries in Ontario. These hatcheries would create a new source of expenditure without any return of revenue coming to this government. The matter is engaging the attention of the department and of the government.

SUPPLY—TRANSPORTATION.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, I desire, before you leave the chair, to call the attention of the House to a matter which has been interesting the the public for a considerable time, and which, in view of the circumstances which have developed lately in connection with our proposed changed commercial relations with the United States, has become urgent. I refer to the question of transportation. It must be evident to the members of this House that the agreement which has been submitted to us by the government involves a number of questions quite outside the range of the schedules of the proposed agreement, and one of the features of that agreement which has been most largely discussed is the question of the transportation of our traffic, and as to whether the large sacrifices we have made in the past to promote interprovincial trade and to secure transportation through Canadian territory will not largely be nullified by this proposed new arrangement. Of all the things that have been said in reference to the agreement, probably more than one half of them concern that question of traffic, and I, therefore, think it important to call the attention of the House and the country to that special feature of the question. As we are aware, in the United States a very intense interest has been taken in the new arrangement by men who are far more interested in the question of traffic and transportation than in the mere trading aspect of it. Possibly the principal mover in the matter at Washington, at least—and it has even been alleged that he is one of the principal movers in the matter within the limits of our own country—has been Mr. J. J. Hill, who commands a very large influence in the transportation of the neighbouring republic, as well as some influence in Canada. So far as Mr. Hill is concerned it is evident it is the question of the transportation of the traffic that has drawn him into the discussion, and fears have been expressed that there would be a diversion of our traffic in consequence of this proposed arrangement. Under these circumstances it behooves us, whilst we are examining the question to take up the aspect of it at least in so far as it may be necessary to evoke from the government a frank and clear exposition of its opinion in regard to this question of transportation.

Probably the most important aspect of the question is that which arises out of the proposed improvement of our waterways and of our transportation system generally between the east and the west. In that regard great prominence has been given during the past few years to the question of the construction of the Georgian Bay canal as a method of insuring to this country the bulk of the trade of the west as against rival methods of transportation in the neighbouring republic. I do not think I would be justified in taking up the time of the House in discussing the merits of that great waterway, which has been discussed fully in this House on many occasions since I have had the honour of a seat in it and many years before. I find on reference to the records of the House that the discussion of the merits of that great highway of transportation began as

far back as 1832, and in almost every session of the legislature since that time the question has been discussed anew and has always been favourably received by the House. I have made a search of all those discussions, with the dates and the principal topics of them. I will not quote the results of that research to the House, but will hand this index, if I may so call it, to Hansard, for the information of those members of the House who wish to study the question from its very inception.

Index to Parliamentary Proceedings relating to the Georgian Bay Canal, and Navigation of the Ottawa River.

1832-3.—Petition for construction of a canal between Chats lake and Chaudière lake. Referred (74). No report.

1836,—Bill granting £4,000 to improve navigation of the Ottawa river and its tributaries: Ordered: Presented (410). Passed (413). Not returned from the Council.

1836-7.—Resolution granting £3,000 for survey of country between Ottawa river and Lake Huron. Bill ordered (46). Presented (47). Royal assent (638).

1837.—Praying for construction of a lock at Ste. Anne's rapids and improvement of the whole line of the Ottawa to Lachine. Reported by a committee. Read a third time and passed (14).

1839.—Report of Commissioners on survey of Ottawa river with sub-reports of engineers and surveyors (131). (App. Vol. 2, p. 87.)

1841.—For copies of reports relating to survey of Ottawa river and improvements contemplated, etc. (453).

1841.—Return of duties collected at Bytown for past five years on timber, showing what portion was expended on improvement of Ottawa river navigation (167). (App. G.)

1842.—Select committee appointed to ascertain best means of removing obstructions in navigation of the rivers Ottawa and St. Lawrence and to extend inquiries to all other communications of transport within the province (10).

1842.—Petition for enlargement of the Lachane canal. Committed (116). Considered (122). No report.

1842.—Petition of McPherson, Crane and Co., and others for enlargement of Lachine canal. Referred to committee on improvement of navigation of Ottawa and St. Lawrence rivers (12).

1849.—Statement of surveys of Ottawa river and tributaries since January 1844 (221). (App. H.H.H.H.)

1852-3.—Petition for constructing a canal to connect Chaudière and Chats lakes. Referred to committee (119). Order rescinded (128).

1852-3.—Petition for extension of navigation of the Ottawa to Des Joachims rapids (52).

1858.—(617) ditto.

1856.—Petitions (some 10) for survey and estimates for continuous line of water communication from Lake Huron to waters of St. Lawrence by the valley of the Ottawa (180) (66), etc. No debate.

1857.—Petition for construction of Canals at the Chaudière and Chats rapids, enlargement of the Grenville and Carillon canals, and general improvement of Ottawa river (104, 106, 162, 272).

1858.—(482) ditto.

1854-5--Estimates and contracts for construction of Chats canal (777). (App. TT.)

1854-5.—Engineers' report on the Ottawa navigation and proposed canal to connect Chaudière and Chats lakes. (Attached to report of Board of Works, App. O.)

1857.—Statement of work done and money expended on Chats canal (469). (App. No. 29.)

1858.—(795). (App. No. 19) ditto.

1857.—W. Shanly's report on navigation of the Ottawa. (Attached to report Board of Works.) (App. No. 29.)

1857.—Instructions to W. Shanly to make survey of the Ottawa for a complete line of communication with Lake Huron and his report. (Attached to report Board of Works.) (App. No. 8.)

1858.—Further instructions and report (801). (App. No. 15.) (916, 935). No debate.

1858.—Report on water-power of Chats islands. (Attached to report Board of Works.) (App. 19.)

1857.—Statement of T. C. Clarke, C.E., concerning trade of the west, etc., and construction of a canal between Georgian bay and Lake Ontario or the Ottawa river. (Attached to report Board of Works.) (App. No. 29.)

1863—Petition of R. McConnell for authority to construct certain works. Ottawa and Lake Huron communication by road and river (185).

1865—Series of resolutions (by Alex. Mackenzie) proposed for opening navigable communication to connect Lake Huron with tide water by way of River Ottawa (226,263). Debate on 13th September.

1859—Report of Messrs. Norman, Clarke and others on progress of Ottawa survey. (Attached to Board of Works Report, App. No. 8.)

1860—Report of T. C. Clarke on cost of entire work of Ottawa survey, 75, 189. (Sen. P. No. 21.)

1857—For copies of maps, surveys, reports, &c., made last year for improvement of navigation of Ottawa and construction of ship canal to connect with Lake Huron (325). (Attached to Board of Works Report, App. 29.)

1858—(584). (App. No. 15.)

1860—For return of recent survey and report of engineers on the Ottawa ship canal (23). (Sess. Papers No. 21.)

1854-5—For contract for construction of Chats canal and estimates (523). (App. TT.)

1858—For statement of expenditures on Chats canal (584.)

1859—For statement of expenditures on Chats canal (293.)

1857—For statement of expenditures on Chats canal (324.)

1857—For copy of W. Shanly's report on survey of Ottawa Valley (611). (App. No. 5). Mr. Stanley's report attached to report Board of Works. (App. No. 29, and 1858); 584, 801 (App. No. 15.)

1863—Ottawa ship canal. To investigate and report on navigable line of communication between Montreal and Lake Huron by Ottawa, Mattawa and French rivers and Lake Nipissing. (Feb. Sess.) (119). (App. No. 5). No debate.

1863—Petition for incorporation of Ottawa and Huron Navigation Company, 1863. (Aug. Sess.) 141, 145, 149. No debate.

1864—Petition for incorporation of Ottawa

and Huron Navigation Company, 1863. (Aug. Sess.) 49, 379. No debate.

1885—Motion for improvements of the Ottawa and French rivers by a system of canals connecting Lake Huron with tidal water on St. Lawrence is deserving of the consideration of parliament (316). Debate. 'Hansard,' vol. 2, pp. 1211-1225.

1894—Montreal, Huron and Georgian Bay canal. Petition for an Act to incorporate (148, 160, 165, 170, 171, 293, 300, 401, 415, 460, R.A. 528). (Changed to Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal, 57 Vic. ,Cap. 103.)

1896—Petition for an Act to revive Act of incorporation (7, 75, 98, 119, 120, 141, R.A. 168). (60 Vic., Cap., 11). No debate.

1896—Order for correspondence in re canal (114.)

1896—Address, reports of Clarke and Shanly (Jan. Sess., 181). (Sen. Pap. 64). No debate.

1897—Order for correspondence in re canal (122, 200. Sess. Pap. 43). No debate.

1898—Petition for an Act to extend time (52, 108, 126, 138, 225, 230, 279, 376, R.A. 435, 61 Vic., Cap. 109). No debate.

1899—Motion for all papers in relation to the canal (228, 255, 283). Debate, 'Hansard, Vol. 2, p. 4273, &c.

1900—Petition for an Act to extend time (32, 73, 139, 140, 147, 173, 182, R.A. 192). (63-4 Vic., Cap. 106). No debate.

1900—Order, reports and surveys on canal (27, 136, 200, Sess. Pap. 90.)

1900—Address, order in council passed in 1856 appointing Mr. Shanly to survey the canal (96.)

1902—Petition for an Act to extend time (112, 178, 187, 193, 196, 216, 287, 288, 297, 306, R.A., 309). (2 Edward VII, Cap. 79). No debate.

1904—Petition for an Act to extend time (31, &c., R.A. 222). (4 Edward VII, Cap. 98). No debate, but a few words on the form of Bill.

1906.—Petition for an Act to issue bonds. (85, etc., R. A. 590). (6 Edw. VII, c. 128.) No debate.

1906.—Copy of instructions issued to engineers on survey. (255, 319.) (Sess, Pap. 172.)

1907-8.—Interim report on canalization of French river from Georgian bay to North Bay. (119, Sess. Pap. No. 19b.) Debate. 'Hansard,' Vol. 1, pp. 1941, 1981. Vol. 3, p. 5228.

1907-8.—Motion for all plans and reports regarding building of canal (125, 266).

1907-8—Maps and plans in connection with canal (322, 442, Sess. Pap. 178b).

1907-8.—Report of engineer, etc. Ordered (577, Sess. Pap. 178b).

1907-8.—Report on precise levelling. (Sess. Pap. No. 19a.)

1907-8—Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co. Petition for an Act to extend time for completion. (57, &c., R.A. 358). (7-8 Edw. VII, c. 130.) Debate. 'Hansard,' Vol. 2, pp. 3622, 3794. Vol. 3, p. 4230.

The question of transportation assumed considerable intensity after the present government came into power. I date the practical question of the construction of the Georgian Bay canal from the year 1903, when, after this government had been in power some seven years, it was decided to refer the whole question of transportation to a commission. That commission was composed in the first instance of Sir Wm. Van Horne, Mr. Bertram, who sat in this House, and Mr. Kennedy, of Winnipeg. Sir Wm. Van Horne did not accept, so I do not quote him as an authority in this relation; Mr. Bertram was lost to us while he was proceeding with the study of the question; and ultimately the bulk of the work fell upon Mr. Reford, as chairman, Mr. Frye, and Mr. Ashdown, of Winnipeg. The object of that commission to study the question in all its phases, and make a full report to the government. They did so, and in 1905, two years after their nomination, they presented to the government a full report. It has often been conceded in this House that no commission upon a subject of importance has cost the country so little or has been so painstaking in its work or has presented conclusions with which so little fault has been found. I have on more than one occasion since that commission presented its report called the attention of the government to it in connection with the execution of public works, and on each of those occasions the government has declared that it accepted that report in its entirety, that it has not been shelved, as I sometimes hinted that it had been, but that the government was carrying out its conclusions and intended carrying them out to a finality. Now, let me quote to you the words of that report upon the point which I am now endeavouring to bring to the notice of the House, in the hope that we may have from the government an authoritative statement as to what its present intentions are. At page 21 of the report, it says:

> Your Commission unhesitatingly affirm their belief in the desirability of a through waterway from the head of Lake Superior to ocean navigation, to aid in the carriage of the grain and the regulation of rates of a standard not less than that above set forth, so that the largest vessels navigating the Great Lakes can continue their voyage to ocean navigation or as near thereto as possible. But in view of the fact that the government has undertaken the survey of a proposed route by way of the French river to Lake Nipissing and thence by way of the Ottawa river to Montreal, and as the feasibility of this route from a commercial as well as an engineering point of view, and if feasible, its cost has not yet been ascertained, and further in view of the fact that the government has also undertaken the survey of the Welland canal and its vicinity, looking to its possible enlargement and diversion, your Commission do not see their way clear to any recommendation as to route, but would recommend that, in the case of the Ottawa river scheme because, of want of feasibility from a commercial or engineering point of view, or on account of its cost or for other reason, be not adopted, then the Welland canal be enlarged and deepened to the standard of the Sault Ste. Marie canal, with a view of enabling vessels

of the largest size to continue their voyage to Kingston or Prescott, thus bringing their cargo to within, say 180 miles or less of Montreal before discharging the same.

I quote this passage to show that subject to two conditions—ascertaining the feasibility of the route and its cost—the commissioners were unanimous in calling upon the government to construct the Georgian Bay canal as a necessary link in our transportation system and the best and cheapest. Since then Mr. Reford, the chairman of the commission, in view of transportation improvements and canal works going on in the United States, sent an additional report to the government in the shape of a letter, which I have not been able to find, but which was published at the time in the press of the country, in which Mr. Reford anew urged upon the government the necessity of immediately carrying out the work of the Georgian Bay canal. And, as to the two conditions mentioned in that report, these have since been fulfilled in a satisfactory way. We have ascertained by the survey instituted by the government at the time the absolute feasibility of this great waterway. We also have ascertained its cost. That survey has cost us, I believe, not less than $500,000. More than that, on every occasion when it has been possible for the government to be called upon to give an answer to those who were anxious to know whether this necessary link in our purely Canadian transportation scheme would be carried out, the government, and also the Prime Minister, I believe, on more than one occasion, have declared that the waterway must be opened to our all-Canadian traffic; in other words, that the Georgian Bay canal should be constructed. And the last time, I think, when a delegation interviewed the Prime Minister on that point, he added that it should be constructed without delay. In the United States newspapers, in their government reports and in reviews, which undertake to treat the question of transportation, there has been a unanimous agreement and admission that successful rivalry with the route of transportation opened by the Georgian Bay canal would not be possible and that if that great work was carried out, we thereby assure for all time to our country the vast trade of the whole west, not only on our side of the line but of the western states as well. If one takes the trouble to examine the distances, there can be no doubt that a strong presumption is created at once that that admission has not been made without cause on both sides of the line. Let me give the House, briefly, the figures:

UNITED STATES WATER ROUTES.

	Miles.
Duluth by lake to Buffalo, and Erie canal by barge to New York..	1,480
Duluth to Buffalo and thence by rail to New York..	1,445
Fort William to Buffalo and Erie canal by barge to New York..	1,358
Fort William to Buffalo, and thence by rail to New York..	1,323

CANADIAN WATER ROUTES.

Duluth by lake to Port Colborne, and thence by Welland and St. Lawrence canals to Montreal..	1,338
Fort William to Port Colborne, and thence by Welland and St. Lawrence canals to Montreal..	1,216
Duluth to Georgian bay ports, thence by rail to Montreal..	1,023
Duluth by lake to Georgian bay ports, and canal to Georgian bay to Montreal..	1,056
Fort William to Georgian bay ports, and Georgian bay canal to Montreal.	934

You have there the Georgian Bay canal route by water direct, 300 miles shorter than any other Canadian route, and 432 miles shorter than any American route. And there is no transhipment, whereby half the cost is saved, for you can take a cargo by steamer carrying 12,000 tons, without breaking bulk, right through from the the grain gathering ports of the west to the sea-board. In addition to this, you have features of this route which have often been adverted to and are well known. You have the advantage of opening up a country known to us as one of vast resources—a new country; bringing freights through without breaking bulk, you have the assurance of return freight, and you develop great manufacturing power. The result of the very complete survey made by the government engineers is to show that, as soon as this great waterway is established, we should have over 1,000,000 horse-power. In the immediate vicinity of the great manufacturing centre of Montreal is power to the extent of over 70,000 horse-power, ready to be used. In fact, the opinion has often been expressed, and is undoubtedly well founded, that when that immense water-power development which will be made possible by the construction of this waterway is completed, the government can assure itself of sufficient revenue from the leasing of water-powers to pay the interest upon the cost of the canal, which cost has been calculated at about $100,000,000.

I need not do more than point out to the House the immense advantage we should enjoy in having this route exclusively to ourselves, without any interference from our neighbours. Not only is it economically the best and shortest, but it is a route exclusively upon our own territory. There is no danger of any diversion of traffic upon that route to our neighbours. The House must be aware that our neighbours can go through our canals to Lake Ontario as freely as we do; and once traffic from the west has reached Lake Ontario, it is not impossible to carry it to the waters of the Hudson. That question has been studied. Some engineers have difficulties in the way;

but, undoubtedly, it is merely a question of money, and there would be that difficulty only to prevent the Americans from taking the traffic that has come to our own canals and carry it from Lake Ontario to the Hudson by American routes, instead of having it go from our head water ports through our own Canadian channels to the ports on the Atlantic. On more than one occasion it has been pointed out that the construction of the Georgian Bay canal involves canal construction for a distance of only 27·5 miles, and improved channel 55·5 miles, and that there are 357 miles of free, open navigation. Under the scheme of construction there would be some 25 locks, while at present in the Welland canal there are 48 locks.

Mr. GRAHAM. There are only 26 locks in the Welland canal.

Mr. MONK. The minister is right, there are 26 in the Welland and 48 in all the canals. I believe in the proposed improved Welland canal there will be fewer locks.

Mr. GRAHAM. In one scheme 6 or 7.

Mr. MONK. What is claimed is that we have in this, partly provided by nature, the shortest, the cheapest, and the best system of transportation, all in our own territory, enabling the largest ships to take freight in large cargoes from the lakes through to the sea, to go as far as the maritime provinces, and return with return freights. Once you have reached the Great Lakes, it is claimed that, if the west turns out to be all that we expect of it, it would be a not very heavy matter to continue that navigation from the Great Lakes into the Lake of the Woods. That has been suggested time and again, it is absolutely practicable, and in fact, I believe formed part of the system of transportation which the Mackenzie government saw fit to resort to, in order to complete the link between the eastern provinces and the sea. Once you are in the Lake of the Woods, you can, without insurmountable difficulties and expenditure, go on to Lake Winnipeg. That also was in the Mackenzie government scheme of transportation. From Lake Winnipeg you have rivers that take you into the very heart of the continent in these western provinces, and even as far as the foot of the Rockies, so that it is quite conceivable that once you have established free communication with the Great Lakes, under the circumstances I have pointed out there is nothing to prevent, with the advance of time and the filling up of the west, continuous water communication from the Great Lakes into the very heart of the western provinces.

It seems to me at this moment, after all that has taken place, it behooves us, in view of the possibility of the establishment of closer trade relations with our neighbours to the south, to make up our minds. We have had the final report of the commission before us for six years. We have the declaration of the government that it adopts that report in its entirety. Its conclusions, have never been controverted. We have been told time and again in answer to inquiries that this canal must be constructed, that it is our duty to construct it. I submit that the hour has arrived for us to decide to move in the matter. Our neighbours do not take that time for delay, they have improved without any such supineness their ways of communication. They have their Erie canal and they are projecting other canals, and we should not hesitate to immediately begin the construction of this one, which by the admission of everybody is to give us the main trade of the west, and place us beyond all possibility of competition, at least to the possible extent of carrying the grain and other products of the west to the ocean ports. Note that on the way of that canal, in places like Montreal and probably here in Ottawa, to perhaps a lesser degree, the cost is increasing by probably 50 per cent every year. In the estimate of the cost of that part of the canal which is in the vicinity of Montreal, it was found that some $10,000,000 was necessary to do the work at that point. I have no hesitation in saying that with the development that Montreal is undergoing at the present moment, and the increase in the value of property, the cost of expropriation and of constructing is increasing on a conservative estimate at the rate of from 30 per cent to 35 per cent a year. In the vicinity of Ottawa there must be a similar condition. It is necessary for us without any further delay to come to a decision and to begin construction in order to avoid the very considerable increase in the cost of the work.

I would not like to be understood as in any way minimizing the merits that attach to the improvement of other methods of transportation, such for instance, as the Welland canal. It seems to me it is our duty to the same degree to improve and make modern and perfect all other canals in which the country is interested, and in respect to the Welland canal we should certainly have it up to date. There is no contention, but that the traffic there, will always be very considerable. We have our St. Lawrence system of transportation and we should not hesitate to improve and perfect it, whenever the necessity arises. I would even go the length of saying that if it is in the interest of the country to open up an entirely new system of transportation, in other words, to build a railway to Hudson bay as has been suggested, I would

not be disposed to oppose such a project, if proper proof was made before me that it is not only feasible, but will amply repay the cost of construction.

We have there an unknown quantity, and if we are to abide by the rather superficial report made by Mr. Butler, a very competent authority on the subject, there exists grave doubts. One would have to pursue the history further without being absolutely certain that such a vast expense as is necessary there, would be perfectly justified. We must equip ports in the Hudson bay. We have a distance of some 1,450 or 1,500 miles of unknown navigation through the bay and through the straits, unprovided with the aids of navigation that we have on the St. Lawrence and everywhere else, but which would have to be provided; and we have a prospect of a short period of navigation at that point, Mr. Butler has said some two months at most. That is a matter which would require to be carefully investigated. But in the meantime we have in regard to this particular method of transportation, this particular way, all the information which the government requires. We know its possibility, we know its immense prospect, we know the immense utility it will be to us. I think we should at this moment particularly in no way neglect anything that could assure to Canadian routes the supremacy of Canadian transportation. Members of the House have seen within the past few days that the question has been mooted of a common waterway with our neighbours over the St. Lawrence route. For my own part, I do not think that the history of such arrangements between nations regarding waterways has ever had satisfactory results. However, that is a remote possibility. What we have to deal with are present conditions. We have this waterway, we are satisfied in regard to the information, and we should not delay a single moment in starting the work upon its construction. It seemed to me that the time was opportune to call the attention of the House to this feature of transportation, which has necessarily and forcibly introduced itself into the consideration and discussion of the reciprocity question, and of our relations with our neighbours to the south. I think I am justified therefore in moving:

That all the words after 'that' in the main motion be omitted, and that the following be substituted:

The House, in view of the possible diversion of the country's carrying trade from Canadian channels, and in order to ensure the most favourable conditions of transportation between western points and the Canadian Atlantic seaboard, records its opinion and determination that the construction of the Georgian Bay canal should be commenced forthwith so as to preserve and further facilitate interprovincial traffic and the carriage of freight in unbroken bulk from the Great Lakes to the sea.

When the right hon. the Prime Minister brought before the House the question of the construction of a new transcontinental railway, he insisted greatly upon the necessity of providing immediately an all-Canadian route for our traffic. I remember that on closing his eloquent remarks on that occasion he prayed God that the country was not already too late in the accomplishment of that scheme. I do not know if my right hon. friend has the same pious disposition in regard to waterways, but it seems to me that we are well founded in hoping that we have not waited too long when we have within our reach all that is necessary in order to warrant us in beginning the construction of this great waterway.

Mr. G. V. WHITE (North Renfrew). In seconding the motion presented by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), I desire to make a few remarks. I heartily concur in the remarks he has made, and in the resolution he has placed in your hands. On several previous occasions I have spoken at some length upon this question, and have endeavoured to urge upon the government the desirability of commencing the construction of this great work. I believe that the time is at hand when the Georgian Bay canal will need to be constructed, and the work should very soon be commenced, and pushed forward to completion with the least possible delay. It has been stated that the work of construction will occupy a period of about ten years. If that be the case every moment's delay means a check in the progress of Canada, especially in so far as our transportion requirements are concerned. It is not necessary for me to dwell at length upon the immense advantages which would accrue to this country by the improvement of this waterway. It is a national project, and will tend to ensure the carriage of our products through an all-Canadian route. It will cement the east and the west by an exchange of products. Our Nova Scotian coal will find a market in northern and western Ontario, and the grain and wheat of the Northwest will be transported to the east. It will effect a saving in the cost of transportation of from two to four cents to the farmers of the west on every bushel of grain which they produce. It will promote the development of our water-powers to the extent of more than a million horse-power, and in so doing will tend to build up industries throughout the country. It will bring Fort William, Sault Ste. Marie and Duluth 282 miles nearer to Montreal than they are by the St. Lawrence route. In short, Mr. Speaker, it will afford the quickest and most direct route from the great lakes to the seaboard. There are a great many other advantages which I

could mention, but I do not wish to delay the House more than to bring to your attention one of the resolutions which was adopted recently by the city council of Montreal:

Montreal, Nov. 28.—At a meeting of the city council this afternoon Ald. Lapointe submitted a resolution in favour of the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. The motion which was adopted without discussion and will be forwarded to Ottawa, was as follows:—

Whereas the construction of the Georgian Bay canal would afford for the produce of the northern and western parts of the American continent the shortest and most advantageous route, and would add an incalculable element of progress and prosperity to the commerce, agriculture and industry of Canada, and thereby to the city of Montreal, would accrue immense advantage, be it resolved that the parliament of Canada be requested to carry out this essentially national enterprise with the shortest possible delay.

Within the last month I understand that a petition was presented to this government signed by 60,000 influential men in the city of Montreal urging upon the government the necessity of building this great waterway. In so far as the improvement and betterment of other waterways throughout this country is concerned, I do not wish to place myself on record as being opposed to the improvement of any waterway that is going to be in the interest of the transportation requirements of the country. I believe, as my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has said, that this country will require the Hudson Bay railway, the deepening of the Welland canal and the building of the Georgian Bay canal, but the Georgian Bay canal project has been before the country for a great many years, it has been proved conclusively that it is a feasible proposition, that it will shorten the distance between the Great Lakes and the sea-board by from 200 to 300 miles, and in view of the fact that it is going to be a great benefit to the country, not only from the transportation standpoint, but from the development which will take place by the improvement of the waterpowers along the route, I believe it is time that the government took action and commenced the construction of this great work. Let us commence its construction to-day, to-morrow may be too late, and let us see to it that Canadian products are transported through Canadian channels to the markets of the world, and in this way bind together the component parts of this great country of ours.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). Mr Speaker, the subject before the House has such a wide scope that I feel that it will require more time and a better occasion to speak upon it than the one which has been offered to us to-day by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I have so often spoken on this subject of the very early construction of the Georgian Bay canal, that I feel it is somewhat superfluous to put myself again upon record as an adherent of the project. I believe, without any vain boasting, that this House will agree with me that I am as strongly in favour of the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, which has been proven by my words in this House, as is the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. It is so seldom that I am able to agree with that hon. gentleman that I am particularly pleased this afternoon to be able to congratulate him upon his speech although I am not able to congratulate him upon the propriety of the manner in which he has brought before the House this discussion upon the question of the Georgian Bay canal. On Friday last my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), when making his very able statement in this House, referred in a few words to the policy that it is understood this government would follow in a short time in connection with the Georgian Bay canal. The House will pardon me if I refer to his words which are to be found in 'Hansard' of March 10, page 5161. In referring to the canal system I had incidentally made the remark that I believed the Georgian Bay canal route was the proper route between the Great Lakes and the sea-ports and my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals said in connection with that:

My hon. friend behind me has said that the Georgian Bay canal route is the route. I would discuss the question of the Georgian Bay canal route at greater length but for the fact that it is not in my department, and I am supposed to be discussing questions connected with my department. I might say distinctly that I believe it is in the interest of Canada from one end to the other to enter upon both enterprises and at a not very far distant date. We must remember that when we bring the products of the great west to the east the products of the east are carried back to the west, and if we could take the time to go into the prospects for increasing that trade in a few years, we would arrive at a conclusion that it is necessary—in the interest of the Canadian carrying trade?—no, it is necessary in the interest of the people who produce in Canada, as well as who buy goods in Canada, that these two great waterways should be developed by the people of Canada, and I believe that no greater interest would accrue from any investment that the people could make than that which would result from the development of these two waterways. My hon. friend will see that I am quite clear upon this subject, and that the diffidence I have about discussing it in detail only arises from the fact that it is not in my department, but I believe in these projects just the same.

So we have the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), a few days ago, speaking in the city of Montreal, in a very able speech, also declared that he was strongly in favour of the early construction of the Georgian Bay canal. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has put himself upon record in the same sense. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) likewise, and when we come to the last and certainly not the least member of the Canadian cabinet we have the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who has said, in the city of Hull, and I believe in other parts of this country, that he was strongly of the belief that the Georgian Bay canal should be constructed at as early a date as possible. That ought to be satisfactory to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and to the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White). But apparently these hon. gentlemen, seeing a question of vital import before this House, and before the country at the present moment—I refer to the question of reciprocity with the United States and seeing that the country is entirely in favour of reciprocity and that the great majority of this House are in favour of reciprocity, they want to put if possible an obstacle in the way of the carrying out of this agreement by bringing up the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. If, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) had brought the matter before the House in a sensible way —well, perhaps it is not parliamentary to say that—but, had he brought it before the House in a judicious way, then I am sure he would have every hon. member on this side of the House supporting him. But, bringing it up as a vote of want of confidence in the government, he knows perfectly well that the members of this side of the House who have confidence in the government and wish to see the Georgian Bay canal built are not going to vote against the government so as to kill the project in its infancy. That would not be sane, that would not be judicious, and yet that is what the hon. member (Mr. Monk) asks us to do. Now, I begin to doubt that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is truly in favour of the Georgian Bay canal, and his action in bringing forward this motion to-day gives me cause to doubt. I shall give my reasons for that doubt—the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) believes in the construction of the Georgian Bay canal and he has submitted to the House on more than one occasion a resolution favouring it, and wishing to assure himself of the support of hon. members of this House he has had the common courtesy to notify hon. gentlemen who are in favour of the canal that he would propose his motion at a certain time.

Mr. FOSTER. It has become so current with gentlemen on the other side of the House, that now when they attack anybody on this side they automatically refer to the hon. member for North Toronto. I do not think the hon. member for Ottawa really means to refer to me; I do not want all the honours.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He was paying you a compliment.

Mr. DEVLIN. If the hon. member for North Toronto were a very small man perhaps he would not come uppermost in my mind.

Mr. FOSTER. I am modest too.

Mr. DEVLIN. Of course, I intended to refer to the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) but I do hope that the hon. member for North Toronto would not object to be connected with a resolution in favour of the Georgian Bay canal. My point was that I would have expected that the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Monk) would have had the common courtesy to notify hon. members on this side who are in favour of the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, that he would bring up this question to-day and that he would expect them to be in their places. I do not mean that we are not supposed to be always in the chamber but there are occasions when through force of circumstances hon. members may be absent, when if they knew such a vital question were for discussion they would make it a point to be in their seats. Now, the hon. member (Mr. Monk) knows perfectly well that the question of reciprocity is not going to affect adversely the Georgian Bay canal. He knows perfectly well that an agreement of reciprocity with the United States will add to the necessity for the Georgian Bay canal. He knows perfectly well that the farmers of this country are clamouring for two things: Reciprocity and the Georgian Bay canal, and he knows that if you add to the wealth of the farmers of this country and to the possibilities of the increased production of grain you will of necessity require increased transportation facilities, and you will have to look for that to an improved waterways system. I have here the report of the Trade and Commerce Department, and I am fairly amazed to see from it the quantity of grain that has been coming from Port Arthur and Fort William by the water route. I find that our exports from Canada to the United States during the year 1907—and I refer now solely to Canadian produce—amounted to $92,283,500 worth, while in 1910 they reached $106,153,900 worth, from which it appears that

Canada's trade with the United States is constantly increasing.

Mr. BLAIN. Have you the figures showing the trade the United States did with Canada?

Mr. DEVLIN. Yes. The dutiable imports into Canada from the United States in 1907 amounted to $116,159,883 and the dutiable imports into Canada from the United States in 1910 amounted to the amazing sum of $143,777,541, which, of course goes to prove my statement, that the trade between the two countries is increasing. I am not a believer in the doctrine which is often preached in this House by the hon. member for North Toronto, that an increase in imports means an impoverished country; on the contrary I believe that increasing imports indicates that a country is wealthy. I therefore say that the trade between Canada and the United States is constantly on the increase, and the grain production of Canada also being constantly on the increase, as a consequence we require increased transportation facilities. I find in the Trade and Navigation Returns a statement showing the receipts and shipments of grain at Fort William and Port Arthur from September 1st to January 31st. and in the month of September 1910 there were shipped from Fort William and Port Arthur by rail 241,362 bushels, and in the same month by lake 4,042,958 bushels of wheat alone.

There was a similar quantity of oats, less of barley and less of flax. In the month of September there were 327,599 bushels by rail and 5,256,055 bushels by lake; in the month of October there were 455,709 bushels by rail and 17,765,528 bushels by lake; in the month of November there were 958,915 by rail and 21,279,964 bushels by lake. Now, where is this grain going to? It is going to the United Kingdom and to the United States. The greater quantity is going to the United Kingdom, and the United Kingdom will continue to take a great quantity of our grain—there is no gainsaying that. Any hon. gentleman has simply to refer to the British parliamentry debates to see that Canada will continue through all time to supply, not alone the United Kingdom, but the world, with grain. The production of Canada is constantly on the increase while the production of the United States is consequently on the decrease. Canada's area of grain-producing is a wonderful area. The wheat belt of western Canada is four times the size of the wheat belt of the whole United States; so that hon. gentlemen opposite need not have any fear that our grain production will not constantly be on the increase. That being so, I ask you if it will not be necessary for us to build the Georgian Bay canal? And reciprocity with the United States will only enhance, and will not depreciate, as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier would lead us to believe, the value of the Georgian Bay canal. We have a great many members of the cabinet of this country on record as being in favour of the construction of that great work; we have a great many members of this House committed to its construction; we have the press of a great section of this country, as well as many boards of trade, clamouring for it. The Georgian Bay canal is one of my pet subjects, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to go on speaking on it all afternoon and all evening; but I know that there are a number of other hon. members of this House who are only too anxious to give utterance to their views upon this subject. I see the Postmaster General, (Mr. Lemieux), for instance—he hardly ever misses an opportunity to proclaim what a strong believer he is in the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), who is very familar with the waterways of this country is also a strong believer in it. I know that these hon. gentlemen will give expression to their views on this subject. But I would like to point out another reason not commonly given for the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. We shall require it for the carrying of our minerals; and, as a great portion of the canal will pass through the province of Quebec, let me point out that that province, as a producer of minerals, is getting richer every year. I know that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier will attribute that directly to the fact that in the province of Quebec there is good government. Whatever may be the cause, the mineral wealth of the province of Quebec is constantly increasing. In 1909 the value of the mineral production of Quebec amounted to $5,552,062, and in 1910 it amounted to $7,072,244. That included asbestos, iron, cement and other minerals which will be shipped by water. Therefore, if we wish to carry our mineral production to a successful issue, we must construct the Georgian Bay canal.

Now, Sir, I am not going to support the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, because the hon. member has brought it in for a political purpose. If not, why did he allow so many years to go by without placing a resolution on the Order Paper in favour of the Georgian Bay canal? Why did he bring it in this particular way, just at a moment when he knew that it involved a vote of want of confidence in the government? Does he imagine for a moment that the country, especially that portion which is interested in the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, is so innocent as to believe that a vote for his amendment will mean the immediate construction of the canal? Before I cast a vote upon this amendment, which would mean, if carried, the defeat

of the government, I would like to ask the hon. leader of the opposition if, following out the wording of the amendment, he were called upon to form a government, would he immediately begin the construction of the Georgian Bay canal?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentlemen is asking me for some instruction as to how he should vote, I would like to say before I answer that I would require some guarantee that he would follow the advice.

Mr. DEVLIN. The leader of the opposition is a shrewd lawyer, and I know that he does not want to commit himself, and it would be hardly fair for me to try to exact a committal from him. I take it that the opposition have not made up their minds what their policy would be with regard to the construction of the Georgian Bay canal if they came into power, which thank Heaven will not be for many a day; and, therefore, it would ill become me to help to defeat the present government and help to bring the opposition into power in order to delay the construction of that great work. Earnestly believing in the early construction of the Georgian Bay canal, I do not think that I could logically vote with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. I appreciate his kindly sentiments towards this project and also toward hon. members of this House who favour the early carrying of this project to a successful issue. But Sir, as I have had occasion to say before in this House, timeo Danaos et dona ferentes—I fear the Greeks even when bringing gifts—and I fear the hon. member for Jacques Cartier because of his manner of bringing this subject before the House. I trust that every hon. member on this side at least, who is in favour of the early construction of the Georgian Bay canal will see that we have one hope for the realization of our wishes, and that is to pin our faith to the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who is earnest in his belief that this work should proceed, and who will proceed with it. His life has been given to great works, such as the construction of the Transcontinental road, and the reform which is to bring wealth to the farmers of Canada, improved trade relations with the United States, and who, I believe, as the crowning work of his life, will undertake the early carrying out of the construction of the Georgian Bay canal.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound). I have no desire to follow the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) in his varied wanderings. Nor have I any desire to cast reflections upon those who are in favour of the early complete deepening of the Welland canal or the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. I believe that all these works will be necessary in a few years to solve the transportation problem of Canada. We heard the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) state on Friday last, that the canal traffic of Canada had incresed from 5,665,259 tons in 1901 to 42,990,608 tons in 1910—an increase in nine years of 660 per cent. According to the reports of the engineers, ten years will be required for the construction of this contemplated Georgian Bay canal. If we increase one-fourth or even one-tenth as fast as in the last ten years, there will be traffic awaiting this canal by the time it is finished. The Georgian Bay canal is in a somewhat different position from any other great work now in contemplation in Canada, including the great works that I have indicated. We have a complete survey of this canal,—and not only one, but many surveys. We have one completed, I think, in 1907, which cost the Dominion of Canada upwards of $1,000,000, a survey in every way complete; and I have yet to hear that any attempt has yet been made to refute any of the statements made in the report of the engineers. In this report, the engineers were unanimous. They agreed in the opinion that this canal would be a great project, valuable to the country, and entirely feasible in every way. The hon. member for Wright has taken occasion to call the attention of the House to the fact that a great many of the ministers of the Crown, have, on various occasions, spoken in favour of this project. I myself, have heard several of them make remarks of that nature. But these were made years ago. They had the facts then that they have now; and I support the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, simply for the same reason that I would support a similar motion if it were made by the hon. member for Wright. Those of us who are in favour of the early completion of this canal—and I think that in this we speak for the majority of the people of Canada—should support any action that will conduce to the carrying into effect of our wishes.

There is another subject mentioned by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, which demands a good deal of attention, and that is the question of cost. It must be evident to everybody that, if the land in Montreal and its vicinity that will be necessary for the construction of this canal were expropriated at this time, it would mean a great saving in the ultimate cost of the canal. There is also the fact that the government has been spending large sums of money for the conservation and regulation of the water flow on the Ottawa river. These works could go hand in hand, with the works for the canal. We had on Lake Nipissing dams put in under the direction of the Minister of Public Works for the control of the waters of the lake. But these were found un-

successful, and the country was put to the cost of blowing them out with dynamite. I understand that they are being built a second time under the Department of Public Works. All this work would be unnecessary, for the control of the water in these lakes and rivers would be effected by the works in the construction of the canal. There is also the matter of water-powers. Canada has just awakened to the value of the water-powers of Ontario and of Quebec and of the Dominion as a whole. The Minister of Railways on Friday last stated that the expenditure upon the Trent canal, great as it was, and little commercial value as it will have when completed, was entirely justified by the great water-powers that had been developed along that route. Contrast the water-powers of the Trent canal with those along the Georgian Bay canal, whether you consider them from the point of view of accessibility, volume or in any other way.

I have no desire to take up the time of the House further. This matter has been thoroughly gone into on other occasions; and I do not think it necessary that I should place myself further on record in the matter. In conclusion, I might say a word in answer to the hon. member for Wright, when he claims that he is called upon to vote against this motion because it is a vote of want of confidence. A few days ago, the hon member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) brought in an amendment to an exactly similar motion, which amendment was accepted by the government and for which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Devlin) voted. I have no hesitation in saying that the government has the same option to-day as it had at that time; if they choose, they can accept the amendment of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier and agree to its unanimous adoption by this House.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Intensely interested as I am in the early construction of this most important link in the chain of Canadian transportation, I feel the deepest possible regret that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has introduced his motion at the present time and in the form in which he has introduced it. Heretofore,—and I speak now of what is within my knowledge of the course of events so far as this great work is concerned, extending over a great many years—never until to-day has the subject taken on a party aspect. Years ago, when the Montreal, Ottawa & Georgian Bay Canal Company first presented its project to parliament, I happened to be one of the counsel employed by the company. I knew what efforts the company had made to bring the matter before the attention of parliament and the public, and it was a matter of gratification to me, as well as to those for whom I was acting at the time, that hon. members of this House dealt with the question from a broad standpoint, entirely irrespective of party. I remember that, on one occasion, upwards of a hundred members on both sides of the House, irrespective of whether they were Liberals or Conservatives, signed a memorial in favour of the construction of this canal. At the last session of parliament, and also, I think, at the session before, motions were made for returns on this subject, and different members spoke in support of the project. I am sure that hon. members who recall those discussions will agree with me that these motions were supported by hon. members of this House irrespective of their party affiliations, and that on each of these occasions the project was spoken of with warm sympathy by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and by other members of the House.

But to-day the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has chosen, for what purpose I know not, for he certainly does not seem to be acting the part of a friend of this great project, to throw into it an element of partisanship. The very resolution he has moved introduces a matter in regard to which we cannot all agree. The hon. gentleman, instead of urging that the government should seriously consider the early construction of this canal, asks that the House shall, in effect, instruct the government to immediately begin its construction, and why? Because of the possible diversion of traffic to the country to the south. The hon. gentleman knows very well that a majority of the members in this House do not share that view. The hon. gentleman knows that nothing has recently occurred and nothing is likely to occur in the near future which would be likely to divert Canadian traffic to the country to the south of us. This canal, when it is constructed, is intended primarily to carry the products of the west to the ports upon the St. Lawrence for shipment to the markets of the old world; any products of the west which may be required by our neighbours to the south and which may be purchased for home consumption would not pass through this canal for the reason I have stated. If I were framing a resolution in order to bring this matter properly before the House, instead of putting it as my hon. friend has, that there might be a diversion of our products to the country to the south I would rather have said: In view of the anticipated continuation of the rapid development of the Canadian west, and the unrivalled position that the city of Montreal

and other St. Lawrence ports will, when the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal is constructed, occupy for the export of the products not only of the Canadian west, but of a large portion of the country to the south of us, in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the government should consider seriously the early construction of this canal. If my hon. friend had moved a substantive motion of that character, I have no doubt it would have met with a sympathetic response from both sides of the House. I am sure it would have met with a sympathetic reception on the part of the government and I believe also on the part of all the supporters of the government. I say that because upon the occasion when a very large delegation last met the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues and presented in the very strongest way possible, the importance of engaging upon the early constructiion of this canal, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) told that delegation that it was not necessary to come to the government with arguments in support of this great project. He told them that he and his colleagues were thoroughly impressed with the necessity of undertaking the construction of the canal at the earliest possible moment, but that it was simply a question of finances, that whenever the Finance Minister, in the exercise of his judgment, informed his colleagues that the time had arrived when the government could safely ask parliament to give it authority to begin the construction of this important work, then at that moment, and the Prime Minister expressed the hope that that moment would soon arrive, the government would be prepared to submit to parliament a project for the construction of the canal. I would ask my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier in view of what has been said by the Prime Minister, in view of the expressions of opinion which have been given in this House by prominent members of both sides in the past, and if he seriously desires to see the early construction of this canal, whether it is desirable that he should at this time introduce into the discussion of this great question, something of partisanship and submit a resolution, in regard to certain parts of which it would be impossible for all the members of this House to agree. I commend the matter to my hon. friend, because as I have said, I am sincerely in favour of the construction of this most important work. I recognize the enormous benefit it would be to the transportation interests of Canada. I recognize that when this canal is built, it is going to command the traffic, not only of the Canadian west, but much of the trade of the States which lie to the south of the boundary line. If my hon. friend had been here on Friday last, I am sure he would have been greatly interested in the most admirable speech made by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) who has always been a friend of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal. In that speech the hon. gentleman dwelt in the strongest possible terms upon the great importance of this work. He showed how important it would be to Canada, important not only to western Canada, but to eastern Canada as well. He spoke as a friend, as one who for years has been in earnest sympathy with this work, and he did not seek to throw into the discussion of the question with regard to its construction any element such as that which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has sought to throw into the discussion to-day.

With regard to my own department and to the attitude of the government towards this work, it ought not to be necessary to do anything further than draw attention to the fact that a number of years ago the government decided to ask this parliament for authority to proceed with a most exhaustive survey of the route of that canal. Years have been spent upon that work. A board of engineers was organized and the work was placed under the control of some of the most experienced and capable engineers of the department. I do not hesitate to say that they have done their work in the most thorough and conscientious manner; I do not hesitate to say, and I appeal to the judgment of members who have seen the report that the report they have made and the plans they have submitted, the detailed plans prepared which are now before parliament, show that they have done their work in the most exhaustive and satisfactory manner. Their reports show that the construction of the canal is not only feasible, but that it can be carried out at a cost which no one will say would, now or in the near future, be beyond the financial resources of the people of Canada. The cost is placed at something like $100,000,000. That, bear in mind, is not merely for a 14 foot canal as at first proposed, but for a canal having a depth of 22 feet, over the mitre sills, a canal which will enable quite large ocean steamers to pass right through to Lake Huron and on to the ports on the western shores of our great inland lakes. That canal will be quite capable of giving accommodation to ocean traffic. The project has assumed proportions far beyond what was thought of in the early days when the fondest hopes of the people of this country only looked forward to a canal with a depth of some 14 feet

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) refers to what the United States has done in the way of building canals, and says that Canada has done little. I entirely disagree in that respect. The Erie canal, to which he has referred, is but little more than a great ditch, having a depth of only 9 feet, whereas our system of canals, extending from Lake St. Clair down to the city of Montreal, has a uniform depth of not less than 14 feet, thus giving accommodation to very much larger boats which are capable of carrying a very much larger tonnage than can be accommodated by the Erie canal. I think there is no reflection to be made on the people of Canada so far as their enterprise in the past in regard to the construction of our great system of canals has been concerned, and I think the very fact that the government had surveys made, shows that we are favourably considering the construction of a great canal which will have a depth not of 9 feet as the Erie canal, not of 14 feet as the St. Lawrence, at the present moment, but a depth of 22 feet capable of accommodating large ocean vessels and enabling them to proceed right up to Port Arthur and Fort William.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me say again that I regret exceedingly that my hon. friend has introduced this resolution in the way he has chosen. I regret its terms, and it does seem to me that my hon. friend, upon reflection, knowing what has been the expressed feelings of members of the House in regard to this project in the past, whenever it has been brought to the attention of the House in a non-partisan way, will feel that in thus presenting his motion he is not acting as a friend of this scheme, but he is acting in a way which is rather calculated to retard the undertaking.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I desire to call your attention to the fact that in my judgment the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is out of order. By the rules of the House, and by the amended rules of the House also, no private member can make a motion which involves an appropriation of public money or a charge upon the revenue. According to the principles of parliamentary government, the responsibility for all public expenditures rests altogether upon the Crown and its advisers; it is not within the province of any member of parliament to make a motion which involves an expenditure of money by parliament. The principle is so well recognized that it is not necessary to refer to it. Still, I will call your attention to rule 53, which enacts:

It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address, or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to that House by message of the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address, or Bill is proposed.

This enactment is not new, it is simply a reproduction of a rule which is as old as parliamentary government in England. But the framers of the British North America Act attached so much importance to this rule that they did not leave it to be ordinarily applied as a rule of the House, as it existed in 1867, but they put it in the constitution in still more positive language. Now, the motion of my hon. friend reads as follows:

The House, in view of a possible diversion of the country's carrying trade from Canadian channels, and in order to ensure the most favourable conditions of transportation between western points and the Canadian Atlantic seaboard, records its opinion and determination that the construction of the Georgian Bay canal should be commenced forthwith——

Now nothing could be more positive than these terms, the House is asked to express a determination that without a moment's delay the construction of the canal should be commenced. Now, everybody is aware that it is allowable to a member of the House, not to propose a direct motion such as this, calling for an expenditure of money, but a motion which invites the attention of the government or of the House to the advisability of providing for an expenditure of some kind. In this respect the rights of members of the House are well defined, but they are limited. While a member may, by a motion, express a desire or declare a policy in abstract terms, the moment the motion goes beyond abstract terms, and the moment he goes so far as to enjoin upon the government the immediate duty of providing for an expenditure, then he overrides the rule. Let me call the attention of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier to the last edition of May, 1906, page 571, where he will find the following words apply directly to his motion:

To a certain extent, evasions are, by usage, permitted of the restriction imposed by the standing orders upon proposals for the expenditure of public money. Bills devising a large scheme for public expenditure, accompanied by provisions for the application of the same, have been brought in upon motion, the money clauses being printed in italics. In such cases, the principle of the Bill is discussed, and, if approved on behalf of the Crown, the necessary pecuniary provision is subsequently made; otherwise further progress of the Bill is prevented by the refusal of the Royal recommendation. In like manner, motions advocating public expenditure, or the imposition of a charge, if the motion be framed in sufficiently abstract and general terms, can be entertained, and agreed to by the House. Resolutions of this nature are

permissible because, having no operative effect, no grant is made or burden imposed by their adoption.

Now, if the motion of my hon. friend were couched in abstract terms and made general, it would be in order; but if, as I contend, his motion, far from being abstract and general, is so precise as to make an injunction upon the government at once to enter upon this expenditure, then there can be no doubt that he has gone beyond the rights assigned to a member, and has made a motion which is out of order. Now let me ask my hon. friend to read his motion over again, and he will agree that the terms are imperative, and their effect if the House were to pass the motion, would be to put upon the government the immediate duty of proceeding with this work.

The House records its opinion and determination that the construction of the Georgian Bay canal should be commenced forthwith.

I submit that my hon. friend has gone beyond the rights assigned to a member, and the motion is out of order, and upon this I would ask your ruling.

Mr. MONK. I think it is a great pity that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) should have gone out of his way to find in this motion a partisan spirit. If the proposed arrangements with the United States are carried into effect they will produce traffic, and if, as is contended, they will produce traffic with the United States, it is quite natural that that traffic would be removed from Canadian channels. I do not see anything in the motion that would lead anybody to believe there was a partisan motive behind the motion I have made. It calls purely and simply for a decision from the government. In answering my right hon. friend, it seems to me he has gone out of his way to avoid giving a categorical answer to the question involved in the motion. I think the public at large would have been much better pleased to see him less punctilious upon the point of order, and more anxious to give the information which is plainly sought for by this motion. We are all familiar with the rule that a private member cannot initiate public expenditure; that has been in the English constitution since 1701, I think that privilege has been with the consent of the House, reserved to the Crown. There is nothing in this motion which calls for an expenditure of money, and that is the only thing which would stop a private member from making such a motion. There is no call here for money, it is for an expression of opinion by the House, and an enjoinder, if you will, to the government to begin the construction of the canal.

But where do you find in that, words which correspond with the rule which my hon. friend quoted about requiring the imposition of a tax or the expenditure of any specific sum of money? That is all I have to submit on that point, Mr. Speaker. You will find authority in Bourinot for the statement that the very greatest latitude possible has been accorded since the House of Commons has existed, in the matters of motions of this kind, a motion which does not go so far as to require the spending of a specific sum of money. That is what Sir John Bourinot says in his work. There is no question of money here and it seems to me that my right hon. friend might very well have answered the question that is sought to be solved by this motion instead of taking refuge in the point of order which has no force with reference to a motion of this kind.

Mr. SPEAKER. If this resolution compels the government to proceed with the expenditure of money forthwith there are rules applicable to it, first, that contained in the British North America Act and, second, a rule of our own House. Section 54 of the British North America Act, which has already been referred to, would prevent the adoption of such a resolution. Rule 77 of our own rules would also prevent the adoption of the resolution if it were not recommended by the Governor General and preceded by consideration in the Committee of the Whole. There are precedents mentioned by Sir John Bourinot of certain resolutions that have been adopted, but Bourinot also states that they were generally evasions of the rule. I may be allowed to read a few lines from it:

A practice has grown up in the House of allowing the introduction of resolutions by private members, when they do not directly involve the expenditure of public money, but simply express an abstract opinion on a matter which may necessitate a future grant. As this is a question not always understood, it may be explained that such resolutions, being framed in general terms, do not bind the House to future legislation on the subject, and are merely intended to point out to the government the importance and necessity of such expenditure.

Referring to this right of members to move such abstract resolutions, all authorities agree that it is one 'which the House exercises, and should always exercise with great reserve, and only under peculiar and exceptional circumstances.' Such resolutions are considered virtually 'an evasion of the rules of the House, and are on that account objectionable, and should be discouraged as much as possible.' Nevertheless, neither the English nor Canadian House of Commons has ever agreed to the adoption of a rule to fetter their discretion in regard to the entertaining of such propositions.

I see by the Standing Rules and Orders of the British House that rule 71, which was passed on the 20th March, 1866, previous to confederation, reads as follows:

If any motion be made in the House for any aid, grant or charge upon the public revenue, whether payable out of the consolidated fund or out of money to be provided by parliament, or for any charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof shall not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned till such further day as the House shall think fit to appoint, and then it shall be referred to a Committee of the Whole House before any resolution or vote of the House do pass therein.

The only point I have to decide is whether the adoption of this amendment would compel the government of the day to proceed forthwith with this expenditure. I think it would, and therefore it is in violation of the rule that requires previous recommendations of the Crown and consideration by the Committee of the Whole House. Therefore, I declare the amendment out of order.

SUPPLY.

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

Department of the Interior—Imigration—Salaries of agents and employees in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries, $350,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought it was the intention of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to give a general statement on this subject before we went into the matter.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). When the House went into committee last Monday the hon. member for Lennox and Addington (Mr. Wilson) requested that a statement should be made on our taking up the item of immigration. I do not think that it is necessary to detain the committee at any great length in making a statement on this item, and that probably the matters that are of special interest to members can be brought out by questioning rather than by a general statement. However, for the information of the committee, it might be stated that for the first nine months of the present fiscal year the total immigration has been 253,326 as compared with 208,794 in the whole of last year; that is that the nine months of the present fiscal year show 253,326 immigrants against 208,749 for the twelve months of the past fiscal year. Of these immigrants 98,995 are British as compared with 59,790 for the whole of the last fiscal year; from the United States 97,702 in the nine months as compared with 103,798 in the twelve months; European continental immigrants 56,628 during the nine months as compared with 45,628 during the twelve months. There is no doubt that the character of the immigrants who arrive is quite as important, if not more important than the number, and on that point some information may be given. The immigration season of 1911 has already opened and we can compare to some extent the arrivals in March, 1911, with the arrivals in March, 1910. We have taken one vessel which arrived on the 4th of March, 1911, and comparing her manifest with the manifest of the same vessel arriving on the 5th March, 1910, we find that in 1910 she brought 559 immigrants, of whom 139 were from European countries in which we put forth no immigration effort, and this year she brought 632 immigrants, and only 27 were from countries where no immigration effort is put forth by us.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). How many immigrants came from Ireland this year as compared with last?

Mr. OLIVER. The immigration from Ireland in the fiscal year 1910 was 3,940, as compared with 3,609 in the previous fiscal year and 933 in the year before that.

Mr. WRIGHT (Muskoka). Can the minister state if the United States statistics are compiled in the same manner as our Canadian statistics? The reason I ask is that the American statistics show that they received more Canadians than we received Americans, prior to last year at all events; the figures for last year I have not seen I would like to know whether the United States figures are compiled on the same basis as ours because there seems to be a difference of opinion on this matter. For instance, I suppose there is some method of dealing with tourists and transients and others who come from the United States for speculative purposes, and who go back after a few months stay here.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the method of counting is the same and the method of accounting is practically the same. I may mention that during the nine years from 1900 to 1909-10 there were, according to the United States reports, immigrants from Canada to the States—immigrants of countries in which we put forth immigration efforts—to the number of 126,624, and during the same period Canada received from the United States 479,262 immigrants.

Mr. WRIGHT (Muskoka). I was asking the minister as to the total migration between the two countries.

Mr. OLIVER. I am giving the total immigration during these years from the United States to Canada, and I am giving the figures of the United States authorities themselves in regard to the emigration from Canada to the United States, of certain classes of people.

Mr. WRIGHT (Muskoka). What I was trying to get at is the method in which the figures are compiled in each country. I have studied the immigration returns as given by the United States up to last year, and they take credit for receiving more Canadians than there were Americans who

left for Canada. Are their figures compiled the same as ours?

Mr. OLIVER. We cannot be responsible for the accuracy of their figures. I do not know how they arrive at their results, and of course if they claim they have received as many Canadians into the United States during the past year as we say we have received American citizens into Canada, we can only say that we believe their figures are incorrect.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. OLIVER. When the committee rose at six o'clock, I was placing before it the figures of the immigration for the current year. I pointed out not only that the total immigration was larger than that of any previous year in the history of the country, but also, from the evidence that was at hand, that the character of the immigration was superior to that of the previous year as the character of that year's immigration was superior to that of the year preceding. I want to emphasize the fact of the larger immigration of this year, an immigration which, if our estimate of 300,000 is correct, is nearly 100,000 more than that of last year, an increase of 33⅓ per cent, and last year's immigration was only exceeded by that of the year 1907-8. The growth of our immigration is shown by the statement that in 1897 the total immigration was 21,716, in 1900 it was 49,149, in 1905 it was 189,064, and in 1910-11 it is over 300,000. The committee will remember that some years ago the conditions surrounding the immigration into Canada were such as to call for considerable unfavourable comment. There were objections made to the character of the people who were coming: They were not well provided with means; they were not sufficiently well selected as to physical and other conditions. The immigration of the present fiscal year, although larger than that of any other fiscal year in the history of Canada, has called forth less complaint upon any of these scores than has ever before been the case in the history of immigration into Canada. That is to say, there is less lack of employment, and less of unfavourable conditions on the part of the immigrants. I will deal with what appear to me to be the reasons for this in a short time. In the meantime, I will give some information as to the means that are taken by the Immigration Department to secure this large influx of people. First, let me say that it is absolutely contrary to the policy of the Immigration Department of the Dominion government at the present time to give assistance to immigrants—to pay anything to induce an immigrant to come to Canada.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). You never did.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, there was a time when we did. In our present attitude we are pursuing an entirely different policy from that adopted by the States which comprise the Australian Commonwealth. New South Wales offers a passage to farmers and farm servants of £6 provided the immigrant has £4 additional in money, and a passage of £3 to his wife and £1.10 to every member of his family under 18 years of age. To domestic servants it offers a passage of £5 provided the immigrant has £3 additional; and the booking agent gets £1 in each case. Queensland is offering a passage of £5 provided the immigrant has £50 of money in addition, and free passages to wives and children, also free passages to domestic servants provided they are country girls, and 22s. to booking agents for every person, whether free or paid for.

Mr. BLAIN. How does the total expenditure for immigration of last year compare with that of the preceding year?

Mr. OLIVER. I am glad that my hon. friend has reminded me of that, because while the immigration has increased from 21,000 in the year 1897 to over 300,000 in 1910, the expenditure has increased from $261,000 in 1897-98, to $960,000 in 1909-10; that is to say, that while the expenditure has increased fourfold, the returns for that expenditure have increased some fourteen fold; so that to-day the country is getting a proportionately greater value for its money than it did in 1897. I have said that Canada has no policy of assisting immigration. Canada has no money to give to any man to cause him to come to Canada; but Canada spends her money for the purpose of bringing the advantages of Canada to the attention of those who are likely to avail themselves of them. Our immigration policy is in the first instance simply an advertising policy—a means of placing the advantages of Canada before such people in other countries as we desire to induce to come to Canada in the belief that they will do well for themselves when they come here. We, therefore, keep salaried agents, advertise in newspapers, and publish literature in regard to Canada for the information of the public. Speaking in more detail, in Great Britain we have nine salaried agents in permanent offices, whose business it is to distribute literature, to give information, to spread a knowledge of Canada wherever it can advantageously be done, and to facilitate the coming to Canada of desirable people who wish to come. On the continent of Europe we have only two such agencies, one in France and one in Belgium. In Great Britain we find that

a great deal of our publicity work is done by the booking agents, who are licensed by the British government to sell transportation. By our arrangement with these people we are enabled to get their special efforts on behalf of Canada. This is where the bonus system comes in. We pay these booking agents $5 on each ticket to Canada sold by them, provided the person buying the ticket is of the class considered desirable by us. This makes the agent interested in advertising Canada. He would rather sell tickets to Canada than to the United States or South Africa, or South America or any other country that does not give him any extra consideration of this kind.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this bonus for men, women and children?

Mr. OLIVER. For all adults; it is £1, and for children under 18 it is ten shillings. We have in Great Britain, therefore, by reason of this bonus system, not only the nine agencies that we have established, but also the three thousand booking agents scattered throughout the British islands, who are working on behalf of Canadian immigration. Not only so, but by reason of the fact that we only pay the bonus on certain classes of immigrants, we have them working to secure that class of immigrants for Canada; because, they do not get the bonus if we consider the immigrant is not sufficiently desirable to warrant us in paying the bonus.

On the continent of Europe, in most countries the conditions surrounding immigration effort are very different from those in Great Britain. We have not the same liberty of action. Some of the countries have very restrictive laws against immigration, and we do not think it is advisable to make the same general arrangement in regard to booking agents that we do in Great Britain. In Great Britain it is assumed that every booking agent is willing to act as an agent for the Canadian government and is suitable for doing so; it is only if we find that he is not suitable that we cut him off our list. But on the continent of Europe, where the governments are more or less restrictive in the matter of immigration, we do not think it desirable to make the same general arrangements with licensed booking agents, and so we only make arrangements with such of them as we are satisfied are of such standing and character that they will not bring us into any conflict with the government of that country. We have arrangements with booking agents in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, France, Belgium and Switzerland, but in none of the other countries of Europe. With regard to Germany, we should be glad to have arrangements with booking agents there, but the German government is so restrictive in the matter of emigration that we do not think it is desirable that we should incur any possibility of friction with that government by making arrangements with the licensed booking agents. In other countries also, we have not dealt with any booking agents, and therefore no bonuses are paid on immigrants coming from these countries. On emigration from continental Europe we paid last year in bonuses £2,035, distributed as follows:

Norway	£940
Sweden	111
Denmark	97
Holland	210
France	448
Belgium	226
Switzerland	1

In the United States we have seventeen established agencies with salaried agents. Our campaign in the United States is more largely a newspaper advertising campaign than in either Great Britain or the continent of Europe.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the minister tell us where these salaried agents in the United States are located?

Mr. OLIVER. In the following cities: Detroit, Michigan; Spokane, Washington; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Watertown, South Dakota; Grand Forks, North Dakota; St. Paul, Minnesota; Omaha, Nebraska; Kansas City, Missouri; Toledo, Ohio: Chicago, Illinois; Great Falls, Montana; Indianapolis, Indiana; Syracuse, New York; Boston, Massachusetts; Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, and Providence, Rhode Island.

In the United States we employ sub-agents who are paid an allowance based upon the number of people whom they bring in, the allowance being at the rate of $3 for each adult male person, $2 for each woman and $1 for each child. These sub-agents are mainly useful in giving the people information as to how they can best reach Canada with their effects.

The work of advertising in foreign countries and in the British islands is a large part of our immigration effort and perhaps the most important part. But another very important part is that of dealing with the immigrants after they arrive in Canada. While we do not give any financial assistance,—that is, it is not our policy to give financial assistance, it is our policy to facilitate, as far as possible, the immigrant reaching the destination and the purpose for which he came to Canada. For that reason we have a system in the western provinces of distributing immigrants on the land. There is what might be called a central distribution office in Winnipeg in charge of the Commissioner of Immigration. All railroads of the west radiate from Winnipeg, and, at different points throughout the western provinces which

immigrants are likely to seek, we have immigration halls, that is, places where immigrants may be temporarily entertained on leaving the train and before they go out on the land. We have a number of officers known as land guides, who are paid at the rate of $2 per day and whose duty it is to guide parties out to the vacant lands. These land guides are men who are acquainted with the run of the surveys, have some knowledge of the country, and can take a person who is not familiar with conditions in that country—and, naturally a person coming from the British islands or from continental Europe must find things very strange when he goes on the prairie—to the best land available in the neighbourhood. When the immigrant comes looking for land, arrangements may be made with the land guide, who is responsible to the government, and who will take the immigrant out and show him the land and indicate the boundaries and, generally speaking, assist in locating him. The immigrant, of course, has to pay for his own expenses, including transportation, but we give the land guide payment at the rate of $2 per day so as to retain his services.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. How many of these land guides are there in the employ of the government?

Mr. OLIVER. At this time, 65.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. How are they distributed throughout the prairie provinces?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not, offhand, say just where they are located, but, generally speaking, they are located so as to be in touch with the land agencies, because the land agency is the place to which the immigrant must go in order to locate his land after he has decided upon it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Has the minister any complaints of any of these guides 'working' these immigrants—that is, getting an extra fee for showing them the good land? The minister, I suppose, understands what I mean. There have been complaints that guides would not show landseekers the best land unless they received $100 or $200 extra. Have any complaints of that kind been received?

Mr. OLIVER. I have had no complaints on that line. Such complaints, if they were made to the commissioner at Winnipeg, would not likely reach me through the commissioner at Winnipeg, as I am sure that on receipt of such complaint the commissioner would dismiss the guide before the complaint reached me. If my hon. friend has any knowledge of such cases and the facts can be substantiated, I will guarantee that the guide complained of will be dismissed without delay.

Mr. OLIVER.

In Ontario and Quebec, where the demand is not for free land, but for farm labourers, we have 125 distribution agents in the farming counties, whose business it is to see that immigrants for Ontario are distributed amongst the farmers who desire help. In 1909, we distributed 3,610 farm labourers amongst the farmers of these two provinces, and in 1910, 6,769. Thus the number of labourers supplied to farmers in this way doubled in one year. In Prince Edward Island we have had a Mr. Winfield employed for about two years. The conditions there are different again from those in Ontario and Quebec and the west. There is no great demand for farm labourers and no free land, but there is land which can be purchased at a reasonable price, so that Mr. Winfield's efforts are directed to bringing out a class of practical farmers who wish to buy land at reasonable rates. He sails on the 14th of next month with a party of this kind.

On behalf of New Brunswick, we have had since Christmas, Mr. Craigie, of St. John, N.B., in the old country. We have so far had no returns from him. At the moment we have no person from Nova Scotia, but expect to have before long.

Mr. DANIEL. Is Mr. Craigie working in connection with the local government? The local authorities have cognizance of farms in New Brunswick which can be obtained by immigrants. Would he have a list of these farms?

Mr. OLIVER. I would think it would be part of his business to inform him in regard to the conditions there. Undoubtedly he would be informed and would take the action my hon. friend suggests. He will work in harmony with the provincial government in securing immigrants who will be likely to occupy land in New Brunswick.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Has not the government an agent in Winnipeg who receives $25 from the farmers to bring out labourers to Manitoba?

Mr. OLIVER. We have two agents in Manitoba for the placing of labourers and we have sent farm delegates from Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta during the winter to advertise and bring to the notice of the people of England, Scotland and Ireland the opportunities offered by the three provinces in the way of free land, land for purchase and employment for labourers.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I did not mean that, but before Mr. Smith was sent to London he used to send agents round to the different towns, and the farmers used to give him $25 on condition that he would supply them with the men. Whether that custom is still continued I do not know.

Mr. OLIVER. That is not being done at the present time, unless under very exceptional circumstances; I think it was not found to work out satisfactorily. I think there was a man named Adamson who did that sort of work, and while Mr. Adamson was a very good man, and brought out a number of good men under that system the scheme did not work out satisfactorily with the steamship companies.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Who got the $25?

Mr. OLIVER. He got it.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the minister if there is similar co-operation in the province of Ontario?

Mr. OLIVER. The distributing agent in the country districts is at liberty to use his own judgment. He communicates with our agents in the old country, he tells them there are so many men required in his locality. If a farmer desires to do so, he can avail himself of the services of the employment agent to advance the fare for a man that he wants to bring over. But that is not a part of our system, that is a transaction between the farmer and the employment agent. That is not a part of our business. If the employment agent and the farmer can arrange it between themselves, we have no objection.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). The minister will remember that before the Christmas holidays I brought to his attention a matter relating to this very point. A gentleman in Winnipeg, Mr. Hutchings, in the saddlery business, had completed a large factory, and he wanted to get a number of operators. The saddlery business in England was dull on account of automobiles taking the places of horses and carriages. He could get good men, but these men could not comply with the provisions of the law which required that they should have so much money in their pocket on landing. The explanation the minister gave at the time, I think, was to the effect that the employer could advance the money. I mentioned the fact to Mr. Hutchings, who seemed to be much annoyed, and thought he was not well treated, and he did not agree with the minister as to the facts. I think the minister said there was an obligation which would prevent them from entering with another man's money in their pockets. Perhaps the minister could make his position clear now.

Mr. OLIVER. There must have been some misunderstanding on the part of Mr. Hutchings. There is no objection to Mr. Hutchings or any one else advancing money to men in England. It is none of our business how the man in England gets his money so long as he comes to Canada with the money in his pocket, and we are satisfied it is his money. We do not care if he has to pay it back afterwards, but if he comes to Canada with the money in his pocket to spend as he pleases, then we are satisfied that he has $25 that will keep him from becoming a public charge until he has a reasonable opportunity of getting work. But we do object to the employer furnishing that money to him at the port of landing, because the inference is that it is only handed to the immigrant to enable him to pass our officer, and then he must hand it back to the agent who is employing him. That is contrary to our policy, and we do not allow it if we can prevent it. But if the man leaves England with the money in his pocket, we do not concern ourselves whether it was advanced to him or not.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). Suppose the employer of labour here has advanced that money to a hundred different men in different places, and they are able to show the money at the port of entry. Well, if there is an obligation to pay it back, could a conscientious man with the money that was advanced to him for that purpose, and which he knew was not his own, and which had to be earned subsequently, could he make a declaration that that was his money? Then it would be useless to advance him the money. That was the point that Mr. Hutchings made to me.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that is rather straining the point. I cannot imagine many men having so tender a conscience as to be unwilling to say that the money they were entitled to spend as they pleased was not their own money. As a matter of fact, it was their own money.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). So the employer has got to make a gift of it, and cannot demand it back subsequently?

Mr. OLIVER. He can lend them the money, but the transaction must be made on the other side before he leaves. We do not ask whether the man has to pay the money back or not; the point is that he must have the money, and that he is privileged to spend it as he pleases. If he gets it in England and brings it with him across the ocean, that is evidence that he has had the money in his possession, and the ability to spend it if he wanted to. Therefore, we are satisfied that when he comes to this side he is able to spend it if he wants to. But if the employer is not willing to give him the money until he lands on this side, that is evidence to us that the employer is not willing to trust him with the money, and the chances are that the money is only given to him to be handed back, and, therefore, it did not belong to the immigrant.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I have great respect for the minister, but I have not much respect for the law that he lays down. Even if the money is loaned to him, he still has it in his pocket.

Mr. OLIVER. The requirement is that the man who lands in Canada shall not be under the necessity of appealing to charity in case he is not able to find remunerative employment immediately upon landing. Now that is one purpose, and that purpose is served if the man has the money in his pocket when he lands, and can do with it as he pleases, no matter whether he borrows it or not. But if it is only given to him as he lands, and must be handed back to the employer the moment he passes our officer, then that is not his money to do with as he pleases, and is no protection to the immigrant.

Mr. BRADBURY. It seems that this is not a good law in so far as we are concerned. I understand that we have been endeavouring to secure the very best settlers we are able to get from the British possessions. In this case under discussion, these men were mechanics, they were under contract, they were coming out here with permanent employment assured in Mr. Hutchings' factory. I think the law is—I will not say a silly law—but one that is bound to work to the detriment of our country in preventing us from securing a very desirable class of men. I do not think it is wise in a case of this kind to exact the qualification of having $25 in their pockets. I think men leaving England, Ireland and Scotland, especially mechanics, or any other kind of men that come to this country with assured positions, should not be required to comply with that qualification. Mr. Hutchings complained very bitterly, and he stated that he had a factory that would give employment to four or five hundred men. He told me that he had three hundred mechanics employed to go into that factory, and that these men were refused entry into Canada because they did not each have $25 in their pockets. Outside of this case altogether I think the principle is wrong. I think the minister is quite right to apply it to immigrants from foreign countries, Slavs and settlers of that kind, but when you are bringing into this country our own people, because we look upon people from Great Britain as our own people, you should not put such a barrier between them and Canada. If men are enabled to come out here with employment assured there should be no barrier. I can understand that it is necessary to keep out paupers, but there is no danger where men are assured a position, and a responsible man in Canada notifies the department that these men are about to enter his employ. I think the law is a mistaken one when applied in that way.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. OLIVER. The law is made to meet a certain condition, it is made for a certain purpose and when the need of the law exists it is desirable that it should be enforced. I quite appreciate the fact that there are times and conditions when it is not necessary to enforce that law, and during a great part of last summer the conditions were relaxed, so that where a mechanic was coming to assured employment the $25 was not insisted upon. But that was during the summer season and when the winter season came we felt that under winter conditions in Canada it was not in the best interests of the country that a man, even if he were coming to what was called assured employment, should come without money in his pocket, because we all know that labour conditions are entirely different in the winter from what they are in the summer, and that if a man is thrown out of employment in the winter he has not the same chance to get employment as in the summer. Although a man may come to assured employment we have no certainty that he will continue in his employment. He may be inefficient, he may have been mistaken in the class of work that he was required to do and the employer would not be warranted in keeping him. Such a man under such circumstances arriving in the dead of winter will be just as hungry if he is out of a job as if he had not been a mechanic or a desirable settler and will become an object of charity. Therefore, we withdrew the relaxation in the fall and it was not until the relaxation had been withdrawn that our friend, Mr. Hutchings, arrived at the conclusion that he needed these men. If he had thought of it a little sooner he would have been able to have got them in without their having the $25; in fact, if I remember aright the relaxation was still in force when my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg) spoke in the House, and I so informed him.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). No, the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, the relaxation was in force until the 10th December.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). He could not take advantage of it by that time.

Mr. OLIVER. That may be; I cannot say as to that, but if Mr. Hutchings had arrangements made for his men at the time my hon. friend brought the complaint before the House there was no bar whatever to him getting them in. But, on the 10th December the relaxation was withdrawn, and I appeal to the committee if it is not right and reasonable that during the winter months in Canada any man landing in Canada should be in a position to support himself for a little time at any rate without appealing to any one.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox and Addington). The minister has given us quite a rehearsal; he has spoken particularly of what has been happening in this financial year, and no person in this House outside of himself has any opportunity of investigating any thing in connection with it. Then there is another thing that I think we are more interested in perhaps than the numbers he has given us as representing the immigrants who have come into this country. There are only certain classes for which the government are giving bonuses of $5 each to agents. I understand they are farmers, farm labourers and domestic servants. He has told us that they placed over 6,000 in Ontario and Quebec last year, or two-thirds of all they got in of that class. I have here a statement that was made by Mr. Scott, the immigration commissioner. He said that during 1910 we received 9,813 farmers and farm labourers for whom we paid $49,065, that we received 6,015 women for whom we paid a bonus of $30,075 and that we received 2,840 children for whom we paid ten shillings per head, the total amounting to $86,240. As I understand the government's position on this question, it is that they are not supposed to assist any other than these three classes to come to Canada—farmers, farm labourers and female domestic servants. We have 3,000 agents who are paid commissions for getting immigrants, we have nine regular salaried agents in the old country and during last season we sent over forty special agents at a very great cost. We did not accomplish very much. My own impression is that sending over special agents is a farce. It is very nice for a friend who is in ill-health or who wants a trip to go over as a special immigration agent, get $100 a month and expenses. Some of these expenses are exceedingly high. We keep no track as far as I know of the people who leave the country. The minister told us this afternoon that we got 103,000 immigrants from the United States. If you look at the immigration report of the United States you will find at page 142 the figures given with reference to the year's immigration from the United States to Canada and the emigration from Canada to the United States as follows:

Immigrants from United States to Canada—	
United States citizens..	78,697
Canadian citizens..	15,203
Aliens..	22,477
Total..	116,377
Immigrants from Canada to the United States—	
United States citizens..	22,832
Canadian citizens..	44,328
Aliens..	27,336
Total..	94,496

According to the American statement therefore we had the better of them by 21,496 people. It seems to me there is something very strange about this. We have been told that the exodus has been stopped and that our people are not now going to the United States, but here the American statistics show that Canadians are going in large numbers to the neighbouring republic. Now, to get this number of people from the United States, we spent something over $232,347 according to the answer given to me by the minister a few days ago.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). For 21,000 people.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). For a little over 21,000 people. Then, there is a discrepancy between the immigration report given out by the department and Lord Strathcona's report to the department. The department says we got from Great Britain and Ireland, 59,760 immigrants last year, while Lord Strathcona says we got 66,554 and strange to say, that while we are told it would cost too much to keep track of the people who leave this country so that statistics might be prepared with regard to them, yet Lord Strathcona in his report to the department at page 65 says:

> Some interesting instances of the volume and character of the immigrants from the United Kingdom to Canada, and the return movement to Great Britain from the Dominion are shown by the figures quoted below which have been obtained from official sources.

Then he says there were sent to Canada 113,315 and there returned to the old country 46,791, leaving, as he says, the balance of 66,524. I should like to know why the department does not adopt some system by which we can know the number and character of the people who come to this country, as well as of those who leave this country, because unless we have such information, we are entirely in the dark and we are paying out such large sums of money that I think it is time to cry a halt. From 1897 to 1910 we paid out for immigration $8,847,272.33, and if you add the appropriation for this year which amounts to $1,066,250, you will have $9,913,522.33 expended for immigration from 1897 up to the end of the fiscal year. When we remember that the federal government of the United States has not now and never had an immigrant agent, and when we remember that transportation companies are forbidden under a heavy penalty to solicit immigration, it is a remarkable thing that last year the United States got over one million one hundred thousand immigrants on whom they collected a head tax of $4 each amounting to over $4,000,000, and they spent for the purpose of keeping out of the country—I think that describes

it exactly—$2,631,538, leaving them a balance collected on immigrants for that year amounting to $1,533,428. Now, it is strange to me that while we have 3,000 agents in Great Britain and Ireland, and 45 immigrant agents on commission in the United States and 17 on salary, we are not as successful in proportion as is the American Republic. I would call the special attention of the minister to this point, because I think the time has come when there should be a reduction in the amount of money we are spending, especially when we are getting such meagre results in the line of desirable immigrants. I am sure the minister would hardly like to go before a Trades Union and tell them he brought in about 300,000 immigrants last year, only about 10 per cent of whom were farmers, farm labourers, and domestic servants, notwithstanding that the Trades Unions are opposed to bringing in mechanics and the labour unions are opposed to bringing in labourers and the government declares it is their policy not to bring them in. During the last three years the government has spent over $1,000,000 a year for immigration although when we were in power the Liberal party found very great fault with our expending $120,000 a year for the same purpose. Now, I have figures here from the American report at page 55 which tend to prove that we are getting into Canada a great many undesirable immigrants and that the selection made on the other side before they start for this country is not nearly as perfect as that made by the United States. I may state that in 1907 there was a large convention held in New York at which persons of various notions about immigration met, and prominent citizens of the United States discussed the question thoroughly. That same year the Congress of the United States passed a law appointing a commission to investigate the whole matter of immigration and the commission was permitted to go anywhere it chose to pursue its investigation, and to report the result. They say, in an interim summary report, that their complete report will require about 40 volumes, and while I do not expect the Minister of the Interior to read the whole 40 volumes, yet I think it would well repay him to read the summary report presented by the commission. Now, in the figures given below it is shown beyond peradventure, that the United States were called upon to reject fewer immigrants on this side of the Atlantic than Canada rejected, and the reason for that is that the process of selection on the other side before the immigrants start for the American continent, is much more perfect under the United States system than under ours. I quote the following figures:

Mr. WILSON (Lennox and Addington).

Immigrants admitted and aliens deported after admission to Canada and the United States, fiscal years 1907 and 1909—

Country.	Immigrants admitted.	Aliens deported.	Percentage deported.
Canada...	534,044	2,774	1 to 193
United States....	2,820,005	5,188	1 to 544

If this statement is true, it shows a great laxity on the part of our Immigration Department in allowing undesirable immigrants to embark for this country. I am informed that the United States have medical officers in some of the European countries for the past ten years. I believe we have one in New York; I do not know that we have any other. Then, every captain of a vessel bringing immigrants to the United States must make a declaration on reaching port that the medical officer of the ship has examined every immigrant on board, both orally and otherwise, and when they land, the medical officer on shore has to do the same thing. It is said that there are often as many rejected at the port of embarkation as are brought over. The shipping companies have got tired of carrying people both ways for one fare. Besides, if any contagious disease is found among the immigrants that might have been discovered before the ship sailed, the shipping companies are liable to a fine of $100, besides having to take back the affected people to the country from which they came. I made some mention of that last year when the Immigration Bill was before the House, and did what I could to assist in improving that measure. I wanted to have it made as stringent as possible, because I look upon the immigration business as the most important business we have in this country. If we bring into the country a lot of people who are weaklings or insane, we can never correct the mistake, whereas if we spend a little more money on anything than we should, we have only to work a little harder to make up the loss. In the Ontario report on the hospitals for the insane for last year, it is stated that during ten months of that year 168 insane persons were sent back, and that was a saving to the province of $400,000, I suppose taking into account the number of years that these people would have to be maintained if they had been left here. That I think shows that our immigration regulations are too lax. One thing the department has done which I am pleased with, although it costs a good deal of money. It has appointed, along our border, between Canada and the United States, 69 regular preventive officers to prevent undesirable people coming into this country. In addition, I understand, there are 132 customs officers who are required to act as preventive officers for the same purpose. That makes an army of a little over 200, and while it is a little expensive, these people render a valuable service. The department

has sent a number of people to the old country as farmer delegates, and it seems to value them all the same, because it pays them all the same salary, except one lady, who is paid at a much higher rate than the others. Donald Irwin, from Lloydminster, Saskatchewan, was employed for four months at $100 a month, and was paid $761.50 for expenses, or over $6.25 per day. Alexander D. Gamby, from Griswold, Manitoba, was paid a salary of $100 a month for three months, and $606.16 for expenses, or about $6.70 per day. S. Larcombe, of Birtle, Manitoba, was paid $100 a month for three months, and $718.28 for expenses, or about $7.98 per day. Rev. J. A. Winfield, of St. Stephen, New Brunswick, was paid $100 a month for four months and $742.68 for expenses, or almost $6 per day. J. G. Turgeon, of Hardisty, Saskatchewan, was paid $100 a month for five months and $885.47 for expenses, or $5.90 per day. Agnes D. Cameron of England was paid $200 a month for four months and $2,592.62 for expenses, or $21.60 per day. H. S. Bardal, of Winnipeg, was paid $100 a month for six months and $1,143.43 for expenses, or $6.35 per day. William Griffith, of St. John, New Brunswick, was paid $100 a month for eight months and $1,613.84 for expenses, or $201.73 per month. That there may be no mistake about this matter, I will read the heading of the statement which Mr. Scott sent to the committee: 'Farmer delegates sent to the British Isles and Europe, fiscal year 1909-10.' I do not know the position this lady, Agnes D. Cameron, occupies, but I can hardly imagine that she is properly described as a farmer delegate. I think the time has come when we should cry a halt in spending money so recklessly in connection with immigration, and for getting into the country many people whom we do not want. What we do want are farmers, farm labourers and female domestics; but I do not think the government can take credit for bringing in a lot of other people who prefer to live in the cities and towns. The United States reports show that about 40 per cent of the immigrants go home again and about 30 per cent stay when they do go. This indicates that the immigrants who are going to the United States now are not the same kind that came years ago. Formerly they came to become citizens and make homes for themselves and throw in their lot with the people of the country. Now many come during the good times when they can get good wages, and then it is so easy to go back that they return home again and take their money with them. I would like the minister to give us a pledge to-night that he will look into this matter and see if he cannot curtail the wasteful expenditure that is taking place on immigration at the present time.

Mr. E. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity of making a few remarks in regard to immigration.

In providing the means for starting an overwhelming influx of immigrants with the object of developing our resources, we have too often neglected to lay down strict rules for the proper selection of such immigrants. Accordingly people have been admitted whose character was not always above reproach.

In the course of the last session, parliament and the government materially improved the law in this respect. However, the form to be filled in and signed by the immigrant is not of a nature to enlighten us as to the latters' character.

The hon. minister should require from the immigrants a certificate vouching for their good behaviour. Such certificate might be delivered by a magistrate, by the physician attending the immigrant, by the clerk of a court, by a clergyman or by the mayor of the municipality wherein the immigrant resides. Such a formality might be readily complied with. Desirable citizens would be proud to hand to the proper officers a certificate giving evidence of their good behaviour. It would be an honourable certificate of registration for each new citizen of Canada.

Last session, I applied for the correspondence which had taken place between the medical immigration inspectors and the superintendent of immigration. I made a special study of the methods of medical inspection followed at Quebec. I appreciate the learning and the zeal of Dr. Pagé, superintendent of the immigration hospital and head of the inspection service at Quebec. I foresee that in the near future satisfactory results will be forthcoming from his work, his researches and his suggestions.

I wish to make a passing reference to the annual report of the Department of the Interior. The hon. minister publishes only the reports of our inspectors, of our immigration agents and the reports of our agents in the British Isles, in France and in Belgium. Unfortunately these reports are oftentimes a mere rehash of the facts already in print. They do not impart any information in respect to our colonization societies or our agents in the New England states. I hope that henceforth the hon. minister will cause to be included in his annual report an account of the work done by all our immigration agents.

We are seeking to blend with our native-born population swarms of foreign elements. We cannot be too careful in the selection of these outsiders. The United States, though their population aggregates 90,000,000, are fearful lest they may be unable to cope with such large arrivals of immigrants, and they are endeavouring by means of restrictive legislation to impede

the rush into the country of immigrants from foreign lands.

The Canadianization of foreign elements in this young country of ours, with its immense territory, presents a social problem of the greatest importance. The growing generations of immigrants, constantly increasing, may ultimately have the upper hand in the management of our affairs. It is then incumbent on us to make a most judicious selection of these immigrants. Some political men conceive the greatest fears in regard to the proposed trade reciprocity arrangements between Canada and the United States. They fear the effects of an immigration policy which has attracted to Canada since 1900 close on one million immigrants from the United States. In their opinion, Canadian feeling is not sufficiently developed, is not sufficiently strong, does not exert enough prestige, to allow us safely to go into a business understanding of that kind with our neighbours. But I cannot admit that such an arrangement implies the slightest weakening of our feelings of loyalty towards the mother country.

It is with sadness that I see so many of our Canadians leaving this country for the United States.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX (Translation.) Do you mean French Canadians?

Mr. PAQUET (Translation.) I said Canadians.

Mr. MARTIN (Translation.) What about those who are coming back to Canada?

Mr. PAQUET (Translation.) Statistics go to show that during the fiscal year 1908-09, 18,111 Canadians emigrated to the United States for good. In 1908-09, that figure reached 43,805. During the last fiscal year, 53,448 Canadians left to take up their homes in the United States. According to the report of Mr. René Dupont, immigration agent at Quebec, 19,000 French Canadians have left the province of Quebec. Over 11,000 emigrated to the United States. Such figures should induce us to make untiring and strenuous efforts towards keeping in the country the sons of Canada.

Allow me to make a few remarks in respect to the French immigration. In the course of the last fiscal year, we received 1,727 immigrants from France, and in order to attain that result, we expended $10,750.71. In 1909. I voted in favour of the French treaty believing in my heart that it would make for an increase of our trade with France. In my opinion, such an arrangement would develop our business intercourse with France, help in building up the means of communication between the two countries, attract French capital and French immigration to our shores.

If the Dominion government is intent on attaining that goal, they should hasten to reorganize the office of our general agent in France. We should have at Paris, as our representative, an active, able man, thoroughly versed in business matters. We should so arrange that this agency of ours in France may become a powerful means of extending our trade, a centre whence Canadian energy may radiate with irresistible force. French capitalists will look on such an agency with great confidence. The question of Canada's representation in France is worthy of the immediate consideration of the government. I quote the following lines from the pen of Mr. Louis H. Taché in the 'Canada' review:

> The decease of Mr. Fabre has created a vacancy which it will not be an easy matter to fill. His great individuality, his refinement, his remarkable learning, and social qualities which are seldom met with to-day, had thrown on the general commissionership of Canada a glow of which it would have been deprived under ordinary circumstances.
>
> The powers that be have never done anything to surround their representative in Paris with the necessary prestige and provide him with the means required to show up Canada in the right light and to develop in an effective and systematic way our relations with France.
>
> It is not a difficult matter to find Canadians capable of representing us worthily. The general commissionership in Paris does not require exceptional qualities; but it is organized in such a manner, its present make-up is so different from what one might expect, that while the post is too important a one to be intrusted to a mere plodding official, it would not be suitable to a man having the ability and the standing expected in one eligible to succeed Mr. Fabre. In brief, heretofore the position has not implied the authority, has not ensured that independence, or that rate of remuneration, or provided the help required towards the fulfilment of its object.

The Dominion government would be meeting the wishes of all the French Canadians and I might say of all Canadians by providing for the maintenance in Paris of a representation worthy of Canada and worthy of France. At the same time it would be the most effective manner in which immigration from France might be fostered.

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Témiscouata). (Translation.) If my hon. friend the member for l'Islet will allow, should he not, in fairness for Mr René Dupont, have added that, following on the publication of the statistics referred to by the hon. member, and seeing that some people were endeavouring to make political capital out of this announcement, Mr. Dupont wrote to the papers in the province of Quebec a letter of explanation, in which he stated that a number of the so-called emigrants were people who had gone to the States, not with the idea of residing there permanently, but to visit relatives or work there for a few months, having the firm resolve of

coming back to the province of Quebec? It seems to me that any one mentioning his report should also mention that explanatory letter which Mr. Dupont sent to the papers.

Mr. PAQUET (Translation.). In the constituency which I have the honour to represent, I went to the pains of inquiring from the very people who had furnished that information to Mr. Dupont, and they stated they had mentioned only such as had left for the States with the intention of staying away several years to say the least.

As regards the remark made by my hon. friend on the other side, I may say that Mr. Dupont himself acknowledged that his report was incomplete and that he contemplated continuing and completing his work. That is the reason which prompted me to request that the hon. Minister of the Interior should include in his next annual report, not only the reports of our agents in the British Isles, France and Belgium, but also such as would be forwarded by immigration agents in the New England states and the neighbouring republic generally, as well as the reports of the various heads of our colonization societies. Such a request appears to me to be perfectly justified.

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the remarks just made by the hon. gentleman from L'Islet. I must congratulate him on the spirit of fairness and moderation evidenced by the manner in which he addressed the committee. He referred to the regulations which were revised last year by the hon. Minister of the Interior in respect to immigrants who come here from the old country. He stated correctly that these regulations had been made stricter and that as a result the moral character of late arrivals was more satisfactory than in former years. As a matter of fact, even a cursory acquaintance with the course of immigration in Canada, within the last few years especially, will satisfy one as to this: while during a period of fifteen or twenty years we may at times have shown too much leniency toward immigrants entering Canada, for the last five or six years, and more particularly within the last two years we have made the regulations such that to-day we can flatter ourselves with having an immigration practically above reproach.

I shall recall to my hon. friend clauses 40 and 41 of the regulations concerning immigration, and he will aver that under these two clauses and subsection 2 of clause 42, the minister is vested with full powers, that is with unrestricted autocratic powers as regards the deportation of immigrants branded as undesirable.

There is no doubt that Canada leads among the countries of the world in looking after immigrants with a view to retaining only the best. It is almost out of the question for an immigrant with some criminal offence chargeable against him or some dark spot in his record to get into Canada, considering that very stringent regulations await him on arrival. I was happy to gather from what my hon. friend said that he gave credit to the government for having done their duty in that respect.

I shall now pass to another point raised by the hon. gentleman. He called the attention of the House to the exit of Canadian emigrants to the New England states. He will agree with me, I think, that in the course of the last fifteen years we have succeeded in checking that exit. He will admit that fifteen or twenty years ago our rural communities were rapidly being depopulated. At the time I travelled through the province of Quebec and I know well that in certain back settlements, and even in the streets of extensive villages, abandoned houses could be pointed to, and they made up one quarter, if not one half of the total, their occupiers having left for the United States. But to-day, thank God, when our fellow citizens leave the province of Quebec, it is to settle on the fertile western plains, in Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and even in British Columbia and the Yukon. Only a very small minority, indeed, take to the New England states. They go to work there during the winter months, but they return in the spring to work the land. They still retain a sweet remembrance of home.

Of course my hon. friend is well aware that since the building of the Transcontinental has been started, new parishes have been established in the counties of L'Islet, Temiscouata and others on the south shore, new industries spring up at every point where our French Canadian fellow citizens are called upon to play a leading part.

As regards the work of repatriation, the reports of our agents and the statistics supplied by them do not appear in the annual report of the Department of the Interior, but I shall draw the minister's attention to the wish expressed by the member for L'Islet, and no doubt such information will henceforth be included in that report.

The following is a list of the agents who are appointed especially to look after the French Canadian communities of New England and some of the near-by western states:

Bérubé, Rév. A. P., Vonda, Sask.
Carbonneau, J. B., Biddeford, Me.
Caron, Rév. I., Montreal, Que.
DesRosiers, Nap., Rockland, Ont.
Dupont, René, Quebec.
Gauthier, Rev. E. E., Saint-Alphonse, Chicoutimi, Qué.
Gingras, Elzéar, Providence, R.-I.
Gravel, Rev. L. P., Moosejaw, Sask.
Laurier, C. A., Marquette, Mich.
Laurier, Romuald, Saginaw, Michigan.

Ouellette, Rev. J. A., Montreal, Que.
Robillard, J. E., Lanoraie, Que.

That is a goodly number of agents who for some years past have been doing some excellent work in New England. It is only fair that the reports transmitted by these agents be included in the minister's yearly report.

As regards the grants paid by the department to various colonization societies, the following is a list of the amounts expended in the province of Quebec.

Quebec and Lake St. John, $8,000.

Société d'colonization de Montreal, $4,000.

Société d'immigration de la Vallée d'Ottawa, $2,500.

L'Union nationale française de Montreal, $1,000.

My hon. friend referred briefly to the immigration from France. I concur in the eulogies he bestowed on the work, the zeal, the high intelligence of the late Hector Fabre, whose decease occurred in September last. He was at the time, and had been for a number of years our agent in Paris. We may find a successor for him, but nobody will be found capable of replacing him in every respect. He was a man who, not only in Canada, but in France as well, was held in the highest esteem, a first rate writer, who more than any one else revealed Canada to Old France. Unfortunately he was getting old and his salary did not allow of his advertising Canada on a grand scale, at a time when it was still practicable to do so.

My hon. friend should bear in mind that during the last decade French immigration to Canada has considerably increased. I remember the time when the sight of a French settler coming to Canada had something of the miracle about it. Of course there existed in the Northwest a few small settlements of Frenchmen and Belgians, here and there, but it was an unusual thing. Our trade intercourse with France amounted to very little and we had not yet succeeded in maintaining a line of steamships plying between Havre and Quebec.

Now what do we find in going through the statistics since 1901? The following figures have been supplied to me for France and Belgium respectively by the Department of the Interior:

FRANCE.

	Immigrants.
1901	360
1902	431
1903	937
1904	1,534
1905	1,743
1906	1,648
1907	1,314
1908	2,671
1909	1,830
1910	1,727
Total	14,195

BELGIUM.

	Immigrants.
1901	132
1902	223
1903	303
1904	858
1905	796
1906	1,106
1907	650
1908	1,214
1909	828
1910	910
Total	7,020

It seems to me almost incredible that we should have succeeded in developing French immigration to such an extent in the space of so short a period, and I shall explain why I take that view.

I have made a special study of that question, not only in books, but on the spot, in France, as well as of the means the Canadian government had at their disposal. The problem appealed to me, not only as a Canadian, but as a French Canadian, still remindful of his lineage. I considered that we had a right to our share in that great flow of immigration which is pouring from year to year over this continent of ours. I went to headquarters for my information, and I say to my hon. friend, with the hope that my voice will be heard throughout the province of Quebec, that the directing of a continuous and powerful stream of immigration from France to Canada is practically an impossibility. In the first place, it is admitted that the population of France is decreasing year by year. That is a sad circumstance for our old mother country, but it is the exact truth. In the second place, France is under a regime of compulsory military service; and for these two reasons the French government not only dislikes the idea of Frenchmen emigrating to foreign lands, but frowns on any scheme for recruiting immigrants. Two years ago, I was in Paris shortly after the hon. Mr. Fabre, who was already a sick man at the time, had got communication of a circular sent out from the Department of the Interior in France to prefects, prohibiting all endeavours towards recruiting emigrants for Canada. The French government complained to the British embassy that, notwithstanding regulations to the contrary, our agents in France persisted in carrying on their work. The French government took exception to certain clergymen appointed by the Canadian government travelling through the country with a view to inducing peasants to emigrate to Canada.

They complain also of the activity of our agents who encourage school teachers to promote emigration to this country. The French Minister of the Interior called the attention of our ambassador to this matter which he called a grave irregularity. I thereupon called on the Prime Minister Mr. Briand, whom I had the honour of

meeting a few days previously at the Chamber of Deputies and explained to him that our agents did not intend to organize a propaganda, but merely desired to convey to those peasants who desired to emigrate, information which might decide them in favour of Canada. I also left in Mr. Briand's hands a memorandum explaining the nature of instructions given to our agents, and he promised to look into the matter carefully with a view to a future conference.

Some few months ago, I was again in Paris, and in order to make it clear to the committee that it is impossible to us to undertake any propaganda in France, I will state that another circular was placed in my hands, it having been, this time, delivered to our commissioner through the channel of the British Embassy. I carefully read that circular; it confirms the opinion just now expressed by me that the government will not permit any kind of emigration propaganda on the part of Canada or of any other coutnry.

Mr. PAQUET (Translation.) Had that circular been altered?

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX (Translation.) It has not been altered. In fact the action of our agents is practically paralyzed, as any efforts in that direction might expose them to a fine and even to deportation.

Another fact must not be forgotten when we are discussing French emigration. How can France encourage her citizens to settle in foreign countries, when her own colonies scarcely receive a sufficient number of French immigrants to counterbalance the foreign element? I read the other day an interesting article published in 'La Revue des Deux Mondes'; it may enlighten my hon. friend from L'Islet.

In that article of 'La Revue des Deux Mondes,' the writer recalled the fact, that in Tunis, a French colony whose climate is similar to that of the South of France and only a few hours distant from Marseilles, the French population is in a proportion of 25 per cent, while the Italian element represents 75 per cent; I mean, of course, of the white population, not the native. France being unable to people Tunis, her most valuable colony, how can she encourage her citizens to settle in Canada or in America?

Of course, with due exercise of tact and discretion, our agents in France may be able to direct towards Canada those Frenchmen who have in any case decided to come to America. But as to supposing that any large number of such emigrants may be obtained, that would be an illusion. We may consider ourselves lucky to have been able during the last decade, to increase so materially the figures of French immigration; but once again I say let us not count upon any large increase. As to Belgium, the case is different. The Belgium government is less opposed to an emigration propaganda, yet it must be carried on with due discretion. Besides we must not forget that Belgium is an exceedingly wealthy country and that from such countries emigration is usually limited. Nevertheless, thanks to the Minister of Agriculture, our pavillion at Brussels was the central point of attraction at the last World's Fair. Hundreds of thousands of Belgians have been able to read and study our circulars, atlases and folders published both in French and Flemish describing the wealth and beauty of this land. I am convinced that in consequence of that exhibit, several thousands of Belgian colonists will settle here. It is easier to carry on a propaganda by means of these exhibitions than by agents. Besides such agents are excluded not from France and Belgium merely but from every important country in Europe. In the United Kingdom alone complete liberty of canvass is allowed. In Germany and Russia emigration propaganda is forbidden. Two or three years ago a Russian officer who was quite familiar with conditions obtaining in Germany and Russia, informed me that he could secure for us several thousands of excellent immigrants, I introduced him to the Minister of the Interior who was quite willing to authorize his work in Lithuania, provided he first obtained permission from the Russian and German governments to carry on the work. The officer consulted the Russian and German consuls, and both informed him that their respective governments would forbid anything of this kind. All this tends to establish that it is quite impossible to undertake any such propaganda in violation of the precise instructions given by the authorities either to the prefects or to the governors of provinces. England alone gives us a free hand.

My hon. friend has expressed some fear as to the future of our country. He believes that we are being invaded by Americans and he considers that there is danger of a change in the mental trend of the Canadian people. In my opinion that is a mistake, and the fears expressed by my hon. friend are groundless.

Mr. PAQUET (Translation.) I quoted those words from certain statesmen who feared such a result, but I said that, for my part, I did not believe that the proposed commercial agreement would interfere with our attachment to the mother land.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX (Translation.) I agree with my hon. friend. Evidently I had misunderstood him. But I frequently hear it said when I go to Europe and especially to England, that Canada in receiving such a large number of Americans will finish by becoming Americanized and losing her distinct nationality. Invariably I reply to those who express such fears in

my presence that they are quite mistaken. It is not so much the true Americans that come to Canada as Germans, Scandinavians and even Canadians who had emigrated to the United States.

Mr. BELAND (Translation.) French?

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) Yes, even French Canadians returning to this country. Look over the names of the new so-called American settlers, and you will find that they are not American 'Yankee' names, but those of different European countries. These settlers are fresh arrivals from Europe who have heard that beyond the American frontier, in the western provinces, there are better lands, and that our laws are wiser and more equitable than American laws. Thus it happens that after a few months or perhaps a few year's sojourn in the United States, they cross the line and settle amongst us. The American 'Yankee' colonist is becoming more and more rare. The great adjoining states of Dakota, Minnesota, &c., do not contain a 'Yankee' population; they are peopled by Germans, Scandinavians and other later arrivals. It must not be forgotten that the great majority of our so-called American colonists come from these states.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the remarks made by my hon. friend and to find that they were framed not in a hostile spirit but rather with a view to obtaining information on the immigration movement in our country. Will he allow me to state that I have frequently had occasion to confer with the Minister of the Interior concerning the interests of our fellow-countrymen either in matters of repatriation or of French or Belgian immigration. My observations were invariably well received by the minister and I am pleased to be able to add that those members of the clergy who are interested in the grave problem of immigration, have every reason to be satisfied with the treatment they have received from him.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I have here a return which shows salary and expenses paid to Miss Cameron as different from those given in evidence by Mr. Scott. This return shows that Miss Cameron was appointed on the 20th January, 1910, at $250 a month. In Mr. Scott's evidence, it appears as $200 a month; and the expenses are given as $1,770, against $2,500 in the evidence furnished by Mr. Scott to the committee. I would like the minister to explain that if he can; and also to state what Miss Cameron's duties are.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give a satisfactory explanation of the discrepancy offhand. I ask my hon. friend to give me an opportunity to go into the accounts and see on which side the error is. Although Miss Cameron's salary appears in the list of salaries of farm delegates, she is not a farm delegate. The farm delegate is a practical, successful farmer, if possible, of British birth, who is sent, if possible, to the part of the country from which he came. He is not expected or required to be a man of many words, but he is expected and required to be a man of material success, so that when he goes to the place of his birth in the old country and meets his friends, and they ask him what he has done, he will have something to tell them—not what he thinks, or has heard, or believes, or supposes, but what he has done in the way of material success. He is in himself an example to the old countryman of what may be achieved in Canada. For these reasons we do not look for men who have any particular ability in speaking, lecturing or making an appearance before the public. But it is necessary to have also lecturers, people who have the ability to interest audiences by delivering addresses. Miss Cameron has a reputation as a lecturer and also a writer. She is a native-born Canadian, a native of British Columbia, has travelled a great deal in Canada, and has had a great deal of experience both as a writer and as a lecturer. We did not think we were making a mistake—and we do not think so now—in retaining her services at the price paid. We could not expect to retain the services of an experienced writer and lecturer at the same rate as a farmer who had no such experience and qualifications.

Mr. BARKER. Was Miss Cameron a farmer?

Mr. OLIVER. I have just explained that she is a lecturer, a lady of Canadian birth who has travelled a great deal in Canada and knows a great deal of the various provinces, and also has the ability to tell what she has seen and what she knows in such a manner as to be interesting to the listener.

Mr. BARKER. I understood the hon. minister to say that he would not employ a man who had not practical experience as a farmer and knew what he was talking about. Is there any reason why he should employ Miss Cameron, who is neither a man nor a farmer?

Mr. OLIVER. I tried to say that we employed men who are not farmers; we employ them as lecturers. We do not employ a farmer necessarily as a lecturer, but we do employ men who are lecturers whether farmers or not. So, we employ this lady as a lecturer and not as a farmer; and we pay her the salary of a lecturer, and not the salary of a farmer.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). The minister told us a great deal about the number brought to this country. Would he tell us how many farm labourers and female domestics were brought out?

Mr. OLIVER. The farmers, and farm labourers who arrived in 1909-10—

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I have that. I understood the figures he gave us of immigrants related to the year which expires at the end of this month.

Mr. OLIVER. I gave the actual figures for nine months of this year, and also the estimated figures for the whole year.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Can you give the number of farmers and farm labourers for the nine months?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not that before me in a form to give it to my hon. friend.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I suppose that will come out in the annual report?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Does the minister think there are more of these classes this year than last?

Mr. OLIVER. Judging from the information I gave the committee this afternoon, regarding the arrivals by one steamship, I would say, 'Yes,' beyond any question.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Largely?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I would say a very considerable percentage more of farmers, farm labourers and domestic servants than in any previous year. That is the impression that has been created in the minds of the newspaper people who have seen the immigrants that have arrived this year —that they are much more largely of these classes than in any previous year. We have been bending our energies, as I have already said, entirely to securing that class of immigrant, and we believe that our efforts are bearing fruit in the increase of these classes which come to us year by year. The hon. member (Mr. Wilson, Lennox) will remember that it is only a few years since we undertook this policy. Before that time, ours was a general or indiscriminate policy of immigration. It takes some time before we get full results.

Mr. WILSON. We got something like 18,000 last year, including children. I do not know why the government pay a bonus of ten shillings on a child, who is neither a farmer, a farm labourer nor a domestic servant. And last year the government paid for bonuses, besides expenses, $86,000. It does seem to me that there is an opportunity to look into this matter and cut off the payments to these gentlemen to whom you are giving pleasure.

Mr. OLIVER. I feel very strongly on the point that the money that Canada pays to induce immigration should be paid with particular attention to getting the kind of people we want and need in the country.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Nobody objects to that.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to the farm delegates, of whom my hon. friend seems to think so little, he is only one means of trying to reach the actual farmer. Now, I cannot think of any way that is more likely to reach the actual farmer in the old country than sending the actual farmer in Canada to meet him. If the experience of the successful farmer in Canada will not appeal to the successful farmer in the old country—who is a man we want—I do not know any argument that will. The old country farmer, as every one knows, is very conservative in his ideas—very slow to move—he would not be half so good a man as he is if he could be moved easily. It will take time to get a movement amongst these people; but we believe we have taken the right course and that we are starting the movement. It is well known that English and Scotch farmers are the best farmers in the world, and this country needs as many of these people as we can get. And I can conceive of no better way to reach the old country farmer than by sending the successful Canadian farmer to tell him what he has been doing.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I moved for a return of the reports of these farm delegates. I am sorry to say that in the whole return there was not a single report from one of them. Mr. Walker wrote a little letter about one, some man had given some lectures, another man interviewed a number of people and they expected great results. If we could get returns from these gentlemen to show what they are doing for the money they get it would be of some use. I have not for some years moved for that because the last time I moved for it it was so unsatisfactory I did not think it was worth while.

Mr. BARKER. I listened to what the minister said. I am not a farmer, but I understand the hon. gentleman to argue that the old country farmer is a very conservative individual and hard to move or convince. The minister's theory is that the best way to convince the old country farmer is to send to him a man whom he does not know, a Canadian farmer. I would think the best way to convince the old country farmer would be to get some trustworthy people from there to come here and see what our farming means. Such a man would be far more likely to influence him than the paid employee of this government, and the last person who would be likely to influence such a conservative old country farmer would be a young lady like this Miss Cameron to whom the minister pays a handsome salary, and who delivers lectures on farming in Canada. To suppose that she can convince the doubtful farmer is nonsense.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister told us that the English and Scotch farmers were the best in the world. I am not prepared to combat that argument with any evidence, but I am surprised to learn that these old country farmers can succeed any better in Canada than our Canadian farmers. I wish the minister would go over and watch the operations of these men and then I fancy he would not make such an invidious comparison as he has made with reference to our Canadian farmers. I would like to know what the minister has done to dissipate the idea prevalent in the old country that this country is so cold and that our people have to work so hard. Do the lectures delivered there give any evidence of the temperature? From my experience in talking with men in Scotland I would think something of that kind was necessary. I was able to tell them that while our temperature may not be as moderately warm as theirs, still we have sunshine which I think makes up for the degree of leisure that they have in the old country. My impression is that the man who gets along here in farming has to work pretty hard. It was a surprise to me to find that the minister was sending farmers from this country who are not as good farmers as those in the old land to instruct them what to do. The minister will have to get a better class of men than the Canadian farmers to instruct these people, if he still adheres to the idea that the Scotch or English farmer is better than the Canadian.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Would the minister inform me how many agents there are in Canada, and the names and salaries of the agents in Great Britain and foreign countries?

Mr. OLIVER. The number employed in the outside service in general immigration work in Canada outside of Ottawa is 178. There are 190 boundary inspectors, including the customs officers, who receive only $100 a year each. Then there are 52 officials employed in the United States, 42 in Great Britain, and nine on the continent. There are 471 altogether. The assistant superintendent in England is J. Obed Smith; in Belgium, the agent is D. T. de Coeli, and in France, Paul Wiallard.

Mr. ARTHURS. Are there any efforts being made to bring immigrants into the unsettled portions of Ontario? The House has been told at different times that we have a large area of clay belt along the Grand Trunk Pacific, and also along the line of the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario. I have seen several publications of the department describing portions of Ontario, but I have not seen anything describing the unsettled portions of the northern part of Ontario.

Mr. BARKER.

Mr. OLIVER. So far the government has not taken up the question of colonization in northern Ontario. We have, however taken an interest in the colonization of what might be called far western Ontario. We have an agent at Port Arthur, who looks after the Rainy River country, and who has been employed there for seven or eight years. We have not taken up the question of the settlement of northern Ontario for the reason that until the Grand Trunk Pacific is in operation, the clay belt which has been spoken of so much is not available for settlement. There is land along the line of the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway between North Bay and Cochrane, but I do not know that the field for settlement there is sufficiently desirable to warrant the government in making any special effort. But as soon as the clay belt is made available by the construction of the Transcontinental and its operation, no doubt the government will be ready to take up the question of directing colonization into that part of the country.

Mr. ARTHURS. I think the minister is mistaken as to the clay belt. A week or two ago thirteen car-loads of machinery from one of the agricultural works were delivered at one of the stations in this clay belt on the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway. There is a large settlement, outside entirely of the portion covered by the Grand Trunk Pacific. I think it would be a wise thing for the minister to make some effort to settle up this country. It is very suitable for cultivation.

Mr. MAGRATH. The minister stated that there were 190 inspectors along the boundary; would he say how many there were exclusive of the customs officers?

Mr. OLIVER. Sixty-nine.

Contingencies in Canada, British and foreign agencies, and general immigration expenses, $700,000.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Would the minister tell us how this money is to be expended?

Mr. OLIVER. Advertising, printing, atlases, pamphlets, &c., $210,000. This is to meet the expenses for general advertising, printing of pamphlets and atlases, copies of papers, &c., in Canada, United States, Great Britain and the continent of Europe. The expenditure for this service for the fiscal year 1909-10 was $214,561.25, and for the six months ended September 30, 1910, $117,815.87.

King's Printer's accounts for printing of stationery, $17,000. This is to pay for books, forms, envelopes and general stationery supplies to head office and agencies in Canada and United States. The expenditure for this service during the fiscal

year 1909-10 was $23,823.65, and for the six months ended September 30, 1910, $18,957.88.

Postage on literature, &c., at head office, $6,000. This is to meet the expenditure for postage on literature and immigration letters mailed at Ottawa to points outside of Canada. The expenditure for the fiscal year 1909-10 was $10,377.44, and for the six months ended September 30, 1910, $2,273.29.

Contingencies and general expenses in Canada, $20,000. This is to meet the travelling expenses of head office officials; the expenses of officials in connection with the inspection of British immigrant children; the expenses of officials superintending the location of farm help and domestic servants, and for general miscellaneous expenses at head office and in Canada. The expenditure for the fiscal year 1909-10 was $30,855.45, and for the six months ended September 30, 1910, $5,140.36.

Seaport expenses at Halifax, St. John, Sydney, Quebec, Montreal, Victoria, Vancouver and Prince Rupert, $20,000. This is to provide for the general expenses of the port officers and officials, covering expenses of meeting boats and trains, temporary assistance, uniforms, maintenance of immigration halls and general office expenses. The expenditure for the fiscal year 1909-10 was $17,641.25, and for the six months ended September 30, 1910, $13,200.84.

Commissions for locating farm help and domestic servants, $4,000. This is to pay for commissions to agents appointed in Ontario and Quebec for placing farm labourers and domestic servants at the rate of $2 for each person so placed.

The expenditure for 1909-10 was $3,923.50, and for the six months ended September 30, 1910, $2,542.60.

General expenses of officials in connection with deportation of undesirable immigrants, $15,000. This is to provide for the travelling and living expenses of officials accompanying persons deported, and also for expenses of deportees. Whenever such expenses are borne by a transportation company a refund of same is obtained from the company. The following officials are employed in connection with this service: R. Boston, P. Devlin, R. Dow, A. Blanchet, C. Choquette, Mrs. M. Killeen and Mrs. E. Tasse. The expenditure for 1909-10 was $15,905.91, and for the six months ended September 30, 1910, $6,201.15.

Telegrams, telephones, freight and express charges at head office, $7,000. The expenditure for these services for the fiscal year 1909-10 was $8,797.15, and for the six months ended September 30, 1910, $3,242.57.

Medical services and supplies $3,000. This is to meet the expenditure for treatment of immigrants at the various immigration halls at the eastern and western ports and at Winnipeg. The expenditure for 1909-10 was $869.24, and for the six months ended September 30, 1910, $1,588.50.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What was the last statement—treating patients?

Mr. OLIVER. Treating immigrants at various immigration halls.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Outside of Winnipeg?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. At Winnipeg they have a regular physician paid a salary?

Mr. OLIVER. There is a special vote for Winnipeg which goes to the hospital and the hospital attends to the treatment of the immigrants.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I understand that, but have you not a physician in Winnipeg paid a salary to treat immigrants?

Mr. OLIVER. There is a salaried physician at the immigration hall.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Why should there be extra treatment in Winnipeg?

Mr. OLIVER. There formerly was a hospital in connection with the hall, but we found it was better and more economical to arrange with the hospitals to treat patients and so the medical man has simply to diagnose the cases.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The next item covers that?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Then what is this amount for treating patients?

Mr. OLIVER. It is at places outside of Winnipeg.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. And does not touch anything in Winnipeg?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Customs duty, $1,000.

This is to provide for customs duty and customs brokers fees' on literature, maps, pamphlets, &c.

Boundary inspection expenses $20,000.

This is to cover the expenses of officials employed along the boundary between Canada and the United States for the inspection of immigrants entering Canada. The expenditure during 1909-10 was $59,364.70 (including salaries, which are charged to the salaries vote) and for the six months ended September, 1910, $5,688.87.

Detention hospitals: Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal and Victoria, $10,000.

This is to provide for the equipment and maintenance of the hospitals above named; for the treatment of immigrants who have contracted some minor contagious disease

on ship board, and detention of those not receiving treatment. For every immigrant treated, the rate of $1.25 per day is charged and 50 cents per day for those not under treatment. No charge is made for infants under one year. All the amounts earned at the above rates are collected from the steamship companies who brought the immigrants to Canada.

Farmer delegates, $35,000.

This is to cover the salaries and expenses of delegates sent to the old country in the interest of immigration. The men so engaged are all practical and successful farmers. The expenses during 1909-10 were $36,076.57.

Locating settlers in the west, $65,000.

This amount is to cover the expenditure to be made by the commissioner of immigration at Winnipeg, for locating settlers in the west. The bulk of this expenditure is comprised of:

Salaries and expenses of interpreters, land guides, temporary agents and clerks, caretakers, &c.; of contingencies of the Winnipeg and other agencies in the west, including postage, telephones, telegrams, advertising, provisions, and supplies for needy immigrants, homesteaders, equipment, maintenance of halls, uniforms and travelling expenses of officials.

The expenditure for 1910 was $59,766.30 and for six months ended 30th September, 1910, $29,483.36.

Collection of exhibits, $20,000.

This is to cover expenditure in connection with the purchase of fine specimens of fruit, grain and vegetables grown in Canada, to be used as exhibits in the offices of our agents; at fairs in United States; in the offices of our agents and on motor cars in Great Britain. This is thought to be one of the best means of advertising Canada and experience has proved that the sight of those fine exhibits has influenced many to settle in this country. The expenditure for 1909-10 was $23,429.13 and for six months ended 30th September, 1910, $2,449.76.

Contingencies and general expenses in the United States, $60,000.

This is to provide for the travelling expenses of our agents and their living expenses while travelling, especially while attending at fairs; for rent of offices, temporary assistance, telegrams, telephones, postage, office furniture and general expenses of the various offices in the United States. The expenditure for 1909-10 was $64,319.06, and for six months ended 30th September, 1910, $33,922.59.

Commissions on settlers from United States, $9,000.

This is to provide for the payment of commissions to local agents employed in the United States who issue settlers' certificates which entitle the holders to transportation at a reduced rate of one cent per mile over the Canadian Pacific railway, Grand Trunk Pacific and Canadian Northern railways. These certificates are returned to the department by the railway companies and commissions are paid to the various agents who issue them at the following rates: $3 per male; $2 per female and $1 per child under 18 years of age. The expenditure for 1909-10 was $3,900.75 and for six months ended September 30, 1910, $2,162.

British bonuses, $57,000.

Bonuses allowed as follows: £1 on each person 18 years of age or over and 10 shillings on those between 1 and 18 years of age. The expenditure for 1909-10 was $39,145.65 and for six months ended September 30, 1910, $47,989.17.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). That does not correspond with the evidence given by Mr. Scott. The bonus paid agents in Great Britain and Ireland last year amounted to $86,000, according to Mr. Scott's evidence.

Mr. OLIVER. The statement I have quoted is $39,145.65 for 1909-10 and we are asking for $57,000 for this year because they expect a larger immigration of that class of people.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Is that the amount of money you paid to agents at the rate of $5 per head for adults and 10 shillings for children?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Well, the statement is certainly greatly at variance with that made by Mr. Scott. There were about 18,000 people that the bonus was earned on last year.

Mr. OLIVER. The number of people does not give you the amount, because some would be children and some adults. I have a copy of Mr. Scott's statement here, and I will turn it up in a moment. My statement here is that the expenditure for 1909-10 was $39,145.65 and for the six months ended September 30, 1910, $47,989.17.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is bonus?

Mr. OLIVER. Bonus actually paid.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. For farmers, farm labourers and domestics?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, and we are asking for the same service for the coming year $57,000.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Is it not so that quite a number of these men who have come out and upon whom the bonuses have been

paid, as farm labourers, have gone to work on railways?

Mr. OLIVER. It is quite possible.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That would hardly be the proper designation for them would it?

Mr. OLIVER. No, it would not, but in so far as we are aware, the payment is only made on those who go into domestic service or farm labour. If we find that a man upon whom the bonus is claimed, has gone to railway work, and not farm labour, we do not pay the bonus, or if we have paid the bonus already, we deduct it from the next claim made by that agent.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). How long does it run for?

Mr. BARKER. How many cases have they found where a farm labourer was really a railway workman going to work upon a contract, and how much was deducted on that account?

Mr. OLIVER. It would be impossible to answer that offhand without having an opportunity to get the details in the department.

Mr. BARKER. Are there any such cases?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly there are.

Mr. BARKER. You found that a number brought out ostensibly as settlers have been really brought out to work on railways?

Mr. OLIVER. No, but they have gone to work upon railways.

Mr. BARKER. I have looked into the matter, and I am quite sure that a large number of these have never done anything else, but work upon the railways and I have reason to believe that as soon as they finished working upon the railways they went back again. If the hon. gentleman says that his department has investigated and deducted the money in such cases or had it refunded, I will be willing to take his word in the meantime.

Mr. OLIVER. I can give my hon. friend absolute assurance as to that.

Mr. BLAIN. The statistics show that from July 1, 1900, to March 31, 1910, 497,390 immigrants came from the United States direct. Of course, a considerable number of these might come through the United States from foreign countries and not be United States citizens at all. Is there any information which tells what nationality these people belong to?

Mr. OLIVER. We take account of the different nationalities of the people who come from the United States, but we have never published it. We have given the United States credit for all those who come from the United States.

Mr. BLAIN. What proportion were born in the United States, and are really United States citizens?

Mr. OLIVER. We have the statistics as to that, but we have not compiled them, although the officer of the department makes a guess that possibly 50 per cent of them would be born in the United States.

Mr. BLAIN. It is misleading to publish that this large number came from the United States when in reality only about half of them are United States citizens.

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, the large majority of them are United States citizens naturalized but a considerable proportion were not born in the United States. If it is thought desirable to compile the figures it could be done.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). In the United States returns they give the nationalities of those who went over to the United States from Canada.

Mr. BARKER. It is important that we should know the origin of these people who come from the United States. For example the Doukhobor and the Norwegian stand on a very different basis, and it is well to know whether out of 100 people who come from the United States we are getting one Norwegian and 99 Doukhobors or the reverse.

Mr. OLIVER. Heretofore it was not considered of sufficient interest to compile that information, but it might be done.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose there is no better settler than the Scandinavian, and other people of northern continental Europe, while there is a prejudice against some other nationalities, and it is desirable we should know whether we are getting what we consider the desirable class or the objectionable class.

Mr. OLIVER. As a matter of fact the immigration that has come from the United States into western Canada has been chiefly or I might say entirely of the desirable class.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They are mostly Anglo-Saxons.

Mr. OLIVER. Or Scandinavian or German. We have an exclusion service now along the frontier which comes in contact with the undesirable class to such an extent that last year we rejected at boundary points over 14,000. But we have not up to the present time considered it important because the people coming to settle on the land were of the desirable class.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Will you try after this to keep track of those who leave the country as well as those who come in?

Mr. OLIVER. If it is considered necessary, we will do so, but it would add very considerably to the expense, and I do not know that the information would compensate us for doing so.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Will the minister tell us how Lord Strathcona collected the information that 46,000 returned to the old country of the 113,000 sent out? That statement is on page 65 of the report.

Mr. OLIVER. The figures were, I presume, secured by Lord Strathcona from the British Board of Trade, which takes account of all the people going and coming from and to British ports.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). How do the Americans get their figures?

Mr. OLIVER. They simply keep a sufficiently large staff to enable them to collect these statistics.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). If you are going into partnership with them on reciprocity, perhaps it would be as well to do so in regard to these statistics. I want to refer to the bonuses. According to Mr. Scott's evidence, we paid bonuses in 1909-10 on 9,813 men, 6,015 women and 2,840 children. If you multiply the number of the men and women by five and the number of children by half that, you will get the same amount of the bonuses paid. I make it $86,240.

Mr. OLIVER. My figures, which are the figures which my hon. friend read, make the amount £17,248 for the calendar year 1910.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). How are we to know about these matters? The minister gives us the calendar year at one time and the fiscal year at another.

Mr. OLIVER. We are trying to give both. There is a bonus on British children of $4,000. These are children taken care of by British philanthropic societies, which under a special arrangement are paid a bonus of $2 for each child under eighteen years of age sent to the distributing homes in Canada. No bonus is paid on infants under one year of age or on children from penitentiaries, reformatories or prisons. The expenditure for 1909-10 was $2,629.99, and for six months ended September 30, 1910, $1,702.02.

Continental bonuses, $10,000.

A bonus of £1 0s. 0d. is paid on adults and ten shillings on children between one and eighteen years of age, as per regulations. The expenditure for 1909-10 was $6,584.61 and for the six months ended September 30, 1910, $5,504.19.

Mr. OLIVER.

Contingencies and general expenses in Great Britain and Ireland, including the London office, $55,000.

This is to meet the expenditure of the London office and of our agents; for rent of offices, taxes, light, postage, telegrams, furniture, temporary assistance, expenses re motor and exhibition wagons, &c. The expenditure for 1909-10 was $55,073.42 (including salaries), and for the six months ended September, 1910, $21,048.29.

Contingencies and general expenses on continent, $7,000.

This is to cover the expenditure in connection with our offices in France and Belgium, including rent, postage, telegrams, stationery, printing, living and travelling expenses, &c. The expenditure for 1909-10 was $12,009.44 (including salaries and for six months ended September, 1910, $1,062.48 (excluding salaries).

Grants to hospitals in the west (not including Winnipeg and St. Boniface), $4,000.

This is to pay for the difference between the provincial government's grant of 50 cents per day in Alberta and Saskatchewan and 25 cents per day in Manitoba for each patient, less whatever may be collected from the immigrants, and $1 per day which is charged by the hospitals on every destitute bona fide immigrant who is treated before he has been one year in Canada. The following hospitals are granted the allowance above stated: The Calgary, Edmonton, Medicine Hat, Regina, Prince Albert, Brandon and Holy Cross, and the Margaret Scott Nursing Mission. The expenditure for 1909-10 was $2,106.13, and for the six months ended September, 1910, $1,588.50.

Grant to Quebec and Lake St. John railway, $8,000.

The above grant is made in consideration of colonization work carried on by the above company in the Lake St. John district. One of the inducements offered to colonists by this railway is free transportation to every bona fide settler locating in that district. The grant is for same amount as for 1910-11.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Do you also pay a bonus to the agent who causes these people to come?

Mr. OLIVER. We pay salaried agents in the United States to induce them to come to the Lake St. John district.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Have you not got in that district men on commission?

Mr. OLIVER. No, this is the only local aid we give.

Province of Quebec Repatriation and Colonization Society, $4,000.

This society has been doing good work for many years in the interest of immigration in the province of Quebec and north-

ern Ontario. The grant is the same as for 1910-11.

Ottawa Valley Immigration Aid Society, $2,500.

This society is chiefly operating in the Ottawa Valley, distributing immigration literature and pamphlets, and giving each year a series of lectures on the interests of general immigration and colonization. The grant is the same as for 1910-11.

L'Union Nationale Francaise, Montreal, $1,000.

This is in aid of the above society which has been keeping a house of refuge for quite a number of years, and which makes a special effort to receive, aid and care for French immigrants and to distribute them in various parts of Canada. The grant is the same as has been made for the last six years.

Womens' National Immigration Society, Montreal, $1,500.

This society established a home in Montreal for the purpose of giving aid and caring for female immigrants arriving in that city. The home is comfortable and attractive, and rendering valuable assistance to immigrants in procuring lodging and meals at a very low rate. The grant is the same as for former years.

Womens' Welcome Hostel, Toronto, $1,000.

This Home was incorporated in 1906 and has for its object the reception and general assistance to immigrant women. One day's board and lodgings is given free, very low rates being charged when remaining longer at the hostel. The grant is the same as for previous years.

The Girls' Home of Welcome, Winnipeg, $750.

The above home was established twelve years ago. The object of the institution is to aid and care for immigrant women and domestic servants. Under agreement with the government, female immigrants coming to the home are given one full day's free board and lodgings. This is the same grant as for the last few years.

The Calgary Womens' Hostel, $500.

The aims and objects of this hostel are similar to the Girls' Home of Welcome in Winnipeg. The grant is the same as for previous years.

Canada West Publicity Office, $5,000.

This is an organization of business men of Western Canada and United States, promoting immigration from the western states. Their mode of operation is by having special articles on immigration to western Canada published in newspapers circulated in western states, the aggregate circulation of which amounts to over thirty-four millions in the year 1909-1910. The Canadian Pacific, Grand Trunk and Canadian Northern railways each make a similar grant to this organization. The grant is the same as for 1910-11.

Salvation Army grants, $15,516.66.

This is to cover the different amounts granted to the Salvation Army to help that organization to carry on their good work in the interests of immigration, for the rent of London, (England) office, $4,866.66; advertising in the Salvation Army publications, $2,433.33; special articles in the 'Emigration Gazette', $1,216.67; allowance for distribution of immigrants and domestic servants in Canada, $7,000.

Miscellaneous and unforeseen expenses, $1,233.34.

Total contingencies and expenses for 1911-12, $700,000.

The Canada West publicity office is aided not merely by the government, but, as I have indicated, by the three great railway companies as well. This institution conducts a publicity campaign in the United States through newspapers and magazines. Instead of an ordinary advertisement, an article dealing with the publication of articles setting forth Canada's advantages is secured in different publications in the United States. It is not an ordinary advertising propaganda, but it is very useful.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The three railways have joined in this?

Mr. OLIVER. They co-operate with the government. Each of the four organizations pays $5,000. The accounts are audited by the railway and the vouchers—that is, the articles clipped from the papers, are furnished to and audited by them.

Mr. BURRELL. What percentage of the large expenditure on advertising, lecturers and so on, is devoted to directing immigration to British Columbia? I am not sure of the position now, but a year or two ago a great many of the lecturers practically ignored the existence of British Columbia. I may tell the minister that it is exceedingly important that we should get all the immigration possible. The labour situation has been rather acute during the last two or three years, and it is getting more acute every year, especially in fruit growing districts. Many of the agents sent over to lecture on Canada have been absolutely ignorant of the conditions in British Columbia. I remember, on one occasion, when in England, I listened to a representative of Australia, who was declaiming vigorously on the advantages of immigrants going to that country rather than to Canada. He spoke of the extremely severe conditions of the Canadian winter, and said that cattle had to be kept housed up for six months of the year, and even then frequently starved to death. I asked him if he would be surprised to know that within a hundred and fifty miles of my home was a place where, to my knowledge, 12,000 head of cattle were kept by one company, and these cattle never had shelter at all. He asked me where this was, and I

told him in British Columbia. His answer was: That may be in British Columbia, but not in Canada. I found a great many like that of those who should have given information about British Columbia to people anxious to obtain it, and it seems to me important that they should be familiar with the conditions beyond the Rocky mountains. I know that the minister has had one or two good men there, and has also published some pamphlets, but, I should be glad to have some assurance from the minister that his department is paying rather serious attention to our immigration needs. He knows that in British Columbia we pay a larger share per capita of the Dominion revenues than any other province, and I think that in this matter of immigration we deserve special consideration.

Mr. OLIVER. The conditions in regard to British Columbia are the same as in regard to the older provinces. That is, the attraction of free land ready for cultivation does not exist there as it does in the prairie provinces, and therefore it is not as easy to secure the attention of prospective settlers for British Columbia, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick or Nova Scotia as for the prairie provinces.

Mr. BURRELL. I am aware of that, so far as the actual settler goes who wants to acquire land. I was thinking, however, especially of the large number of labourers on whom the minister pays a bonus and who go on the land to work but not to take up land for themselves.

Mr. OLIVER. I intended to cover that point. The main purpose of the immigration effort of the Dominion government, of course, is to bring into cultivation the vacant land of the prairie provinces. But, in doing that, we put out literature which covers the whole Dominion. I suppose that all the members of the House are aware of the atlas which was published and which covers all the provinces. The lady whose employment my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) has been criticising is a native of British Columbia, and has been lecturing in Great Britain last year and this year. She has strict instructions to give British Columbia the full benefit of her talents and knowledge.

Mr. BURRELL. I suppose the hon. minister is referring to Miss Agnes Deans Cameron. To what class of people would her lectures be addressed? I can understand it would be that class in Great Britain who are likely to come out with money to invest in fruit lands. But I presume that she would not direct her attention in lecturing work so much to the labouring class.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) has the idea exactly. But, besides lecturing, Miss Cameron furnishes articles to magazines and newspapers which would be more likely to reach the people he has in mind. Besides Miss Cameron, our arrangement with the Salvation Army is with a special view to their attention to that particular side of the work that my hon. friend has mentioned, always with due consideration, of course, to the other side of the question. Our records show that British Columbia has not suffered so badly in the general effort to secure increase of population. Our statement is that in 1900 and 1901 the immigration to British Columbia of which we had knowledge was 2,600, and in 1909-10 the immigration of which we had knowledge was 30,721.

Mr. BURRELL. Of course my hon. friend would not wish to assume for a moment that that was all due to the immigration work of the Dominion department. I do not wish to minimize the work of the Dominion, but the provincial government has gone to a great deal of expense of a special kind to promote immigration. I want to impress on the minister the strong need of immigration into British Columbia to meet the serious conditions that exist there now.

Mr. OLIVER. I quite appreciate the situation and can assure my hon. friend that our department in Great Britain is co-operating with the British Columbia department in every way possible. Samples of British Columbia fruit are given display in our offices and in every way we are working in harmony with the British Columbia government. I do not wish to claim that this large movement was entirely the work of the Dominion, but I point out that the province has at least had some consideration in the flow of immigration.

Winnipeg and St. Boniface hospital, $15,000.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. How is that divided? It does not seem a large sum.

Mr. OLIVER. Accounts are rendered and checked. This sum is to provide for the treatment of immigrants who have been less than one year in the country. The hospitals charge $1 per day for each immigrant treated, one-half being paid by the Dominion and one half by the provincial government. The expenditure in 1909-10 was for the St. Boniface hospital, 3,590 days at 50 cents per day, $1,795; and for the Winnipeg General hospital, 7,288 days at 50 cents a day, $3,644, a total of $5,439.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It seems hardly fair to make the province pay one half. Of course they pay all hospitals for all patients but it seems hardly fair to make them pay for the immigrants who have been in the province less than a year.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course it is a matter of compromise.

Mr. MAGRATH. Why is there no report of the Chief Medical Officer in the current report of the department?

Mr. OLIVER. He was in Germany at the time of the compilation of the report, and his report will appear separately.

Mr. BURRELL. The minister said that if a man had $25 it did not matter to the department where he got it, whether it was by charity or not. How does that work in the case of an immigrant helped by a charity society at home?

Mr. OLIVER. There is quite a difference between the man who borrows $25 and the man who is given his passage or assistance out. If the charitable society pays the man's passage and furnishes him with $25 that he would have on his arrival here, we would not question his entry. The exclusion of the charity aided immigrant, was made to meet the case of the charitable society furnishing an immigrant with a passage to Canada, and landing him here without means of support or employment.

Mr. BURRELL. As long as they lend him the extra $25 you accept him?

Mr. OLIVER. If he is sound physically.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I suppose we have fairly definite information as to the number of Americans who have come into Canada as settlers.

Mr. OLIVER. In the fiscal year 1909, 103,798; for the 10 months to the end of January, 1911, this fiscal year, 102,017 people who came from the United States to settle in Canada.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Have we as definite information as to how many people have gone from Canada to the United States?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Why?

Mr. OLIVER. It would add to the expense of administration and we did not realize that there would be the serious benefit that would warrant us in going to the expense.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Then how would we know what we were gaining? There might be half as many going to the United States as came into Canada. It would be hardly business to say that we were getting 104,000 or whatever the number was, in the year, if we have half as many going from Canada back again.

Mr. OLIVER. It is a matter of judgment whether we should go to the expense or not. No doubt we could get the information, but it would cost something, and the material result would not be altered. If we have the people we have them, whether we count them or not.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. And if they have gone back we have not got them.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I remember distinctly in the old days when the government used to keep a record of all that came in and no record of those that went out; and I also recollect when the census was taken the very comfortable position the government was in; they would not find their natural increase, and showed nothing but the immigrants that came in.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it would be a great mistake to assume that all the people who have come into the country have remained in it. I am not taking that position; I merely say that we have counted this many people coming in, and we have not taken account of the people who went out. Of course the census will tell the tale. I am afraid that those who have been building on all the people who have come into the country remaining here, will find themselves at sea.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Graham, House adjourned at 11.28 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 14, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE, MR. GOODEVE—LORD STRATHCONA.

CORRECTION OF ERRONEOUS REPORT.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. On Thursday last, in the course of some remarks on the subject of the reciprocity arrangement, I quoted a statement attributed to Lord Strathcona. Yesterday, the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) read a cable despatch denying that the words quoted had been used by Lord Strathcona. I feel it due to myself to give my authority for making use of that statement. I find it on the front page of the Ottawa 'Evening Journal' of February 3, 1911, column 7. The item quoted appears under the general title 'British views,' with the sub-heading 'Canadian Press despatch.' And the date line is 'London, February 3.' The quotation I made use of is found in unrevised 'Hansard,' page 5075, and it is absolutely identical with the despatch quoted in the

'Evening Journal' of the date referred to. It is also quoted in a great many other daily papers throughout Canada. I further took the trouble to inquire of the chief editor of the 'Journal,' Mr. Wilson, who said that, while he could not vouch for the accuracy of the despatch, he could vouch for the fact that it had been published as issued by the Canadian Press Despatch Agency. I find in the volume of estimates of the current year, the year ending March 31, 1912, page 93, this statement that the said Canadian Associated Press had its subsidy increased from $3,000 to $12,000 by the legislation of last session. Taking all this into consideration, I feel that I was amply justified in regarding this despatch as authority for the quotation I made. Desiring to go further in order to be accurate, I wired the general manager of the Canadian Press Despatch Agency, Toronto, as follows:

Ottawa, March 13, 1911.

C. O. Knowles, Manager, Canadian Press Despatch, Toronto, Ont.

The following appeared in the Ottawa 'Evening Journal' of February 3, also in several other daily papers:—

Then follows a quotation word for word of the despatch to which I have referred, after which my telegram proceeds:

Is it correctly quoted? If not, what is full correct quotation as sent out by your despatch?

A. S. GOODEVE, M.P.

To that message, unfortuately, I have not yet received a reply. I simply desire to make this statement so that it may be seen on what authority I made my quotation.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it may be safely assumed that some remarks made by some other person have been wrongly attributed to Lord Strathcona. That is the most probable explanation, and it is an error which might easily occur.

WAYS AND MEANS—GRANTS TO VETERANS.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). Mr. Speaker, before that motion is carried, I desire to bring up for a few monents' consideration a matter of which I spoke to the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), but which, at his request, I deferred from last Friday until to-day. Some years ago, in fact, away back in 1863, a man by the name of James Thomas, then at the age of 19 years, enlisted in the imperial army. He served seven years and 178 days, and received, at his own request, his honourable discharge and the payment of the regular compensation of some £15. His discharge is dated from Halifax in April, 1871. The small sum to which I have referred, two good conduct badges and a medal are all the compensations that this gentleman received for his services. After serving under Sir Garnet Wolseley, in the corps through the Red River rebellion, in the corps of the Royal Engineers, Mr. Thomas took up his abode in the county of Frontenac, where he has resided ever since, a citizen respected by all who know him. What he and others endured in that expedition under Wolseley is well depicted in a document which is signed with Wolseley's own hand and given to Mr. Thomas at Fort Garry in 1870. As the document is not very long, and as I daresay it would be of interest to many members of the House, I beg to place it upon 'Hansard':

Fort Garry, August 28, 1870.

To the regular troops, Red River Expedition: I cannot permit Col. Fielding and you to start upon your return journey to Canada without thanking you for having enabled me to carry out the Lieut. General's orders so successfully. You have endured excessive fatigues in the performance of a service that for its arduous nature will bear comparison with any previous military expedition. In coming here from Prince Arthur's Landing, you have travelled a distance of upwards of 600 miles. Your labours commenced with those common at the outset of all campaigns, viz., roadmaking and the defensive works. Then followed the arduous duties of taking the boats up a height of 800 feet along fifty miles of river full of rapids and numerous portages. From the time you left Shebandowan lake until the time Fort Garry was reached your labours at the oars have been incessant from daybreak until dark every day. Forty-seven portages were got over entailing the unparalleled exertions of carrying the boats, guns, stores, ammunitions and provisions over a total distance of upwards of 15,000 yards. It may be said that the whole journey has been made through a wilderness where, as no supplies of any sort were to be had, everything had to be taken with you in the boats. I have throughout perceived with pleasure the manner in which the officers have helped with their men, carrying heavy loads. I fell proud to be in command of officers who so well know how to set a good example and of men who evince such eagerness to follow it. Rain has fallen upon 45 days out of 94 that have passed since we landed at Thunder Bay, and upon many occasions officers and men have been wet for days together. Yet there has not been the slightest murmur of discontent heard from any one. It may be confidently asserted that no force has ever had to endure more continuous labour, and it may as truthfully be said that no men on service have ever better behaved or more cheerful under trials arising from exposure to inclement weather, excessive fatigue and the annoyance caused by this. There has been a total absence of crime amongst your advance to Fort Garry, and I feel confident that your conduct during the return journey will be as creditable in every respect.

The leaders of the bandits who recently opposed Her Majesty's loyal subjects in the Red

River settlement having fled as you advanced upon the fort, leaving their guns and a large quantity of arms and ammunition behind them, the primary object of the expedition has been peaceably accomplished, although you have not, therefore, had an opportunity of gaining glory you can carry back into the daily routine of garrison life the conviction that you have done good service to the state and have proved that no extent of intervening wilderness, no matter how great may be the difficulty whether by land or water can enable men to commit murder or to rebel against Her Majesty's authority with impunity.

(Sgd.) G. I. WOLSELEY,
Colonel.
Commanding Red River Expedition Force.

This House has given grants of lands to those who took part in the war in South Africa, and I believe that action has been generally commended in Canada. Out of the millions of acres of land that we have in Canada we have given grants to some hundreds of men who on that occasion responded to the call of their country. I make no objection whatever to that, but I say that if that recognition was reasonable and just, and I believe it was, there are reasons as weighty or more weighty why the services of those men who took part in the Red River expedition of 1870 should be recognized in a suitable way by this government. The difficulties they had to undergo on that occasion are very well set out in the document which I have read. Recognition of those few survivors of the Red River expedition should have come years ago. A few years more and recognition will be entirely impossible, because the few survivors will all be gone. To refuse their just claims at this time will, in my opinion, be a blot upon the history of this country. Recognition of their claims by this House will, I feel confident, receive the approval and hearty commendation of every person in this country.

It may be said that hitherto in has not been the policy of the government to recognize any persons who served in Canada on any such expedition, who had enlisted in a country other than Canada. That may have been the policy in the past but in this instance and in others if there are any, where a man enlisted in England, came out to this country, served as this man did and served well, received his honourable discharge and remained all these years in this country, the government should recognize that man's services just as if he had been born in the Dominion of Canada and had enlisted in this country. There are very few of these survivors left, probably half a dozen, and I repeat it does seem to me that their claim is just and that the government should take steps, if necessary, by passing special legislation, to recognize the services performed by those men in 1870.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). Mr. Speaker, this matter is a very simple one. My hon. friend has referred to the fact that land grants have been given to those who served in South Africa in the recent war, but my hon. friend will see in the statute making these grants that it was only given to volunteers who were domiciled in Canada. Precisely the same course was pursued in connection with the grants to the South African volunteers as was pursued with reference to those who served in the Red River expeditionary force. Grants were made to those Canadians who served in the expedition of 1870 under the same rule as the grants to those who served in South Africa. The man to whom my hon. friend refers enlisted as a British soldier and was never anything else than a professional soldier who enlisted in England, and came over here without any idea that he would serve in this particular rebellion. He was called upon to serve in the regular course of his duty. I do not see that we are called upon in any way to make a grant of land to him or to any of the regular troops who served in that expedition. The fact that there are only a few of them left would seem to me to be not a good argument. If there is a principle underlying this we would have to hunt up the heirs of those who have died, and make land grants to them just as to those who survive.

Mr. EDWARDS. My contention was that consideration should be given to the fact that this gentleman has resided in Canada ever since he obtained his honourable discharge.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That evidently was not considered a sufficient reason at the time or since for granting land to these men. I do not think that at this late date the House of Commons will feel disposed to take up the matter and give a grant of land to this or any other of the regular soldiers who served at that time. My hon. friend has done right to bring the matter up. I have stated the rule under which the grants were given to those who did serve in that expedition, they were given only to those Canadians who left their homes and their regular business in order to aid in the protection of the country and the putting down of the rebellion. That was the special or specific reason. The professional soldier who happened to be in Canada at the time was a part of the British army, he did not participate and the government which was in power at that time did not think that he had any claim to receive a grant.

Mr. BOYCE. Why does the minister not apply the same principle to the veterans who served in 1866 and 1870?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There were no grants given to British soldiers that I am aware of at that time.

Mr. BOYCE. No, but to Canadian soldiers.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is entirely a different question.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I understand from the Minister of War that grants were given to South African veterans irrespective of what section they belonged to. For instance, quite a number of civilians attached to the Army Service Corps in South Africa were given grants. Am I right in that?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If they were domiciled in Canada.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I wish to call the minister's attention to one fact that I should think he would take into consideration in connection with grants to those who participated in the Red River expedition. The minister has stated that the same legislation was adopted in the case of the Red River expedition as was adopted in the case of the South African veterans. I have had occasion to go into that matter and I find that instead of legislation the grants in the case of the Red River expedition were made by order in council. I think the minister now will remember that I am right in that particular.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Very likely.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The Red River expedition is unique in the history of British expeditionary forces. It is doubtful if history affords an example of a more difficult expedition into an unknown country. The transportation of the expedition was handled by Canadian voyageurs. Possibly 30 or 40 of these men are still living. They went through with the Canadian militia; they not only took the volunteers from Ontario, but they also took the British army through. They never lost a man, and they carried the provisions with them for hundreds of miles as any one knows who has studied the history of that expedition. Had the same rule applied then as that which applies now these men would all have been enlisted as Army Service Corps men. The minister knows that that unit was added previous to the South African war to the British army and was adopted in Canada. These men would have been forced to bear arms and they were supposed to bear arms all through the expedition. They handled the column which had in charge the transport of the force and their supplies and they did the work well. A great many of them were white men and many of them were residents of the province from which I have the honour to come. I think that if there is any class in a community who have added lustre to Canadian arms it was these men, and in view of the fact that the volunteers of a later day who served in a similar capacity in a foreign country have been rewarded with grants of land these members of the force in charge of transportation, and who carried their work on so successfully under the military law should receive the same consideration as their fellow Canadians. I think it is not too late yet for the department to take this question up. Very many of these men have passed away. A few of them are still living and some in such circumstances that a grant of this kind would be of very great value to them. I have one or two in my riding and I know of a few others. Possibly there would not now be more than 50 or 60 survivors of that force. I think the minister will see the strength of the argument I make. These men went from Canada to do exactly what these others did in South Africa—to serve with the transport column, for which the latter received grants of land from the Canadian government. These men, although the regulations with regard to the Army Service Corps were not in force in those days under that name, placed themselves under the military law, and they should be entitled now at this late date to some consideration. I hope the minister will consider it at a very early opportunity and do something for them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the cases are quite analagous, although I admit there is a similarity. It seems to me that the work done by the voyageurs was more like work that would be done by transportation lines, and there were absolutely no transportation lines at that time in that part of the country. Had the voyageurs been enlisted, of course, they would have been paid and would have received the grant of land. Evidently they did not wish to be enlisted, and so they probably received very high pay and did so from preference. Besides that, while it is true that the Army Service Corps, so called, has been organized of late years, nevertheless there are always, or very often, men hired by the corps to do work who are not soldiers and so, to a certain extent, a considerable number of these men might have been, even had there been an Army Service Corps in existence at that time, engaged as ordinary employees. However, I think the suggestion that my hon. friend makes is worth looking into, and I shall be very glad to look up the history in connection with that expedition.

ANNEXATION OF BERMUDA.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he has received any intimation that the legislature of Bermuda has passed a resolution in favour of annex-

ation with Canada, and if so what is his intention in regard to the matter?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No communication has been received by us on the subject and therefore no conclusion has been formed upon it.

FISHERIES ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the government and more especially to the attention of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) a matter which I think is of considerable importance, a matter which at the present time is agitating the minds of a large portion of the population in that part of the province of Ontario from which I come. I had arranged with my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to bring this matter before the House yesterday, but to suit my hon. friend's convenience, I postponed it until to-day. It was my intention to deal with this subject at much greater length than I intend to to-day, for I intended to speak upon the administration of the fisheries on the Great Lakes. But for the reason that a number of my friends who wish to take part in the discussion this afternoon, have kindly consented to my preceding them, I have decided to speak upon the subject as it affects the riding which I have the honour to represent in this House. The question arisen out of what is known as 'a system of uniform and common international regulations for the protection and preservation of food fishes in the international boundary waters of Canada and the United States,' and on the 11th of April, 1908 a treaty was signed in Washington a copy of which is found in the fisheries report of 1910. The title of that treaty as given here is:

A treaty between Great Britain and the United States concerning the fisheries in the waters contiguous to the Dominion of Canada and the United States, signed at Washington on the 11th April, 1908.

Article 2 of that treaty reads:

And it shall be the duty of the International Fisheries Commission within six months after being named to prepare a system of uniform and common international regulations for the protection and preservation of food fishes in each of the waters described.

Article 4 describes particular waters over which the commission shall have jurisdiction, and I take particular exception to the regulations which forbid the carrying on of commercial fishing in the Detroit river. Article 4 of the treaty does not mention the Detroit river itself, although it does describe a number of lakes and rivers and streams that constitute the international boundary line between the United States and Canada, but it does say:

And such other contiguous waters as may be recommended by the International Fisheries Commission.

By an order in council of date 29th May, 1909, Professor Prince, of the Fisheries Department was appointed a commissioner, with full power and jurisdiction on the part of Canada, to make these regulations, and clause 44 of the regulations provides that no nets of any sort shall, for commercial fishing, be used in the Detroit river. So, Mr. Speaker, when these regulations are brought into force, the fishermen on the Detroit river will be deprived of that right which they and their forefathers have enjoyed for 200 years. It does seem to me, unless there is some very good reason to the contrary, that such a course should not be pursued by this government. I may say for the benefit of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the policy which his government is pursuing in respect to the fishermen on the Detroit river, is very different from that laid down by the supporters of his political party when the Liberals were in opposition. In 1895 there were regulations agreed to by the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the Conservative government, which regulations provided that for five weeks in the year there should be a close season on the Detroit river, and Mr. William Macgregor, who then represented North Essex spoke in this House, on the 5th of July, 1895, and used these words:

We feel that our people having invested a very large amount of money in the purchase of plant for fishing purposes and then being deprived of the fish are obliged to suffer a great loss. They have not only invested in the land but they have cleared the rivers for the purposes of fishing, and the fact that they have not been able to utilize their means of livelihood has left many of them in debt. They have lost their boats and their docks and many other investments they have made all on account of the extraordinary and ruinous policy of the government of Sir Charles Tupper. Sir Charles Tupper said, 'Canada for the Canadians'; but, Sir, the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said, 'Canada for the Americans.' It is against the laws of Canada for a Canadian to have white fish in his possession during the close season, but the government come along and take large quantities of the white fish for the ova, and the fish being killed in the process are sold to the Americans. The Canadians who lived there so long and who enjoyed the fishing formerly, are not permitted to buy their fish even from our Canadian government; the Americans have that privilege, and we feel that to be a great grievance. Talk about the Czar of Russia and his severity to the Russian Jews. Sir, no Czar of Russia ever treated the Russian Jews as the people of Essex have been treated by these fishery laws.

That is a citation from a speech delivered by Mr. Macgregor who represented North Essex when a regulation was being put in force only asking the fishermen to cease their operations during the month of November, and for a week or two in October, but to-day by these regulations of which I complain, for twelve months in the year the fishermen will be deprived of carrying on their operations in that river. What is meant by 'a system of uniform and common international regulations'? It is not reciprocal in trade, but it certainly is reciprocal in regulations. Two nations have agreed to a condition that is supposed to work out to the equal advantage of the fishermen on both sides of that river, a term in economics applied to international relationship where two nations mutually agree to a condition that works with equality. Now, what are the conditions which exist in applying these regulations to the fishermen on the Detroit river? There is on the American side, a great city, with a population of half a million people last census, and land has become so dear, that the fishermen cannot buy land to carry on their operations on the American side, and they are not to-day fishing on the American side.

But this compels 20 fish stations, with 150 fishermen engaged and some $20,000 invested by them, to give up rights which they and their forefathers have enjoyed for the last 150 or 200 years on the Canadian side of that river. Let me say to the Prime Minister that that is not fair to those fishermen. They have rights there that ought to be protected. As far as I have been able to ascertain there is no excuse whatever for adopting a regulation which will deprive those people of their rights to carry on their operations on the river. To the mind of some expert in the department, there might be some reason; but I want to say to the Prime Minister, that Professor Prince, who is at the head of the Fisheries Department, does not understand the conditions that exist in the Detroit river. I have here one of his reports, and I am going to read it to my right hon. friend. It is a report made in 1904, when Professor Prince was sent to investigate the conditions among the fishermen on the Detroit river. It is contained in volume 9 of the Sessional Papers of 1904, and is headed, 'Whitefish Close Season on the Detroit River,' and says:

> Detroit, it may be mentioned, has one of the greatest fish markets on the continent.

Allow me to interject here that under the trade arrangement which my right hon. friend has entered into with the United States, fish will be free. At the same time, under these fishing regulations our fishermen will be deprived of the right to fish in the Detroit river; therefore the benefits, if any, that would accrue from that free market, will not be for our fishermen who have carried on their operations in the Detroit river for so many years. Professor Prince goes on to say:

> And the view that prevails there is entirely in favour of the Canadian policy.

The Canadian policy was five weeks of close season. He continues:

> The Canadian side is and always has been the chief resort for the whitefish. . . . Parent fish in rivers and lacustrine waters when ascending to the spawning grounds always take the most direct course and are not easily turned aside, as experienced fishermen are well aware. No more erroneous idea could be entertained than the supposition that whitefish wander aimlessly hither and thither from one side of a river or lake to the other. In these waters, as in other waters, it is certainly not the case that the schools of breeding fish deviate from their usual course and cross from side to side so that fish caught by American fishermen during our close season would be caught by Canadians were they permitted to fish at that time.

The position taken by Professor Prince is that the whitefish in the Detroit river came up from Lake St. Clair, that they keep on the Canadian side of the river, which is 3,000 or 4,000 feet wide, and not more than a mile at any point, and the whitefish will not cross the international boundary line and go to the other side. Upon this mistaken idea my right hon. friend's officer and his department have been making regulations and with this idea Professor Prince goes to Washington; and for some reason that I am unable to ascertain—for the Detroit river was not mentioned in the treaty—he agreed that from the day my right hon. friend stamps his approval upon these regulations, henceforth and forever, while they are in force, the fishermen of the Detroit river must stand back with their arms folded and not any more carry on commercial fishing in that river. This treaty was signed in Washington on the 11th of April, 1908, and these regulations were signed on the 29th of May, 1909.

Mr. BRODEUR. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that the Detroit river was not included in the treaty?

Mr. WILCOX. I understand that the name of the Detroit river is not included in the treaty; but there is a clause which, after mentioning a number of rivers and streams that the treaty does cover, goes on to say: 'and such other contiguous waters as may be recommended.' The Detroit river might be included under the conditions of the treaty; but I take it that the United States government and the gov-

ernment of Great Britain thought that the Detroit river was so insignificant, not as a navigable stream, not for its lack of beauty, but on account of the few fish that were caught in it, that it was not worthy of mention. Professor Prince or the commissioner who might be appointed, was simply given power to take in any stream that he might consider advisable; and the Detroit river is one that Professor Prince jumped on as a foxhound would jump on a rabbit.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think my hon. friend is mistaken. Subsection 9 of the article he has read states that the waters connecting Lake Erie and Lake Huron, including Lake St. Clair, are embodied in the treaty.

Mr. WILCOX. My hon. friend would take it that those waters mean the Detroit river.

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly.

Mr. WILCOX. Well, probably they do; but it would be reasonable to assume that the commissioners did not consider the Detroit river as important as Lake Ontario or the Niagara river, or they would have distinctly mentioned it. Now, the treaty has been negotiated and the regulations have been signed, but they are awaiting the stamp of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister before they can be brought into operation. After the regulations were signed there were nine months or more, before I came to represent the riding of North Essex in this House. I brought this matter to the attention of the government on the 4th of May last year. But at that time my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) was not able, on account of illness, to be in the House. However the Bill was passed and clause 15 provides:

The Governor in Council may, by proclamation, bring into force the international regulations prepared by the International Fishery Commission appointed under the treaty signed at Washington on the 11th April, 1908, between Great Britain and the United States concerning the fisheries in waters contiguous to Canada and the United States.

The second section of clause 15 provides:

The Governor in Council may make regulations to secure the due enforcement of the international regulations, may prescribe penalties for the violation of such regulations or of the international regulations, but no such penalty shall exceed the sum of $1,000 and costs or in default of payment imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, or in the case of a continued offence, the sum of $20 and costs for each day the offence continues.

So that, under these regulations, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) may cause to be issued a proclamation which will have this effect, that my French Canadian friends, who are the chief fishermen in the riding of North Essex, who have been permitted that liberty so many years, should they violate the provisions of those regulations, one or two or half a dozen of those forty men appointed recently will be looking after them, they will be summoned to court, and the penalty prescribed by those regulations will be meted out. Therefore, I would ask the government to give this matter their most serious consideration before they bring down any such regulations.

There is another matter I desire to speak upon, and it is this. I refer to the necessity of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) taking the eggs of those white fish and using them for propagation. It is shown in the reports that whitefish in those lakes and streams are decreasing greatly. In fact, the commissioners, who agreed upon those regulations, have agreed that it is of the utmost importance that the eggs of the whitefish should be taken and placed in hatcheries and the fry deposited in the lakes. I have here the bulletin promoting whitefish product in the Great Lakes, published by the American commissioners. On page 681, I find it deals with this as follows:

In studying the relation of the plant of whitefish fry to the catch, it is found that in those lakes or parts of lakes where there has been a large and extensive plant of whitefish fry (30,000 per square mile), there has been a correlated increase in the catch of whitefish (72 per cent); in those lakes or parts of lakes in which there has been a moderate plant of whitefish fry (10,000 per square mile), there has been a slight increase in the catch of whitefish, or the catch has remained nearly constant; and in those lakes or parts of lakes in which there has been a small plant of whitefish fry (2,000 per square mile) or no plant, there has been a reduction in the catch of whitefish (26 per cent).

The collecting of eggs from the whitefish and placing them in the hatcheries would not be such a difficult task. Then we could have the young fry thrown into the lakes. From every authority I have been able to secure, that would be the proper course for the government to pursue. The whitefish caught, according to the report of 1910, amounted to:

	Lbs.
Lake St. Clair	29,575
Detroit river	24,325
Lake Erie	826,189
Lake Ontario	773,397
In light waters	6,880
Total production, as shown by the report 1909-10, was	1,660,366

From that report I gathered the information that a whitefish will weigh on an average 3 lbs. This would represent simply, by dividing three into the total number of

pounds, 553,451 fish taken out of those lakes in 1910. An authority upon the point informed me that one-half of the fish taken would be shiners and would be capable of depositing the usual number of eggs. 553,445 fish taken out of those waters would leave 276,727 fish, capable of depositing their usual number of eggs. I find from the reports of my hon. friend's department that a fish weighing three pounds has a capacity of depositing 30,000 eggs; one weighing three and one-half pounds, 30,000 to 35,000 eggs; and one weighing four pounds can deposit 30,000 to 40,000 eggs. We will suppose that the average fish weighed three pounds capable of depositing 30,000 eggs in those waters. Multiplying 30,000 by the number of fish which we consider capable of depositing that number of eggs, and we have 8,301,814,000 eggs taken from those waters that year. What has the minister of marine done to replenish those waters and make good that loss? I find that 79,000,000 fry were placed in those waters, according to the reports of last year. 8,120,200,000 eggs were taken from those waters which were not replaced. My hon. friend cannot farm the waters in that way. He should collect the eggs and build hatcheries. I understand that we have only one or two hatcheries in Ontario to-day, yet it is of the utmost importance that the government should add to the number.

There is one at Sandwich. There should be one on Lake Erie; there should be one on Lake Ontario; there should be one at Owen Sound. Consult the reports and you will find that the catch of whitefish in Georgian bay has decreased by hundreds of thousands of pounds in the last few years, but in Lake Erie, where the young whitefish fry have been released from the hatchery at Sandwich, the catch has increased within a few years by four hundred per cent. These facts seem to establish beyond a shadow of doubt the necessity and importance of these hatcheries.

Now, in conclusion—and I have spoken longer than I intended—let me say that if my right hon. friend would establish a hatchery on Lake Erie, would allow the fishermen of Lake Erie to collect the eggs and release the young fish into the lakes; and if he would send his officers to collect the eggs from the fish as they are caught by the fishermen and place these eggs in the Sandwich hatchery, and so set the fishermen of North Essex free from this notorious regulation, he would have much better results. He would not be depriving the fishermen of the rights they have enjoyed for so many years. So, I submit, from the evidence I get from the fishermen—and I am very well acquainted with a number of them—they were given to understand, when the original regulations to which I have referred were brought in, that they were only supposed to give up the right for five weeks in the year, and even this was considered by my right hon. friend's supporters, Hon. Mr. McGregor and Hon. Mr. Sutherland, as a most notorious thing. What can we expect they will say when they are deprived for the whole twelve months of the year of the right of carrying on their operations?

I submit these facts to my right hon. friend, and ask the government to give the matter their best consideration. And I want to say to the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that I am not actuated by any political motive in bringing this matter to his attention. I have a real interest in my constituents. I feel that I am the medium through which they speak in this House, and that I should be derelict in my duty if I allowed him to secure approval of these regulations without telling him he was doing wrong. I can remember the occasions when the right hon. gentleman came to North Essex. And I can tell him that he never did come to North Essex but I did him the honour to come out and hear what he said. I can remember the beautiful sentences he uttered—no doubt he can remember them, too. 'There is nothing so dear or sweet to the heart of a man as the land of his birth.' That is a beautiful sentence that inspired us Canadians in North Essex, and it was one of those with which he appealed to his fellow-countrymen in Tilbury in 1908, to give him one more turn to finish his work. I was sitting only four seats away from him at the time. Little did I think that one of the works that he expected to finish was to deprive my fellow-countrymen and his compatriots of the right, which to them is sacred, of carrying on their fishing operations in that great Detroit river.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). My hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. Wilcox) was kind enough to advise me that he was going to introduce this question yesterday. He said there had been some arrangement made by us previous to yesterday. That is right to some extent, but yesterday we made an arrangement that the matter should be discussed to-day. So, my first word should be a grateful acknowledgment of the kindness of my hon. friend in advising me that he was going to discuss this question of the international regulations concerning the Detroit river. My hon. friend finds fault with one part of the regulations made under the treaty. But he forgets, I think, the great importance to Canada of having a treaty on this subject with the United States. Before this treaty was made—and, unfortunately, it is not yet in force, but I expect it will be in force very soon—while our regulations were passed and carried out by the Dominion government, so that we had one policy applying to the fisheries whether in the maritime provinces or in the great lakes, unfortunately this system did not

exist on the United States side. On the contrary, the regulations on the United States side were under the control of the several states interested. On the Pacific coast, where our fisheries are extensive and valuable, we had to deal with the state of Washington; on the great lakes we had to reckon with regulations made by Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York; in the province of Quebec, in regard to the fisheries of Lake Memphremagog and Lake Champlain, we were affected by the regulations of the states of New York, Vermont and New Hampshire; and as to the fisheries by the sea, regulations were made by the state of Maine. Each state has its own policy and its own ways of dealing with the fisheries. In some states the regulations passed were enforced, and in others they were not. The result was that any efforts we made on the Canadian side to enforce our regulations or protect the fisheries were handicapped. For years and years the question was discussed and agitation carried on on both sides of the line in favour of an agreement by which all the fisheries regulations should be controlled by the same authority. After a long agitation and negotiation, in which we had the co-operation not only of the Canadian people as a whole but of many on the United States side, we succeeded at last in arranging a treaty which has been called the Boundary Waters Fisheries treaty, which was signed on the 11th April, 1908, by Mr. Bryce and Mr. Root.

This treaty provided for the appointment of two commissioners, one by the British authorities and the other by the United States authorities. The British authorities were kind enough to leave the nomination in our hands and we nominated Professor Prince. The Americans appointed Dr. Starr Jordan of the State of California. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything with regard to the reputation or to maintain the standing of Professor Prince. He has enjoyed a high reputation in the administration of our Canadian fisheries. He is certainly one of the ablest men we have had in Canada and one who knows most concerning our fisheries, and we thought we could not appoint a better man to frame those regulations than the man who had been connected with the administration of the fisheries for a great number of years, who knew exactly the situation in all parts of the country, and who, at the same time, had had an opportunity on different occasions to acquire not only a general knowledge with regard to the fisheries, but also particular knowledge by the fact that he was appointed a commissioner in several instances. I would be sorry to hear that there is any member of this House who fears that in Professor Prince we have not one of the best men we could secure to fill the position of commissioner under that treaty.

Mr. WILCOX. I do not want to be understood as disputing the ability of Professor Prince, but I do think he does not understand the conditions that exist in the Detroit river.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am sorry to differ from my hon. friend in that respect. Professor Prince knew exactly the conditions in the Detroit river. In the years just preceding his appointment he had been investigating the Georgian Bay fisheries, the North Channel fisheries, and also, at the request, if I remember aright, of a great number of fishermen, some of whom may have come from Essex he was appointed to investigate the fisheries in Lake Erie. Consequently I think he was very well informed as to the nature of the fisheries in that locality, and was as competent as any one else to give a good sound judgment upon the fisheries and their extent in those different waters. Outside of that I may perhaps recall to my hon. friend who I know does not wish to throw any party politics into this question, the fact that some years ago an investigation was made by the Canadian authorities on that question of the Detroit river. In 1892 or 1893, under the Conservative government,——

Mr. WILCOX. Is it not a fact that the Hon. Mr. Sutherland, who represented North Essex, and Mr. Wolfe came here in 1908 and asked that the fishermen be released from this regulation, and the department promised to release them and did not do it?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember exactly to what my hon. friend refers. I shall come later to discuss that phase of the question. I was referring to what had been done by the previous government and trying to show to my hon. friend that in the selection of Professor Prince we have not only appointed a man well versed with respect to the question of fisheries generally, but a man acquainted with the particular situation of the fisheries in the Detroit river, who had at his disposal information which was in the department with respect to these fisheries.

In 1893 efforts were made to investigate the Detroit river. A commission was appointed consisting of Dr. Wakeham and Mr. Rathbun. I do not know Mr. Rathbun, but I know Dr. Wakeham very well. Dr. Wakeham has been connected with the administration of the fisheries for a great many years, he has had a great deal of experience, a great deal of knowledge, and no better man could be appointed for the purpose of making an inquiry into the fisheries. After visiting the Detroit river Commander Wakeham said, when dealing with the question of Canadians not being al-

lowed to fish when commercial operations were being conducted on the opposite side of the line:

At first thought, this may seem to some unreasonable; but when it is known that in most places where our waters join those of the United States, the fisheries on the Canadian side are not depleted to anything like the same extent as on the United States side, it is well to consider why this is so, and if we do we must admit that the reason is that the wise restrictions imposed by the department have prevented our fisheries from being exhausted to the same extent that they are on the other side. No thoughtful fisherman considers the absence of regulations on the United States side as wise and prudent. In view of this, I think it behooves us to look sharply after our Fishery Regulations, and the chief of these must be the close season during the spawning period.

We had at that time a situation as follows: On one side of the Detroit river, on the American side, there were no fisheries, the fisheries had been exhausted. Why? Because there was no close season. In this part of the Detroit river the fish of Lake Erie and Lake Huron come and spawn, that is the spawning ground of this lake and the authorities of the State of Michigan were in the habit of letting their fishermen go and fish there during the spawning season. Is there anything more contrary to the interests of the fishermen than that during the spawning period we should allow netting operations? My hon. friend after giving the matter more serious thought and consideration will agree with me that if the fisheries have been destroyed on the American side it is certainly due to the fact that there was no close season under their regulations. How was it on our side? My hon. friend has referred to the fact that, on the Detroit side there is a city of 500,000 and people could not fish there. That is true as far as the city of Detroit is concerned, but as my hon. friend knows the Detroit river is many miles in length. Below the city of Detroit on the American side there were good fishing grounds at one time. Why were they depleted? Because the state authorities of Michigan allowed their fishermen to fish there during the spawning season. The former government in issuing regulations provided for a strict close season which amounted practically to prohibition, although, it was not total prohibition.

Mr. WILCOX. During what portion of the year was the restriction in force?

Mr. BRODEUR. During the time that the spawning was going on.

Mr. WILCOX. Four weeks.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, suppose it was four weeks, will my hon. friend deny that it was during the spawning season?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. WILCOX. I do not deny that, but there are a number of the minister's statements that I do not admit. For instance, it is contrary to the view expressed by the most practical fishermen we have in that country to say that fish from Lake Huron come to the Detroit river to spawn. The fish of Lake Erie spawn on the shoals and sand bars of Lake Erie. To some extent fish do come to the Detroit river, but less than two per cent of the fish caught are caught in the Detroit river.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no doubt that it is a spawning ground. My hon. friend will not deny that, and whether the fish come from Lake Huron or Lake Erie does not matter very much. Will my hon. friend state that the former government were at fault when they enacted the prohibition of fishing during the spawning season?

Mr. WILCOX. I will answer that question by saying that my hon. friends—Messrs. McGregor and Allan—spoke at length on this question and they have always taken that position.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend does not answer the question which I am putting to him. I am asking him whether he is willing to admit the former government were at fault in instituting this close season.

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, I condemn those regulations.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does my hon. friend favour a close season?

Mr. WILCOX. I am not taking so much exception to the four weeks close season, but you are prohibiting them from fishing during the whole twelve months in the year.

Mr. BRODEUR. We will come to that later on. I am discussing the close season as it was instituted by the former government, and I say that the close season proved undoubtedly of some benefit, but perhaps not to the same extent as we might have expected. However, the regulations went into force and we found that although the Americans could not fish at all on their side, because they had entirely depleted their fisheries, they having permitted their fishermen to fish during the spawning season, we had fishing on our side. If I understand my hon. friend, he wants to put the Canadian fishermen in the same position as the American fishermen have been put in by their lack of regulation.

Mr. WILCOX. No.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. WILCOX. No.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, that is what my hon. friend is contending for. He is blaming this government because of the international regulations which are going to pro-

hibit netting in this river. My hon. friend knows there is no close season under these regulations. I suppose he is aware of that. The only thing that regulation does provide is the prohibition of netting. We are not going to permit, when these regulations are in force, any netting in the Detroit river.

Mr. WILCOX. My hon. friend is making a close season for twelve months in the year instead of four weeks.

Mr. BRODEUR. It may please some of the fishermen for the moment that the fisheries should be depleted, but the government does not exist only for one day or only for one year. We have to look to the future, and I say it would be criminal on the part of the government to allow the fisheries of the Detroit river to become depleted in the same way as they have been depleted on the American side. We want to protect the fisheries, we want to protect the fishermen too, and the policy that we are going to adopt is one far more in the interest of the fishermen than that which my hon. friend is trying to have accepted in this country. It may please some of the fishermen, but those who look into the future, those who are interested in the preservation of the fisheries, will say that it is a wise policy and will stand by it. My hon. friend asks me why we adopt these regulations. I will give him a few reasons. We want first to stop the destruction of spawning whitefish and pickerel in the Detroit river. That is the object of regulation 44. Perhaps before referring to that I may say to the House that in 1902 or 1903 representations were made to us in order to secure the repeal of the close season which had been provided in 1893. We repealed that provision. Those who made the representations said: On the American side they have the right to fish at any time in the year, and we are not allowed the same privilege. There was a great deal of force in that argument and our fishermen were, I am sure, more or less affected by the fact that the American fishermen had the right to fish on their side of the river while we did not allow them to fish on our side. That situation brought discontent, and the government thought of repealing this restriction which had been provided for formerly. But now when we are going to obtain from the American authorities the undertaking to prohibit fishing on their side there is no more reason why we should not adopt the same restriction on our side.

Mr. WILCOX. That is on the Detroit river.

Mr. BRODEUR. On the Detroit river. There was some reason at one time when the Americans were allowed to fish on their side of the Detroit river that the Canadian fishermen should be allowed to fish on our side, but now that we have a treaty, and now that we have by this treaty a provision by which fishing is to be prohibited on both sides we must welcome, in the interests of the country, and in the interests of the fishermen, such a regulation involving as it does the discontinuance of net fishing on both sides. Why should the Detroit river be treated differently from the St. Lawrence?

Mr. WILCOX. There is no fishing on the American side of the Detroit river.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no fishing on the St. Lawrence? My hon. friend is mistaken. I know some members of the House who are living on the St. Lawrence, and I think they will say that there is a good deal of fishing on the St. Lawrence. I am sorry that my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is not here; I think he would tell my hon. friend there is some fishing on that part of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. WILCOX. My hon. friend did not understand me. I say there is no fishing on the American side of the Detroit river for the reason that the land is too valuable, it all being city property. There are a couple of fish hatcheries operated by the State Fish Commission. All the fishing is carried on on the Canadian side where the land is not so valuable.

Mr. BRODEUR. I misunderstood the hon. gentleman; I thought he referred to the St. Lawrence. There is no more fishing on the American side of the Detroit river, because the Americans had not the necessary restrictions to preserve the fish. In 1904 we repealed the restrictions which were formerly in effect with the result that the catch of white fish in the Detroit river had fallen from 100,070 pounds a year to 24,000 pounds a year. In 1898 the doré caught in the Detroit river amounted to 12,000 pounds, while in 1908 it was only 6,000 pounds, or a reduction of one-half.

Mr. WILCOX. Has not that condition been general on the Great Lakes with the exception of Lake Erie?

Mr. BRODEUR. The reason Lake Erie is not depleted, is because I am glad to say that on the American side the state of Ohio had adopted proper regulations for the protection of the fish. But, in the Detroit river there were no regulations on the American side, and our fishermen having asked us to repeal the restrictions on our side, we did so, with the result that the white fish catch fell from 100,000 pounds to 24,000 pounds, and the catch of dore from 12,000 pounds, to 6,000. Well, if we allowed free fishing without any restriction, it would not be long before the fish would disappear altogether.

Mr. WILCOX. Does the minister contend that that condition was solely due to the fact that our fishermen were permitted to fish for 4 or 5 weeks in the year?

Mr. BRODEUR. We prevented fishing during the spawning season, and as the Americans had no restrictions, the result was that the fisheries were depleted in American waters. Last session these regulations were adopted unanimously by this parliament, and not a man in this House dissented to the treaty or to the regulations passed under it. Indeed I may say there was a general feeling of satisfaction that at last we had reached an agreement with the United States to bring about uniform regulations in international waters. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilcox) takes a small part of the treaty and he says that it will have an injurious effect upon the fishermen of a particular locality. Well, suppose it has, it is only for a time and in the future it is bound to result in the greatest benefit to the fishermen of that locality. The treaty will last for four years and the fish in these waters having four years rest, they are bound to replenish, and the fisheries will be still more valuable to the fishermen when this treaty expires. The regulations, though not so severe as I would like to see them, have, nevertheless, for the first time brought the fishery regulations of the United States under the control of a central power which in respect to these contiguous waters, is a most important matter. We adopted these regulations because in the first place they will stop the destruction of spawning whitefish and pickerel in the Detroit river, and no sensible person can take exception to that. I believe that the wise fishermen will say that it is good policy to preserve the spawning grounds. Nay, more, I say that if there is a fisherman who is opposed to preserving the spawning grounds, it would be just as well to protect such a man against himself, because he does not know what his best interests are. The second reason for our adopting the regulations is that we may stop the destruction of immature fish which are found in large quantities in the nets in narrow waters like the Detroit river, and the catching of which is of no benefit to the fisherman. The third reason is to restore the more valuable species of fish by stopping netting for market during the four years this treaty is in force. I am quite sure that during these four years the fish will be replenished in these waters as they have in other waters where similar regulations existed, and at the end of that period the fisheries will be more valuable to the fishermen than ever before. Now, we need white fish eggs for the hatcheries, and the hon. gentleman admits that hatcheries are a good thing. I am not at all in accord with the views expressed by some American writers, that if you have a sufficient number of hatcheries, you have no need for a license system or a close season or regulation as to the size of the mesh, because the hatcheries will of themselves, replenish the fisheries. I believe that while the regulations adopted by the commissioners are not up to the standard I would like to see, yet they are a step in the right direction, and I am surprised that there are Canadians who enter objection to them in any form whatever. I may say that the regulations to which my hon. friend (Mr. Wilcox) takes exception, are not yet in force. The parliament of Canada has unanimously passed a law empowering the Governor in Council, to put these regulations in force when the American authorities have adopted similar regulations. Unfortunately the matter is not yet disposed of. I must say, however, to the credit of the President of the United States, that some time ago I had a conference with the authorities of the Department of State with regard to this question of enforcing our regulations, and I was promised that in a short time a message would be sent to the Congress suggesting the adoption of those regulations. I am glad to say, from information that I have received, that the President of the United States has sent such a message to the Congress, but unfortunately it was so late in the session that the necessary legislation was not passed; but I hope that this will be done in the next session. I repeat that if my hon. friend wants to be the friend of the fishermen—and I believe he does and is sincere in his motives—let him work with us in the effort to preserve these fisheries which are now so greatly depleted. If we left matters to go on as they are now going, in a few years, though there might be some fishermen, there would be no fisheries. I think that is not a condition which my hon. friend wants to see in the Detroit river. Let him work with us in the framing of such regulations as are necessary to preserve the fisheries, and if we are successful in having those regulations adopted by the United States authorities, they will be of the greatest benefit to the vast fisheries of this Dominion.

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot speak a second time on this motion except by the general consent of the House.

Mr. WILCOX. I just wish to say that the hon. minister expresses the view that I find fault with the general application of these regulations. I will agree with him that it is a good thing for Canada to have a uniform set of regulations with the United

States; but I find fault with the way in which they apply to the Detroit river.

Mr. BRODEUR. Why discriminate between the Detroit river and the St. Mary's, the St. Clair or the St. Lawrence?

Mr. WILCOX. For this reason, that on the south side of the county of Essex the fishermen have a right to fish in Lake Erie as they have always had, while on the north side of the county of Essex, where the fishermen have enjoyed the same privilege, they are now deprived of it. It is only that part of the regulation that applies to the Detroit river that I object to. The hon. minister referred to the question of fishing on the spawning beds. There is a great difference of opinion on the part of the experts on that question. We have high authority in the United States for saying that the best way to propagate these fish is to catch them on the spawning beds and place them in the hatcheries and have the young fry hatched out there.

CAPITALIZATION OF RAILWAYS.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to bring before the House a question of great importance, especially to the people of the Canadian west. It has been stated repeatedly, in the press and on the floor of this House, that the tariff is the great grievance of the people of the west. My contention is that their railway grievances are of even greater importance than the tariff. We have full control of questions relating to railroads, while the trade question, as it comes up in this House, is in the jurisdiction of the people of the United States. We can immediately redress the railway grievances of the people of the west if we choose to do so. The Manitoba 'Free Press' not long ago made the assertion, and it has not been denied, that railway rates in the Canadian west today are greater than those that obtain in the American west. I have been informed that the Minister of Railways has made the statement that railway rates in Canada are lower than in the United States. I dispute that statement, and if necessary I will give the facts as presented by the Manitoba 'Free Press,' which gave a great many instances in which rates were higher in Canada than in the United States. This is a substantial grievance, and there is a cure for it, and that cure rests with this House and the Railway Commission which we have created. I purpose approaching this question this afternoon by introducing a motion to the effect that the capitalization of the railways of this country ought to be controlled by the Railway Commission, inasmuch as the basis of railway rates is supposed to be the amount of money invested in the construction of the railway. If the money raised for the construction of a railway is raised in an extravagant way, the railway rates must be higher than they otherwise would be, or if money is borrowed for the improvement of a railway when it is not necessary, the interest on that money must necessarily come out of the people who pay the railway rates. My intention is to show that if the railway companies are forced to submit their capitalization to the Railway Commission instead of to parliament, a great reduction in rates could be effected. For a while the doctrine was preached in this House and in the country, and also in the United States, that the capitalization of a railway had nothing to do with its charges; but at last that doctrine has had to be abandoned, and it is now admitted in all quarters that the first thing to do in order to reduce railway rates is to reduce the capitalization of the railways. I heard the Minister of Justice say some time ago that it was no concern of parliament what capitalization the railways had or what kind of capitalization they had, whether it was stock or bonds. But in the United States, where they have made a great study of this question, they are now reaching the conclusion that the first thing to do with regard to the railways is to regulate their issue of capital stock. In this country the only regulation we have had is the promiscuous regulation of the Railway Commission, which sometimes allows a railway to issue a large amount of stock and a small amount of bonds, and sometimes the reverse, just as the question seizes the committee. No regular system has been adopted, a great many irregularities have occurred, and consequently the capitalization of Canadian railways is not to-day in a satisfactory condition.

In order to make clear what can be done in this case, and show what has been done in other countries, I propose to call attention to the laws at present in the United States on this question. In the state of New York, the people have suffered more from the over capitalization of railways than in any other country. Some time ago they saw that there was only one remedy, and that was to appoint a public service commission, and compel all railway companies, which wanted to increase their capital, to obtain the approval of that board. Here is the law in the state of New York, consolidated statutes of New York, volume 4, 1909. Clause 55 of the public service Commission Act, reads as follows:

> A common carrier, railway corporation, or street railway corporation organized or existing, or hereafter incorporated, under or by virtue of the laws of the state of New York, may issue stocks, bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness payable at periods of more than 12 months after the date thereof, when necessary for the acquisition of property, the construction, completion, extension or improvement of its facilities, or for the improvement or maintenance of its service

or for the discharge or lawful refunding of its obligations, provided and not otherwise that there shall have been secured from the proper commission an order authorizing such issue, and the amount thereof and stating that, in the opinion of the commission, the use of the capital to be secured by the issue of such stock, bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness is reasonably required for the said purposes of the corporation, but this provision shall not apply to any lawful issue of stock, to the lawful execution and delivery of any mortgage or to the lawful issue of bonds thereunder, which shall have been duly approved by the Board of Railroad Commissioners before the time when this Act becomes the law. For the purpose of enabling it to determine whether it should issue such an order, the commission shall make such inquiry or investigation, hold such hearings, and examine such witnesses, books, papers, documents or contracts as it may deem of importance in enabling it to reach a determination.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does that apply purely to increase of capital?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). No new capital of any kind can be secured without the authority from this commission. The railway company show that this increase is necessary for the extension of the road.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Suppose a new railway is organized in New York state for the building of a new line, would the provisions of this statute apply to its initial capital?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Yes to everything. Not one dollar of capitalization, no security not even a note issue extending over 12 months, can be issued without the approval of this commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If a railway is organized in the state of New York, who authorizes the issue of capital?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). This railway commission also. That does not come within the jurisdiction of the state legislature at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This applies to bonds only, and not to the stock of a company.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). It applies to stocks, bonds, notes or other security in any form with the exception of promissory notes for less than twelve months. The companies may give promissory notes provided they are for a short term, but if these notes extend beyond twelve months, they must first be approved by this railway board. That law has proved most effective in the state of New York. In that state there are to-day two railway commissions. One deals with electric companies, whether light, trolley or street railway service; and the other deals with steam railways. I have a summary here of the total applications made and granted with regard to street railways from July 1, 1907, to December 1, 1910:

Total amount of securities applied for..	$361,000,000
Amount approved by the commission..	82,000,000
Amount disapproved..	$279,000,000

Had the commission been in operation at the time the different railways were financed in New York, instead of over $500,000,000 of watered stock being injected into the street railway propositions of that state, less than $3,000,000 would have been advanced. The result of all this water is that the underground system, while it carries more passengers than any other road of the same standing, is to-day in the hands of a receiver. This shows the necessity for some commission to regulate the issue of railway stock. A similar experience has resulted in the case of the other railways. The commission has rejected from time to time various schemes of the steam railways in the way of financing, but its report does not give the amount of the rejections. The commission, however, refused to endorse the issue of capital which it did not consider necessary in the interests of the road. It has said to the railways: We will not allow you to issue stock which may call for dividends of from 6 to 10 per cent, but will compel you to issue instead 4 per cent bonds. Unfortunately the railway situation to-day is so bad in the United States that none of their railways can get a market for their stock. They have issued so much watered stock, that American railway securities are discredited in Europe. Our Canadian railway stocks have good standing to-day; but if we do not interfere with the pernicious practice adopted by the Canadian Pacific railway, our securities will get into the same standing as the American. The other day one of the members of the New York Public Service Commission, Mr. Maltby, gave his opinion on this question. If any one wants to read an instructive article on it, he will find the article in the New York 'Times' annual financial review of this year. I am going to read just two or three paragraphs:

> Government supervision of securities issued by public service corporations is of importance not only to the investor but to the shipper, the passenger and the consumer. It is ordinarily argued that the investor alone is affected, and that reasonable rates, adequate service and proper treatment of the public can be as easily secured without control over securities as where such control exists. This may be true in certain instances, but where there is an efficient government authority with adequate power, rates and service tend to reflect these conditions.

That is the opinion of the most active man on the Public Service Commission of the State of New York, a man who has

been for several years actively connected with that commission. Here is another sentence:

In the second place, unregulated public service corporations tend toward over-capitalization, and over-capitalization is apt to have a direct effect upon rates and service. Theoretically, if a company is earning 8 per cent upon a certain capitalization, it will make no difference if the capitalization is doubled and the return is 4 per cent upon the new capitalization. As a matter of fact, however, the tendency will be very strong to boost the 4 per cent return to 5 or 6 per cent.

And again:

Effective regulation contains several essential features. In the first place, bonds should not be sold by corporations for less than their market value and preferably at par.

I will give a remarkable instance of violation of that wholesome rule in Canada. Here is another sentence:

The sale of stock at its market value would also be beneficial to existing companies. The English method of sale in open competitive market seems preferable to the plan whereby the price at which it may be issued is fixed by a public authority.

And again:

Before securities are approved a careful examination should be made into the purposes of the expenditure, but supervision should not stop here. It is essential that the supervising authority should know how the funds are actually expended and that the amounts paid are reasonable, that the property is needed and that the cost should be charged to capital and not to operation. Unless this is done, the public is apt to be misled, believing there is adequate protection when it does not exist.

He shows, that it is in the interest not only of the public, but also of the investor, and, most of all, it is in the interest of the consumer, who, in the last analysis, must pay railway rates, that there should be absolute and practical control of the capitalization of all companies. We have had an instance in this country where we have neglected to make the necessary regulations, and, as a consequence, the consumer and the public and even the railway service itself, suffers from the lack of control.

Now, they have that law in the State of New York. The credit for it is due to that eminent man, Charles E. Hughes, recently Governor of New York, and now a member of the Supreme Court of the United States. He has followed the financial history of the United States very closely. He was the counsel in the investigation of the insurance companies doing business in the State of New York, and he came to the conclusion that the most serious evil in the United States was a lack of regulation of the finances of the great trusts and railroad corporations. It was at his instance that this law was placed on the statute-book of New York state. It is the most satisfactory law they have, and no man would think of repealing one clause or one line of it. So satisfactory has it been that the present president of the United States has taken up the matter and is moving to have it apply to interstate railways which will practically make it apply to all the railways of the United States. It was in the Bill regulating railroads of the year before last and would have become law only that the railroads made a great protest against it. But, as a compromise, it was agreed that a commission should issue to investigate the subject. I have secured a copy of that Act. It is entitled, 'An Act to create a commerce court and to amend the Act entitled, 'An Act to regulate commerce approved February fourth, eighteen hundred and eighty-seven, as heretofore amended, and for other purposes.' This, one of the great improvements of the railroad laws of the United States has been the creation, in the session before the one just closed, of this court of commerce, which has jurisdiction over the decision of the Board of Railway Commissioners. Section 16 of this Act reads as follows:

16. That the president is hereby authorized to appoint a commission to investigate questions pertaining to the issuance of stocks and bonds by railway corporations subject to the provisions of the Act to regulate commerce, and the power of Congress to regulate or affect the same, and to fix the compensation of the members of such commission. Said commission shall be and is hereby authorized to employ experts to aid in the work of inquiry and examination, and such clerks, stenographers and other assistants as may be necessary, which employees shall be paid such compensation as the commission may deem just and reasonable upon a certificate to be issued by the chairman of the commission. The several departments and bureaus of the government shall detail from time to time such officials and employees and furnish such information to the commission as may be directed by the president. For the purposes of its investigations the commission shall be authorized to incur and have paid upon the certificate of its chairman such expenses as the commission shall deem necessary.

This is the Act passed at Washington to authorize the president to appoint the highest-class commission he could secure to investigate the whole question of the issuance of the securities of railways and to bring in a report dealing with the matter. Under this authority, the president appointed president Hadley, of Yale, chairman of the commission. Here is the president's letter of appointment:

Beverly, Massachusetts,
September 16, 1910.

Hon. Arthur T. Hadley,
President Yale University,
New Haven, Conn.

Under the provision of section 16 of the Act of Congress approved June 18, 1910, en-

titled an 'Act to create a commerce court,' and to amend the Act entitled an 'Act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, as heretofore amended and for other purposes, I hereby appoint you chairman of a commission to investigate questions pertaining to the issuance of stocks and bonds by railroad corporations, subject to the provisions of the Act to regulate commerce, and the power of Congress to regulate or affect the same.

WM. H. TAFT.

Professor Hadley, of Yale, is known as one of the ablest publicists of the United States. Associated with him are other able publicists, and the commission are now dealing with this question. They have had hearings all over the country, and, as far as I can judge, the evidence is all to one effect, and that is that it is absolutely in the interest of the railroads themselves, of the corporations, of the investors, to have complete regulation and control of securities issued by railroad companies. If you ask me what the 'insurgent' movement in the United States means, I say it means a rebellion of the people against the excessive charges of the railroads and a determined effort to bring about reform. They have come to the conclusion that, to strike the evil at its root, there must be regulation of the finances of the railway. And in the United States it is harder to regulate corporations than it is here; for it is provided under the constitution that investors must be allowed a fair return on their investment; you cannot injure a man's investment, and if there has been an extravagant issue of securities, the Railway Commission in the United States is limited by this provision that a reasonable return must be allowed on the investment.

No such law obtains here in Canada fortunately and our commission can regulate, but in all fairness the investor ought to be protected and ought to get a reasonable return on his investment. However, before that security issues, it ought to be shown that it is absolutely in the interest of the undertaking, not of some stock operator or Harriman or some one who wants to make a fortune out of what is called the reorganization of a company. The reason ought to be given and has now to be given in the State of New York, and there is every prospect that the Congress of the United States will add to the general railway law of that country provisions which will secure control of all railway capital. The same thing has been dealt with by other eminent men in the United States, among them Mr. Woodrow Wilson. Mr. Woodrow Wilson, Governor of New Jersey, is one of the new type of public men who are coming up in the United States and Canada ought to watch with the greatest interest the rise of these new public men in the United States who devote themselves to public service; I am glad to say that the legal profession is furnishing the greatest number of these men. Governor Wilson is an excellent sample of this type. At his inauguration as Governor of New Jersey the other day he said that the first thing to which he would devote himself in connection with the legislature of New Jersey would be the regulation of the capitalization of companies chartered in that state. Everybody knows that the State of New Jersey has been abused by men getting corporate powers of every kind with enormous capitalization. The State of New Jersey would give any power to any corporation and give capital by the millions, which only meant water. He is of the opinion that the regulation of the capital of railways must be handled in a scientific way by a well-trained commission, and all the leading magazine articles in the United States dealing with the grievances of the people of the United States in connection with railways have taken the ground that the first essential is the regulation of the capitalization of railways. They have seen that the railway grievance has its origin there, and have come to the conclusion, as was expressed by Mr. Kuhn of the great firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Company, who backed Harriman more than any one else, that the regulation of capital has got to come. The day when one man like Harriman or the Vanderbilts could reorganize a railway with an enormously increased capital and put the increased stock in his own pocket is over. Harriman's last act in reorganizing the railways of Southern California and the west was to make such an increase in the stock that the orange and fruit men of California have to-day to pay $12,000,000 of increased railway rates because of his reorganization of the railways he acquired. He accumulated an enormous sum in the four or five years by what he called reorganizing companies, getting control, making a great bond issue which he gave to the public who bought them and then putting the money in his pocket. That is the idea of his gigantic financing for his own benefit, but he had also a good idea of reconstructing and reorganizing railroads and his policy and the policy carried out by his successors has had the effect of greatly improving the railways, but at the same time greatly increasing the rates on these railroads so that they have become a public grievance to-day.

Now to bring the case right home to us in Canada and to the people who are served by the Canadian Pacific railway in the east or in the west, I would point out that the Canadian Pacific railway in its original charter was allowed to issue I think $25,000,000 of capital. It has now, according to its statement, $150,000,000 of capital

out. It received from the Governor in Council not long ago authority to issue $50,000,000 more capital and $30,000,000 of that has been issued. The Canadian Pacific railway has to-day a capital stock of $180,000,000. It has of 4 per cent preference stock $55,000,000, and of 4 per cent consolidated debenture stock $136,000,000, or about $200,000,000 in stock and $200,000,000 in debentures and bonds. It still has a right to issue $20,000,000 more under authority given to it by the Governor in Council, two or three years ago. My contention is that a great corporation like the Canadian Pacific railway to-day can finance itself and build every mile of railroad it requires on the issue of 4 per cent debenture stock on which only 4 per cent has to be earned. But they are issuing stock on which 14 per cent has been paid for several years now and that is a thing which should not be allowed. The Canadian Pacific railway is paying by dividends and bonuses to stockholders on the issue of new stock below the market price, as I can prove by stockholders and the market reports, more than 14 per cent a year on their capital stock. Why should not that money or any new money required by the Canadian Pacific railway be obtained by the issue of 4 per cent debentures if they can float them, and that they can float them is evidenced by the experience in the past. The Canadian Pacific railway is in such a good position to-day that it can put out 4 per cent debentures and get all the money it wants, but instead of doing that it asks to have power to increase its stock. Let me tell you what has happened in regard to this last issue of stock. They came to the Governor in Council and got authority to issue $50,000,000 of stock. If there had been a commission here with full power to investigate, as in New York, they would have gone to the commission and said: 'We want $50,000,000,' 'What for? For the undertaking?' 'Yes.' 'Wholly for the undertaking and no one else?' 'Yes.' When they had proved that that amount was necessary for the undertaking and was to be devoted to the undertaking, they would ask what form the security was to be in. The road might say: 'Oh, we would like it in stock.' Stock? What about 4 per cent debentures? You have a great many out now and the public are satisfied with them, the investor is satisfied. You must put the securities in the form of 4 per cent debentures or bonds. Under existing conditions they said: 'We want stock and the government of the day in the innocence of their hearts, and I know they are not fully informed as they have many things to attend to, although the would have avoided the whole responsibility if they had had a public service commission, gave them authority to issue $50,000,000 of stock some two years, $30,000,000 of that stock was put out on the market a short time ago, and it was all allotted to their own shareholders. Every shareholder had a right to take his proportionate share of this new stock. I raised considerable row about it in this House although I had little support, but my complaint had this effect that the Board of Directors of the Canadian Pacific railway decided to make some concession to public opinion and decided at last to issue to their own shareholders at $125, although the market price then was $175, and the law in England is as it is in the state of New York, that if a company issues stock it must issue it at the market price

It is considered a crime in this country to compel a railway or any corporation that proposes to issue new stock to put it out at the most money it will bring. So, the Canadian Pacific railway which to-day serves more of the people of Canada than any other railway, is allowed by a law of this kind to sell its shares to its own shareholders at $125 for a hundred dollar share when on the market those shares would be worth $175 each. As a consequence the $30,000,000 of shares that were issued put $37,500,000 into the treasury of the company but put $15,000,000 into the pockets of the shareholders as a bonus. That $15,000,000 should have gone into the treasury and been devoted to the purposes of the undertaking. It was a breach of public trust, it was a violation of the rights of the people, it was a violation of the rights of the farmers of the west, who are to-day complaining of the freight rates, that that $15,000,000 should be switched away from the purposes of the undertaking and put into the pockets of the shareholders. What is the result? The stock of the Canadian Pacific railway is worth $215 for a hundred dollar share. Why? Because a rumour has gone abroad that another melon is to be cut, that this remaining $20,000,000 of stock is to be issued at an amount below the market value and that that money is going to the shareholders as a bonus instead of being concentrated to the reduction of the rates charged by the Canadian Pacific railway to the people of Canada for the transportation of their products. It is a crime against the consumer. It is the man who has to pay for what is transported over the railway, the farmer of the west, the man who raises the grain, or the man who buys it to use it, who has to suffer. He has to pay for this money that the Canadian Pacific railway shareholders have unfairly, unjustly, and most improperly been allowed to put in their own pockets. I have here a statement which I read in the House once before, and which I can read again, in which a shareholder of the railway said that he had

found that his Canadian Pacific railway investment had netted him more than 14 per cent per annum for the last five years. That has got to be stopped, and if the Canadian Pacific Railway Board now propose to issue that stock, under the present state of affairs and in view of the cry of the people of the west that they have a grievance both with regard to the operation of the railway and freight charges, and if they have a grievance that we can regulate, I say that it is the duty of this House to compel the Canadian Pacific railway when they issue that new stock to put every dollar of it into the treasury and to devote every dollar of it to the undertaking, either to the building of new lines or to the reduction of rates. The Canadian Pacific railway to-day has such enormous profits and resources that it has $20,000,000, or $30,000,000, or $40,000,000 of deposits in the banks of this country. It has even been in a position to lend money to the government of this country. It has become in one case the banker of the government. I do not know whether the people of Canada are aware of that fact. Here is a great corporation which we have created in order to serve the public which has accumulated so much money in the carrying out of its undertaking that it has millions and millions of deposits in the banks. There is no other railway in America that is in the same position. There is no other railway in America but is seeking to borrow money. The Canadian Pacific railway has so much money in its treasury that it could build every line that it requires in the west without issuing another dollar of stock or another debenture. I was in the railway committee to-day, and I found this company applying to issue debentures for branches in the west to the extent of $30,000 a mile, an altogether unnecessary amount. It makes this proposal notwithstanding the immense sums that it has in its treasury, its land grants and all that. My contention is, as I said on the floor of this House the other day, that these enormous assets, these accumulations, should go back to the people in the shape of reduced rates, and that there should be no issue of capitalization hereafter unless it can be absolutely justified by the facts after it has been laid before a railway commission competent to deal with such a question.

Now, we have undertaken to regulate the rates of the railways in this country. Surely it is a reasonable inference from that to say that we must regulate the capitalization of the railways. That is the line of argument upon which they are proceeding in the United States to-day, and that is the line of argument to which we ourselves must come. My motion is to the effect that the issue of securities by the railways of this country should first be approved of by a commission. It is not fair to put this duty on the Governor in Council. I do not know whether it was the present or the preceding government that gave that power to the Governor in Council. I am not criticising any one who gave it or criticising any exercise of it that has taken place so much as I am asserting that it must cease, and that in connection with the issue of this $20,000,000 of new stock the scandal shall not be allowed to continue. It is a great scandal that the proceeds of stock issued to the public for the benefit of the undertaking should be switched into the pockets of the shareholders. No wonder the stock of the Canadian Pacific railway is going up. No wonder the Dutch investors think this is the greatest investment in the world. But it is at the expense of the people who pay the freight rates of Canada that they are enabled to cut melons, not only giving these men 7 per cent on the face of their stock, but giving them a bonus of 7 per cent for five years instead of applying this 7 per cent for the benefit of the people of Canada by way of a reduction in rates. Why, this is a fine investment. No wonder that the Canadian Pacific railway has a fine standing in the money centres of the world. But this is based on a false doctrine, on an unfair procedure, and it discriminates against the public who have to pay the railway rates. The Canadian Pacific railway to-day, by reason of its accumulations, could reduce passenger rates to 2 cents a mile. They could reduce their express rates, they could reduce their telegraph tolls, and they could reduce their freight rates. The freight rates, the telegraph tolls, the express charges, and the passenger rates in the Canadian west and the Canadian east are a great grievance, and they should not continue. Their finances are in such a condition that they could reduce their rates to a very large extent. In fact, I am told that they would like to reduce them only the bogey has been set up in this country that if you reduce the rates of one railway you have to reduce them on all, and as it would hurt some you must not reduce them on any. I do not subscribe to that doctrine. The Canadian Pacific railway is under more absolute control than the others because that was provided for in the original charter. Hereafter there must be regulation of the issue of securities. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals gave me, some time ago, an engagement that he would look into the matter. Perhaps he has got more light on the subject since. But, it is in the

interest of the transportation of this country and in the interest of lower rates that the regulation of the issue of securities must be taken up and be taken up in the scientific way in which it has been taken up in the United States, in the way in which it has been taken up by the State of New York, and in the way President Taft proposes to take it up when he gets this report from the specal commissioners who have been appointed to investigate the subject. I have come to the conclusion that if the people of the west wish to have their grievances reduced the first thing for them to do is to insist on parliament placing the control of the capitalization of these railways within the hands of our railway commission.

I am quite satisfied that this commission which the government has created, is more competent than either the government itself or a promiscuous body like the railway commission of this House to deal with such a matter. I believe we should follow what is done in England where all securities that are issued are put up to competition and are not left to the whim or advice of company directors to say how they are to be placed. When the Grain Growers' were here from the west they mentioned incidentally that there were railway grievances in the west although the principal thing they came to complain about, was the tariff, and yet the other day I had to stand up in this House alone fighting for the rights of the people of the Canadian west with the members from that section of the country indifferent to my appeal. However, I got a letter from the west which is one little green spot in a very dark outlook.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). The Prime Minister says 'hear, hear,' but I remember a time when he too was in the wilderness and had not many supporters at his back. I am to-day in the wilderness when urging the rights of the people of the west but the little letter I got was a solace to me and while I read it, I will particularly ask hon. gentlemen who represent western constituencies to listen:

THE NORMANTON GRAIN GROWERS' ASSOCIATION, SASKATCHEWAN.

March 1, 1911.

Sir,—I am directed to forward to you this resolution, which was passed at the last meeting of this association:

Resolved, we the Normanton Grain Growers' Association, wish to set on record our appreciation of your recent address on the floor of the Dominion parliament, on the excessive freight rates now in force, and whi'st assuring you of our admiration and support, note with regret that you received no support, not even from the western members.

Yours truly,

W. J. LAWLESS,
Secretary.

W. F. Maclean, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa.

The people of the west have grievances against the railways and the root of these grievances is to be found in the system of capitalization which it is time for this parliament to regulate, especially in the case of railroads who are coming along now looking for charters and power to issue capital. My proposal is to put the power of fixing the capital, whether it be stock, bonds, or any other security, under the control of our railway commission, for I believe that the regulation of the capitalization of the railroads is only a complement to the regulation of the rates. We have adopted the principle of regulating railroad rates and as a complement to that, it is absolutely necessary to regulate the caption so that the traffic may not be too much burdened with excessive dividends and excessive returns of other kinds on the stock. Now, I would like to have some supporters for the motion I am about to present to the House; I do not present it as a motion of want of confidence, I urge it solely in the interests of the people of Canada. I move:

That before the said motion pass, this House desires to express the opinion that the control of the capitalization of the railways of Canada should be within the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I have been much interested in the remarks of my hon. friend concerning the capitalization of railways, and which of course, will apply to the capitalization of all companies. I do not think it can be denied that capitalization has a great deal to do with the rates charged and what we might call the necessary cost of operating and managing these utilities. The hon. gentleman has made a comparison between tariffs and transportation and they are connected in a sense. The problem of transportation properly solved will do a great deal to minimize the evils which may come through a tariff or the lack of a tariff. depending upon the point of view you look at it. In Germany the state-owned railways are used in large measure as an adjunct to the tariff. If a German manufacturer is in competition with a foreign manufacturer outside of Germany, I am told he is given very cheap rates on his products to the confines of the German Empire, and conversely if a foreign manufacturer is competing with him in the German market, the state owned railway

puts almost prohibitive freight rates on that foreign manufacturer's goods. In that way the railway rates are made to assist German manufacturers and are an adjunct to the tariff. That may prevail to a certain extent in Canada at the present time, but that is a point I shall not discuss. However, a great deal of fear has been expressed in many quarters that any international board that might have the power to deal with two local rates, one on each side of the line, and making one through rate, might interfere in a measure with certain privileges that the railways on both sides have, in regard to high or low rates on products coming in or going out of the country.

Mr. LENNOX. Is it a fact as rumoured that the government has abandoned the idea of an international railway board?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend asks me a very pointed question, and I would not care to answer him 'yes,' or 'no,' on that particular point. At the present time the question of an international arrangement is not being discussed and is not actively engaging the attention of the government.

Mr. LENNOX. That is a fair answer.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has referred to rates in western Canada. During a recent trip in the west, I had prepared for me a comparative table of rates on farm products from the interior of western Canada to Port Arthur and Fort William, and of rates from the interior of the western states to Duluth and these were the rates I was discussing in the House when I said that the farmers of the Canadian west had cheaper rates on their products to the Great Lakes than had the farmers of the western states, and I have no reason to change my mind on that.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). In special instances.

Mr. GRAHAM. I took a list covering the whole of the west, of rates from the large farm product shipping centres and I found that the Canadian farmer had a cheaper rate on his wheat and oats to the Great Lakes at Fort William and Port Arthur than had the American farmer to Duluth.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Did that include coal?

Mr. GRAHAM. Let me tell my hon. friend that from Fort William or Port Arthur to Winnipeg, although the distance is some miles longer, the rate on coal is 50 cents a ton less than the rate from Duluth to Winnipeg.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I have the authority of the 'Free Press' for saying that the coal rates to Winnipeg and the west from the country to the south are greater in Canada than in the States.

Mr. GRAHAM. Winnipeg and the west get their coal largely, I think, by the Great Lakes, and the rate from Port Arthur and Fort William to Winnipeg is $2.50 a ton, while the rate from Duluth to Winnipeg, a shorter distance, and mostly through American territory, is $3 per ton; and the commission has refused to reduce this rate on the ground that it is fair as compared with other rates in American territory. Now, there is a difference in the situation in the United States and in Canada as to capitalization. There is also a difference between Great Britain and Canada in this respect. We are a young country, while these two other countries are comparatively old. In the United States railway charters are granted by letters patent in the various states; in Canada they are granted by Act of parliament; and any dangers there may be from over-capitalization are in the hands of parliament itself. It may be that the time is arriving when other steps ought to be taken; but hitherto the Canadian people and parliament have seen fit to keep in the hands of parliament this question of capitalization when companies are organized. In New York state the capitalization of railways is not for the construction of new lines into new portions of the country; it is for old railways, for the development of terminals, the building of large stations, the changing from steam to electricity, or some such purpose. The conditions are different in Canada, where companies are formed to make the experiment of building new lines into new territories, which may or may not be productive. I am glad to say that they have been productive in the past, and, if we may judge by the course of the Canadian Pacific Railway stock, which is going up every day so that men of ordinary means can hardly reach it, the prospect for transportation companies in Canada in the future is really good. The Canadian Pacific railway is in a class all by itself in many ways. This much must be remembered. Although liberal provision was made for the Canadian Pacific railway, although the company got a large grant of land which, owing to the development of Canada, has proved valuable beyond our expectations, no person will deny that in the first place the men who put their money into the Canadian Pacific railway took a mighty big chance.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). How much did they pay for it?

Mr. GRAHAM. They did not pay a great deal, but my hon. friend will remember that at one time in the early history of the

Canadian Pacific railway, it was on the verge of not being worth anything, and if the government of Canada had not come to its assistance, it would have gone into bankruptcy.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). How much did they pay for their stock?

Mr. GRAHAM. They put everything they had as financiers and their individual character behind this road, and they made a success of it. In discussing it we should not forget that. I could make a fair argument by saying that it is not altogether unjust that the men who made this experiment should have the first chance to make what profit there was in the investment. I do not see that we ought to give the Canadian Pacific railway more than its share. I am not arguing for the Canadian Pacific railway; but this must be borne in mind, that the greatest benefit that has come to the Canadian Pacific railway has come through the increase in the value of its real estate. If we were to confine them solely to the profits of the railway, I am not so sure that they would have such a good story to tell. But Canada has become a great country; we have done a great deal to develop the railways and other transportation facilities of this country, and the lands in western Canada have become valuable far beyond what any one expected. In discussing such questions as this we are very apt to be guided by hindsight. The Canadian Pacific railway has been a great success, and we are glad of it; but we must not go to the other extreme, and condemn this undertaking merely because it has been a great success. We should bear in mind that the Canadian Pacific railway has been guided through very dangerous times by the aid of the people of Canada; and while we were doing that, while we were maintaining the credit of the country and making the Canadian Pacific railway a standing advertisement of the greatness and growth of Canada, three-fourths of the railways of the United States have at some period passed into liquidation.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Because of overcapitalization.

Mr. GRAHAM. That may be. If that is the case, the Canadian Pacific railway has not been guilty, because it has not had the same experience. Seventy-five per cent of the railways on the continent of America have at some time or other passed into liquidation, and the people who put their money into these railways originally have been wiped out of existence financially. But the Canadian Pacific railway has lost none of its original stock, and I think it is greatly to the credit of the Dominion of Canada that an enterprise of that kind has been carried through, and that the men and the women who have invested in it have had a safe investment. I would like to see all the investments made in Canada, whether of foreign or home capital, so successful that we would never have any trouble in getting all the capital we want.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Does the minister justify, then, the cutting of these melons?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will come to that. My hon. friend's argument has been made from a state law, not a federal law. The new court that has been established by the Congress of the United States has not been established for the purpose of looking after capitalization particularly, and for a very good reason, that most of the railways of the United States get their charters from state authority and not federal authority. This new court has been established—and I think Mr. Knapp is to be a member and perhaps the head of that court—in order to provide for a speedy judgment in the case of appeals from the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That commission, being able to deal only with interstate traffic, does not occupy the same position as the Dominion Board of Railway Commissioners. When our commissioners give a judgment, there are only two things on which an appeal can be made. An appeal can be made on a question of fact to the Governor in Council or on a question of law to the Supreme Court, but they must first obtain the permission of the board. In the United States the position is altogether different. The parties can go from court to court, and the whole procedure is more cumbersome. In order to get over that difficulty, the federal authorities are establishing a new commerce court to deal effectively and speedily with all such appeals.

It must also be borne in mind that in a new country like ours there are difficulties in financing not experienced in older countries. We have railways which are being constructed by the Grand Trunk railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Canadian Northern railway, and to-day the complaint throughout the west is that the railway companies are not pushing their new lines nearly fast enough. If we insist however on their going faster, they must provide more capital.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). That complaint was made with regard to the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. It happened that the Canadian Pacific railway was up before the Railway Committee to-day. It all depends on whose Bill is before the committee, and we have to be careful not to do anything that may shake the confidence of the financial world in such undertakings

in this country. I am not speaking as an advocate at all of any railway company. It does not make a particle of difference to me what railway company may be affected. I am not in the position of my hon. friend who can attack a railway or anybody else solely on his individual responsibility, and his responsibility of course to those he represents; but in dealing with a question of this kind, and holding the position in which I am placed at present, I consider that I am responsible to see that no injustice is done to any part of the community, not even the railway companies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM. We want to let the world know that in this Dominion men who are induced to make investments shall be treated justly and honestly, and also that the people of the country shall not be imposed upon by these companies to whom we give such great privileges.

But coming to the question as to the granting to our board of railway commissioners the power to deal with capitalization, as I have said, the two systems are before us. In the United States the States themselves—not the federal authority—grant charters to railway companies by letters patent. In Canada the provinces grant charters to local railway companies and the federal authority grants charters to Dominion railway companies by Act of this parliament, and heretofore we have left in the hands of this parliament the right to deal with capitalization. In Canada the increase of capital is largely for the construction of new lines into new territories. In the United States it is largely for terminals or something in connection with old established lines. The conditions in both countries are different; but as my hon. friend points out, we are growing very rapidly in Canada and must soon be looking to the future, because it will not be long before we shall be unable to class ourselves among the young countries. The question to which he has directed our attention is one certainly worthy of being considered. I have discussed it with some of our leading railway men, I have discussed it with the chairman of our Board of Railway Commissioners, I have discussed it with some gentlemen on the other side of the line, and I tell my hon. friend frankly that I have not yet been able to convince myself that Canada is prepared to take the step he recommends at present. Possibly he may be right and I may be going a little carefully, but with the responsibility I feel, speaking for the government and the people of Canada, I think we should go slowly. One of our strong points when asking for money from the financiers of the world is to go slowly and not frighten capital, to do nothing to shake the confidence of the people who hold the purse strings. Our credit must be protected and will be. Let us then be careful in whatever we do so that in the future, as in the past, the capitalists of the world will be prepared to furnish the funds, when asked to do so, for any great undertaking Canada may have on hand.

My hon. friend has brought this motion in a peculiar way; and while I say that the question is one I have been considering, I am not convinced the time has yet come for us to make the move he advocates. I am much obliged to him for the information he has given in a matter for such deep interest, but the government could not accept the motion he has submitted. It is not one which we can amend. It is a vote of want of confidence, and it is asking us to adopt, without the investigation we think necessary, a new departure. I think he would do well not to press his motion to division because we all are anxious to do what is best for the people and to guard all the interests at work in the upbuilding of this country. This matter is under consideration. We are considering it, and wondering if it is the best thing to do. I am not yet convinced that this is the proper time to take such a step in advance, but the government has it in mind, and this, as all other questions connected with transportation in the cheapest way for the people, is receiving serious consideration and will continue to receive that consideration in the future.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

ALBERTA ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. SPROULE moved the third reading of Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Alberta Electric Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. TURRIFF. In accordance with the notice I gave, I move that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of striking out section 14.

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

Mr. TURRIFF moved that section 14 be struck out.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member (Mr. McCarthy) who is in charge of the Bill, is not present, and it would be too bad to amend it during his absence. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again, allowing the Bill to stand until the hon. gentleman is here.

Mr. TURRIFF. This clause would authorize the company to carry on a coal mining business as well as run a railway. I think such a clause should not be passed. There is no objection to these people taking out a charter for a subsidiary company, and operating a coal mine under that charter, but a law should not be passed authorizing a railway company to own and operate a coal mine. I do not think there is much likelihood that this company will ever start a coal mine, but I do not support in this case, and do not intend to support in any case in the future, the proposal to give a railway company power under its charter to go into the coal mining business.

Mr. SPROULE. This Bill was allowed to stand yesterday because the hon. member who is in charge of it was not present. I agree with much of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) has said. I contended against this feature of the Bill when it was in committee. But power similar to this has been given to other railway companies in that western country where coal is so plentiful, and there seems to be no very strong reason why we should grant such powers to one company and refuse them to another. We ought to treat all alike.

Mr. TURRIFF. If it is the desire of the committee to let the Bill stand over until the hon. member who is in charge of it is present, I have no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is the hon. member for Calgary away only for to-day?

Mr. SPROULE. He is away temporarily, I understand.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Bill was allowed to stand the other night because the hon. gentleman was not here. I have no objection to having it stand over again if he will be here the next night.

Mr. STANFIELD. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) was in charge of the Bill the other night.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, but the changes made on that occasion were by arrangement with the promoter. This change is one, I understand, which he does not desire to have made. However, if my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) is willing, we might leave it over until the next private Bills night.

Progress reported.

BRITISH COLUMBIA AND CENTRAL CANADA RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 113) to incorporate the Dominion Development Company.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

On section 1—corporate name.

Mr. McCRANEY. Yesterday notice of motion was given by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith), who is not here at present, to change the name of this company. In his absence, I would move that the section be amended so as to change the name of the company to 'The British Columbia and Central Canada Railway Company.'

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported as amended and read the third time and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS—CAPITALIZATION OF RAILWAYS.

House resumed discussion of the motion of Mr. Fielding that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means and the proposed amendment thereto.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, before this resolution is disposed of, I wish to offer a few observations. I have not gone into the subject with sufficient care and analysis to enable me to say whether the tribunal that is proposed to do this work is the best that could be devised, but at least it seems to me to be the best in sight and there would apparently be an appropriateness in assigning the duty to that tribunal because of the nature of their work and functions. Their chief duties are to look into the operations of railways, to deal with their tariffs and with disputes between railway companies and the people. The whole nature of their business is calculated to make them experienced in that line. For instance, in determining what is or is not a proper railway charge for freight or passengers, they are necessarily obliged to know how much money is invested in the railway, how much capital has been put into it by the company, and by borrowing or other means, possibly government subventions. I take it that one of their most important duties would be to allow the company to make such freight and passenger charges as would give them a fair remuneration for all the money that they put into that railway and all assistance that they acquire for that railway from certain sources. In my judgment it should not be from all sources, but I say that the Railway Commission would be bound to look into that carefully before they could intelligently determine the traffic charges that might be imposed. Therefore, if there is any tribunal in the country who ought to be able to analyse the subject it would be the Railway Commission. I am not going to say much about the capitalization of railways at the initial stages because parliament exercises its judgment with regard to the capital of a railway which is being incorporated, but we seem to do that in a very perfunctory way. I have often thought that we fix the capital at an arbitrary

amount without intelligent inquiry as to why it should be fixed at that sum. We say it shall be about $10,000 a mile, but if we were asked why it should be $10,000 a mile, I venture to say that not one of the 170 members of the Railway Committee could say why. Therefore, we have arbitrarily fixed that rate and we do not permit them to go beyond that. A few years ago we gave bonding powers to railways of $15,000 a mile. It was afterwards raised to $20,000, since then it has been raised to $25,000 a mile, and this session of parliament we have given bonding powers of $30,000 a mile, and sometimes more, upon the plea that the country through which they must build is expensive to build in, or that the right of way is very dear. But we give very little attention to the bonding powers and do not exercise much care as to whether they are too high or too low. Therefore, as the minister says, parliament has in its own hands, the right to say what the bonding power shall be and we have no right to delegate it to the commission, but I do think that the perfunctory way in which we settle this question is an evidence that we do not go into it very carefully, and it would not be amiss if there was some other authority that would go into it much more carefully and intelligently.

This motion merely says that the capitalization of railways shall be under the Railway Commission. I think that is the best body to have it under and therefore I have no serious objection to the motion. I think there is not a member of this House who will not admit that the capitalization of railways as at present practised is a growing evil and productive of great injustice in many cases to the users of these railways as well as to many investors in railway stocks, because when new capital is issued it is usually gobbled up by the large stockholders who are often directors and have, therefore, power to allot the stock to themselves and deprive the small investor of the benefit to which he is properly entitled. Take the issue of Canadian Pacific railway stock last spring, Canadian Pacific railway is to-day selling at $214, but the stockholder who got that stock at $125 receives $100 to put in his pocket as a bonus. That in my judgment is not fair. It is well known that the railway companies in Canada are paying large interest on the money invested in them.

We give them a great deal of assistance to build these railways. The government give them many subventions, subsidies, guarantees of their bonds and help them in many ways. Why do they do it? —for the benefit of the country which needs a better system of transportation, for enabling these railway companies to carry the produce of the country at a moderate rate,

and so as to indemnify the companies against loss on their investment. As a general thing, is money invested in railways lost? Take the history of the railway charters of Canada for the last quarter of a century or more—if you like for the last thirty or thirty-five years—and how many of these companies have lost money? Take Mackenzie & Mann: when I came into this House thirty-two or thirty-three years ago they were ordinary contractors whose financial means were very limited—I have been told, very small. Then, they commenced to build railways. What are they to-day? I suppose it would be very difficult to state approximately what they are worth, but I think it will be admitted that they are worth many millions of dollars, that they are probably worth $40,000,000, or $60,000,000 or $70,000,000. Could they possibly have made that amount by getting a fair return for their labour? No one will assert that they could. Then, how did they make it—by the assistance that parliament and the municipalities gave them, in the way of subsidies, grants of land, guarantees of stock and bonds and in a hundred other ways that the country can help them in order to ensure them a fair return on their money. If these companies were not getting a fair return for their money I could understand why we should give them the privilege of selling stock and allotting that stock to themselves below its ordinary market value. We gave them this assistance in order to make it practically impossible for them to lose money. We put it within their means to get a return of 10 or 20 and of even 40 or 50 per cent on the money they actually invest in the railway and that being the case there is no justifiable reason in the world why we should allow them to turn around and increase the stock of their railway not for the purpose of putting it into the betterment of the road or of extending the road a number of miles in one direction or the other, but for the purpose of putting it into their own pockets. There is no reason why we should grant them this assistance for the purpose of improving or extending the road, and not compel them to put that stock up for sale so that it will realize its full value in the markets of the country. For instance, if they wanted one hundred thousand dollars and they issued stock in the railway, if that stock were selling like the Canadian Pacific railway is to-day at 214, they would only require to issue less than $50,000 worth. because it would bring them $100,000. If that $100,000 were put into the road the users of the road would only require to pay interest upon that amount, but when they allot that stock to themselves and it is put in at fifty cents on the dollar there is only $50,000 put into the road, and yet the users of the road will be compelled to pay interest on $100,000.

That is an injustice which should be remedied in some way. That is one of the greatest evils that the country has to contend with to-day and parliament should address itself to the subject so as to find a remedy.

The Minister of Railways and Canals said that we cannot do what the United States have done because we do not charter railways in the same way as they do. He said that they take out letters of incorporation, practically they simply make their plan and file it. I do not know what control Congress has over stock issues, but in the United States they have found by experience that it is not safe to leave this matter in the hands of the companies. They have taken the right to control issues and properly so. But what difference is there between a railway corporation that gets a charter from us in the ordinary way and one that gets its charter from the United States in the way they grant charters there?—none so far as I can see. We give them the right to sell so much stock, and if that is not enough we give them the right to enlarge their stock as much as they like practically. There is no restraint upon them. Therefore that argument does not hold good. Then the minister said: You are talking about railways in the state of New York, but those are state concerns. He also said that interstate railways would be difficult things to contend with. I have no doubt that they would be, but I think the government of that country will endeavour to overcome that as well and take control of the capitalization of those roads. They have greater difficulties to contend with than we have because of the limited area in which these charter rights are operating. If these railways were under one control fom the Atlantic to the Pacific the question would be much easier to deal with than it is. The very fact that the states are taking up this question and dealing with these companies that are operating in a limited area, and that Congress is extending this control to the interstate railways is the best evidence that the problem that they have to contend with is much harder than the one we have here, and it is no argument against our doing what is proposed by this motion.

I am heartily in accord with the principle of controlling the stock issues of railways. I think it will have to be done earlier or later and the earlier a remedy is found for these things the easier it will be to find the remedy. As time goes on, as greater interests become involved, as vested rights become stronger and stronger, and corporations become more and more powerful, it is always harder to find a remedy and more difficult to put it in operation. Therefore, the earlier we tackle it the better it will be for ourselves and the country as well.

The country has for a long time been under the impression that this is a pernicious system and members are often asked why parliament does not take it up. That question has been put to me a hundred times. I often say that this is one of the things that it is so hard to find a suitable remedy for that parliament is reluctant to undertake it. But the answer comes: What is the duty of parliament? Is it not to grapple with these problems that affect the interests of the people? Should parliament refrain from doing it because it seems a hard task? Not at all, in my judgment. The harder the task is the more we should apply ourselves to it, and the harder we should endeavour to find a remedy. It is no excuse to say that because the task is a difficult one we should not make an effort to find a remedy. I think we ought to do so, and because there is no better remedy in sight I am disposed to support the proposal contained in this resolution.

Mr. THOMAS BEATTIE (London). Mr. Speaker, I have no sympathy with this resolution. It seems to me that it has been moved by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) to suit his own purposes. I have the best opinion of the Canadian Pacific railway. We have reason as Canadians to be proud of the railway. That stock within my recollection sold for 38 cents on the dollar, and the member for York would not dare to and did not buy thirty-eight cents worth of it, but he comes forward to-day and finds fault with the Canadian Pacific railway. Well, Canada and the British Empire have reason to be proud of the Canadian Pacific railway. No railway has attained the same high position it has, and I venture to predict that if the Canadian Pacific railway would buy that man he would not open his mouth on it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must withdraw those words; they are not parliamentary.

Mr. BEATTIE. I do not wish to be unparliamentary or rude, but I have that opinion of the gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BEATTIE. It is well known he has brought this question up time and time again and what object he has in view, I do not know, but of course it is well known that the hon. gentleman has no love for anything that is good for the country. The hon. gentleman is one of those extraordinary men who finds fault with everything that is good in this country. The Canadian Pacific railway has made its mark in Canada; it has been conducted by wise and honest management and no man in Canada has a right to dare to get up and

say anything against that company. The men who have brought the Canadian Pacific railway to its present success, are worthy men, and if they had been men of a different class we would not have such a splendid railway as we have to-day. The Canadian Pacific railway has been conducted by wise, honourable, respectable, responsible gentlemen. The hon. gentleman from York does not bear the best reputation in this world for being honest or straightforward.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member should not use these expressions; they are not parliamentary.

Mr. BEATTIE. I will not use them, but I think so all the same.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BEATTIE. The hon. member for York came to London some two years ago to oppose me in my election, and I telegraphed him to know what he came for, and he did not answer my telegram, and when I sent to his hotel, he was found locked up in his room and the bell boy could not find him. He had the audacity to state during the election in North York that I was against public ownership and that that was the reason he opposed me. He had no right to say so, because it was a falsehood. He did not know whether I was in favour of public ownership or not, but I may tell him that I am not against public ownership if it is conducted by honest, straightforward men. He ran for York, and the Conservatives would not oppose him, and the Liberals would not oppose him simply because they were afraid that if they did, he could get in between the two. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to say anything unparliamentary, but I can tell you that if the Canadian Pacific railway offered him a sum of money you would not hear from him in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, these words must be withdrawn.

Mr. BEATTIE. All right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. These words should be withdrawn.

Mr. BEATTIE. I cannot help stating my opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must withdraw these words; he cannot be allowed to use such expressions in parliament.

Mr. BEATTIE. Well, when I find a gentleman going to a public meeting——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must withdraw these words.

Mr. BEATTIE. I withdraw them. The hon. gentleman has no right to go to a public meeting in South York and tell a falsehood about me, as he did when he said I was against public ownership and he said that to the mayor of West Toronto. I am strongly opposed to this motion. I think the Canadian Pacific railway is well managed by honourable men and it is a credit to the Dominion and to the British Empire. There is no railway in the United States or any other country that has had the same success as the Canadian Pacific railway has had. Every man that has invested a dollar in it has done well, and all the financial institutions in this country and elsewhere, are delighted with its success. If the hon. gentleman had gone into Canadian Pacific railway he would be the last man to get up here to say a word against it. He has not gone into it and now he tries to do everything he can against it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude, but there are a great many things I would like to say of the hon. gentleman if you would allow me. However, I have great pleasure in voting against this motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I declare the amendment negatived.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Yeas and nays.

Mr. SPEAKER. The amendment is lost on division.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). All right.

Motion (Mr. Fielding) agreed to and the House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton) resuming—Mr. Chairman, when I moved the adjournment of the debate on Thursday night last, I was discussing the attitude of the different political parties in Canada towards the coal industry. It is well known that in Ontario and in the western sections of Canada fault is found with the Canadian plenipotentiaries particularly with the Minister of Finance that he did not reduce the coal duty more than he did, while the Conservative press in Nova Scotia and in the east, find fault with him because he reduced that tariff too much, and the argument is there made by our Conservative friends that the Liberal government and the Liberal party are not the friends of that great industry. In this way is capital sought to be made against the government. I was pointing out, Sir, when the debate was adjourned, that on every occasion when the coal industry of Nova Scotia required consideration and protection it received that consideration and

protection from the Minister of Finance and from this government. I was pointing out further that the Conservative party had no claim to any particular guardianship over that great industry and that their history does not give them any warrant to claim that they have done anything in particular for the coal industry in Canada, and particularly in Nova Scotia, where the industry really had its origin. It is contended by members of the Conservative party that the National Policy was largely created originally for the sake of the coal industry and that it has done it much good. But, I would point out that practically throughout the whole life of the National Policy there was a statutory offer that coal would be made free of duty in Canada whenever it was made free of duty in the United States, an offer which stood on the statute-books of Canada from 1879 down to 1904, two years before the Conservatives went out of office. That offer was allowed to stand on our statute-books for 16 years by the Conservatives, and no advantage having been taken of it, I suppose they got tired of seeing it there and so they took it off. I also pointed out that in 1890 the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald then Prime Minister of Canada offered free coal to the United States. Now, I do not think there is any responsible person in this House on the Conservative side who will say that coal should be protected to any greater extent than it will be under this compact if ratified, or protected to any greater extent than it is by the tariff as it stands to-day. When I had the honour of holding a seat in the legislature of Nova Scotia this question of duty on coal was under consideration. As the members who represent the coal counties of Nova Scotia are called to task for their support of this government, and as my own course in that regard is called in question, I wish to point out that the position I am taking to-day on the coal question, is but the position I have always taken. Speaking in the local House over ten years ago, as may be found on page 7 of the Debates of the Legislature of Nova Scotia for the year 1901, I said:

> I am in favour of duties upon coal, and of bounties upon iron and steel and of everything that is considered to be necessary for the protection of every industry now established or hereafter to be established in the province of Nova Scotia or in the Dominion.

It is not necessary for me to quote anything further from the address I made to the legislature at that time. The short quotation which I have made shows the position which I then took, a position which I still occupy. I submit, therefore, that it is not fair for hon. gentlemen either in this House or out of it to be claiming for themselves a position in regard to that great industry, in the province of Nova Scotia, in British Columbia, or wherever we have mining coal, to which they are not entitled. It is said in the press of Nova Scotia that the Premier of that province, the Hon. G. H. Murray, is not favourable to the coal industry, and that he is in the compact with those who are making the agreement with the United States to ruin the coal industry. The Hon. Mr. Murray has a record on the coal question that puts him beyond any attacks of that kind. When there was some speculation in 1897, when it was not known what the Fielding tariff was going to be in regard to the duties on coal, the Premier of Nova Scotia dissolved the legislature, called upon the people to pass judgment on that question, and nailed his colours to the mast in favour of a tariff sufficient to protect that great industry. The Hon. Mr. Murray, having taken that position at that time and every time since, has made a record for himself that will not bear any adverse criticism to-day from hon. gentlemen who may wish to make political capital out of the slight reduction in the coal duty now proposed.

So far as the present agreement is concerned, I have heard no specific criticism of it from hon. gentlemen on the opposition side. They make the bald statement that it is a bad agreement, that it is going to disturb conditions in this country, that it is a severe blow at the loyalty of the people of this country. But there is no specific criticism of any particular item of the agreement. Nobody has said, here is something that should be in the agreement that is left out, or here is something in it that should not be there. I have heard no gentleman of responsibility, or indeed no member of this House, telling the Minister of Finance that he has not dealt with the coal industry or the steel industry in the best interest of those industries; and while the hon. gentleman who is responsible for the policy and the destinies of the Conservative party in this House does not venture to say anything against the agreement so far as these industries are concerned, I submit that the press and others outside of this House who speak on the side of that party are stopped from taking that ground. On the question of the tariff generally, the position of the Conservative party is most extraordinary. In 1897, when the Fielding tariff was brought down, Sir Chas. Tupper assailed it on the ground that it was to be the ruin of every industry, every mine and every other work that, according to him, depended for its existence upon the tariff policy of the Conservative party. This chorus was taken

up by his friends, who had no doubt that his prophecy would be fulfilled. After waiting for a while, they found that the prophecies did not turn out as they had expected, and they came to the conclusion that they had made a mistake in raising the howl they did against the policy of the Minister of Finance, and that they should have said that there was no change at all, and that it was the same old National Policy. But it took them quite a while to reach that conclusion. We find that in 1903 the present hon. leader of the opposition moved as an amendment to the budget a resolution to this effect:

That the House, regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory, is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians.

It is quite evident that in 1903 the Conservative party did not think that they had the National Policy, because they said: This policy is not satisfactory; it is not sufficient protection; it is going to ruin the country; it is not the grand old National Policy. There was no change in the tariff between 1907 and 1903; and if it was not the National Policy that we had in 1903, and the tendency of the Liberal policy ever since has been to a lower tariff, how is it that to-day, when we have the great and marvellous prosperity so much boasted of by the hon. leader of the opposition, we have it without the National Policy? It certainly cannot be argued that we had the National Policy in 1903 when they moved this resolution. If we did not have it then, we certainly have not got it to-day. It is impossible to argue with any logic that we have to-day any other tariff than the Fielding tariff according to the records of our hon. friends opposite; and if the tariff is satisfactory, it is one to which they have no right to claim any credit whatever.

I have here a record of the position taken by different leading members of the opposition on the question of the tariff. When our friends from the west who support the opposition pretend that they have any expectation of a lower tariff should the party they support ever obtain office, I wish to point out to them the record of their leading men on this question. I have here quotations from speeches made by a number of them. Here, for instance, is what the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) said in 1903, at page 1499 of 'Hansard.'

That hon. gentleman is one of the leaders of the opposition and we have no record of any change of policy or heart on his part since he used the language I am about to quote, in 1903. This was the position he then took and which he now takes:

I hold that the tariff should be so arranged that every institution in this country that is manufacturing goods to be consumed by the Canadian people will have sufficient protection to keep out the same classes of goods made in any foreign country; and I have no hesitation in saying that if that country should be England, the policy of Canada should be framed in the interests of the Canadian taxpayer as against the people who are producing the same class of goods, even in the old country under the same flag.

There is not a word in all that about this great loyalty to the British flag of which we now hear so much. My hon. friend was then prepared to put a tax on anybody and everybody in order to make this a highly protected country. To-day, however, he advocates reciprocity within the empire. But how can you reconcile protection to Canadian manufacturers against their British competitors with reciprocity within the British Empire. I fail to see how we can have a tariff wall around Canada and at the same time reciprocity within the empire. I fail to see how we can have anything except free trade among Britain and all her possessions. There is no hope of the British people accepting anything but free trade judging by the results of the last election; and if we are going to have an exchange of goods all around between the different parts of the empire and Canada, we must accept free trade in its entirety between Britain and her possessions. I would like to know what my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) will say to the Canadian manufacturers, who are so strongly in favour of protection when they are told that this policy of reciprocity must mean absolute free trade at all events with Great Britain, although in 1903 my hon. friend was prepared to put up a Chinese wall to keep out British manufacturers from this country.

Let me now quote another hon. gentleman in this House, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) who stands high in the councils of the Conservative party. He was a veteran in politics in this House when some of those who are leaders to-day were but children in the political field. He does not agree in the cry that we on this side stole the clothes of the Conservatives and confiscated their policy. The tariff policy of this government was too low, and he could not see, therefore, how we could have stolen it from them. This is what he said:

It was said in the early days of the present tariff, that the Liberals had stolen our clothes. I have never said so, but, of course, when the preferential duty was only 12½ per cent, and when on coloured cotton goods, and many other goods the duties were pratically

the same as under the Conservative regime, there was some reason for, perhaps, coming to the conclusion, without due consideration that the Liberals had stolen our clothes. But I do not consider that they have done anything of the kind. I am only sorry that they did not, for it would have been better for the country if they had. Their tariff is instead, just the antipodes of ours.

Then my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) who is a strong party man, says that he would not consider any tariff too high which was high enough to keep out any competition with our manufacturers even the British. This is what he said:

Thus we sent to the United States last year nearly $2,000,000 to purchase these implements. In a very few years there will be nothing left of them but a heap of iron, and the Americans will have $2,000,000, whereas, if we had a government that would have given adequate protection, every one of these articles would have been made in this country. Employment would have been given to our working men, Canadian farmers would be supplying a home market, and we would have those $2,000,000 in Canada as a national capital to help on our progress and development.

That is the position taken by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I simply quote these extracts to show my hon. friends from the west, who are in the ranks of the Conservatives, that if they are in favour of a low tariff for the western farmers, they need not expect ever to get it from the party they are supporting, because the policy of that party has been always in the opposite direction, and the position taken by the Conservatives to-day on the resolution before the House shows clearly that they have not undergone any change of mind.

There is just one thing I think necessary to mention to complete the history of our Conservative friends on the coal question. in 1891 they started in to make arrangements with the United States. If ever our coal industry depended on the tariff it did in that year, but that was before the province of Nova Scotia had received the impetus given it by the capital brought into it owing to the Fielding legislation. One of the first propositions made to the United States in 1891 was to renew the treaty of 1854, which of course implied that coal would be made free. Any one who will look over the items on the free list in the treaty of 1854 will find that coal is one of them. Therefore, at all times when negotiations were taking place between the Conservative government in Canada and the United States, our hon. friends opposite were always ready to have free coal, so that I am perfectly safe in saying that there is nothing in the history of the Conservative party to entitle them to make the claim that they, and they alone, are the friends of the coal industry of Nova Scotia.

There is another thing I wish to point out, rather as a personal matter, to show the interest that I myself have taken in the coal industry not only in the legislature of Nova Scotia, but in this parliament as well. On March 26, 1909, in my place in this House as will appear from 'Hansard' of that year, page 3087, I moved a resolution:

That in the opinion of this House such steps should be taken as may be deemed most effective in conserving the home market to the Canadian coal operators.

I supported that resolution with all the power that my poor ability could command, and put upon the records of the House all the facts that I could gather in support of the contention I made in favour of the coal industry of this country. I received from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on that occasion, the warm, cordial and friendly response that he always gave when this question of the coal industry comes up for consideration. He said:

I take it for granted that the purpose of this motion was to have the opportunity of presenting these very interesting statistics, and to urge, if it be necessary to urge, the importance of this great mining industry. There will be no difference of opinion in that respect. We all recognize that the coal industry of the country, not merely of Nova Scotia, but other parts of the Dominion, is a very great industry, and that whatever may reasonably be done to advance the interests of the Canadian miners should be done.

That is the position taken by the Finance Minister on that occasion, and that is the position that was taken by the same hon. gentleman when premier of Nova Scotia and on every occasion when he had the opportunity of promoting the development of this great industry. On every occasion we found in the Minister of Finance and in this government of which he is a member practical friends to carry out whatever was necessary to be done in promoting the best interests of the workingmen, and of those who had money invested in the great industries of the country.

The point which I have to deal with is the compact before the House. I desire not only hon. members of this House, but also the people of Nova Scotia, and particularly those of North Cape Breton and Victoria, which constituency I have the honour to represent here, should know the things that will be free under this agreement, that they may see for themselves the advantages that will come to the country if this compact is consummated. I have here a list of articles so arranged as to show the duties that are now charged upon them when sent to the United States all of which will be free under this arrangement. The consideration of this list will show the advantages that will come to the people of

Nova Scotia by having the American market open to these articles which are so largely produced in Canada, particularly in the maritime provinces:

Cattle, less than one year old, $2.
Cattle valued at more than $14, 27½ per cent.
Horses valued at $150, $30 per head.
Horses valued at over $150, 25 per cent.
Swine, $1.50 each.
Sheep and lambs, less than one year, 75 cents each.
Sheep and lambs one year and over, $1.50 each.
Poultry alive, 3 cents per pound.
Poultry dead, 5 cents per pound.
Oats, 15 cents per bushel.
Barley, 30 cents per bushel.
Potatoes, 25 cents per bushel.
Turnips, 25 per cent.
Cabbage, 2 cents each.
Apples, 25 cents per bushel.
Berries of all kinds, 1 cent per quart.
Dried apples, 2 cents per pound.
Butter, 6 cents per pound.
Cheese, 6 cents per pound.
Eggs, 5 cents per dozen.
Hay, $4 per ton.
Straw, $1.50 per ton.
Mackerel, fresh, pickled or salted, 1 cent per pound.
Herring, fresh, ¼ cent per pound.
Herring, pickled and salted, 50 cents per 100 pounds.
Halibut and salmon, fresh, pickled or salted, 1 cent per pound.
Cod, haddock and pollock, 1 cent per pound.
Cod, haddock and pollock, boneless, 1 cent per pound.
Eels and smelts, fresh or frozen, 1 cent per pound.
Salmon, 30 per cent.
All fresh water fish, ¼ cent per pound.
Cod liver oil, 15 cents per pound.
Seal, herring, whale and other fish oils, 8 cents per gallon.
Talc, 1 cent per pound.
Plaster rock or gypsum, not ground, 30 cents per ton.
Salt in bulk, 7 cents per cwt.
Salt in bags, barrels or other covering, 11 cents per cwt.
Barbed fencing, wire, iron or steel, ¾ cents per pound.
Rolled round wire rods, in the coil, of iron or steel, not over ⅜ inch in diameter, 3-10 cents per pound.
Rolled iron or steel sheets or plates, No. 14 gauge or thinner, galvanized or coated with zinc, tin or other metal, or not, ½ to 1½ cents per pound.
Wire crucible cast valued at not less than 6 cents per pound, not less than 35 per cent.
Galvanized iron or steel wires, covered or not. Nos. 9, 12 and 13 gauges, 35 per cent.
Coke, 20 per cent.
Timber, hewn on one side or squared otherwise than by sawing, and round timbers used for spars or in building wharfs, ½ cent per cubic foot.
Sawed boards, planks, deals and other lumber, not further manufactured than sawed, $1.25 per 1,000.
Paving posts, railroad ties and telephone, trolley, electric light and telegraph poles of cedar and other woods, 10 per cent.
Wooden staves of all kinds not further manufactured than pointed, and stave bolts, 10 per cent.
Pickets and palings and other sawn material, 10 per cent.

Many of these duties are practically prohibitive. When these duties are removed for instance, on horses, sheep and swine, a market will be open at the very doors of the people of the maritime provinces of which they will have no difficulty in taking advantage. That is a matter of the greatest importance, that this market is within the reach of the people. One of the arguments presented here is that we have the English market for our horses, cows and sheep, and that this market offers higher prices than are offered in Boston, New York and Chicago.

It is no advantage to the ordinary small seller in the maritime provinces to be told that he can sell his cow or horse or small produce in London because he cannot send them there. It is all right for the man who has large connections and can send full cargoes, but to the small seller or farmer in the maritime provinces it means nothing. If this arrangement is made there is not a port in the maritime provinces that will not become a busy shipping port and a busy haven of industry and commerce, sending our goods across the Bay of Fundy to the New England states. That is the opportunity it gives us and the advantage which is not taken into consideration when we are told that we can secure equal advantage in the English market. This is perhaps a vulgar story, but I wish to tell it because it gives point to what I have to say. It is said that an Englishman came across an old Scotchman driving a cow to market. The Englishman said: If you had that cow in London she would command £50. The old Scotchman was worried trying to drag the cow to market, and knowing he would not get one-tenth of that amount, he said: If I had Loch Lomond in Hades I could get a dollar a glass. He knew he could not get the cow to London any more than he could get Loch Lomond to Hades. It is much the same with the farmers of Nova Scotia. When you say they can get large prices in London it means nothing to them, because they cannot get their produce there. That is why this agreement is so popular in the maritime provinces, that we will be able to get to the market with such goods as we have to sell in small quantities.

This agreement will be of great advantage to the lumbermen, the fishermen and the men who are dealing in coal in Nova Scotia. It may be said that coal will not gain very much by this arrangement, but when we had reciprocity before, from 1854 to 1856, the coal trade in Nova Scotia made rapid strides; we sold large quantities of coal to the New England states. I am not a sufficient authority on that question to say what

is going to happen now. All I have to say is that we have a right to suppose that the same thing will happen now that happened then, that we will be able to increase our traffic with the United States, and as we have other trade with them they will deal largely in our coal. That being the case, I have no doubt that everything we can produce in the maritime provinces will be produced in larger quantities and sold at better prices than they are sold now. The opinion of the Hon. Mr. Berry was read in this House by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) so I shall not read it again. Every one who knows Nova Scotia knows that the opinion of that hon. gentleman is well worth being quoted, that there is perhaps not another man in politics in the maritime provinces to-day equally respected by the people. His opinion on any question of business is highly prized by his compatriots in Nova Scotia and well worthy of respect. He gives it as his opinion that this will be a great boon to the fishermen in Nova Scotia and to every enterprise in that province. I have here a letter from a gentleman in business in my county, Mr. McCurdy, who writes in the press giving the conditions in Victoria county, and the conditions in that county are exactly the same as they are in every other county in Nova Scotia. Mr. McCurdy writes:

This question is at the present time taking up almost the entire attention of the Canadian people and may yet result in an appeal to the country.

It is a subject that should be of intense interest, and is of immense importance to the people of this county, perhaps, more than that of any other county in the province. It directly affects each and every existing and prospective industry in Victoria county, chief among which are the fishing, gypsum and pulp wood industries, all of which are to be given the incentive or chance to increase their operations, perhaps a hundredfold. It appears to me the same as a bonus offered by the government to capital to invest in and largely develop the natural resources of this county from end to end. It almost appears as though Mr. Fielding had this county especially in his mind and had particularly favoured it when making this clever bargain with the United States. It is a bargain which, as Hon. Mr. Murray says, may make Nova Scotia the principal fish food producer of this continent, perhaps of the world. We all know that the waters of this county have more fish in them than any other county, and should therefore derive the chief benefit from it, and this does not mean merely fishing alone, but the establishment of many subsidiary industries, such, for instance, as boneless fish factories, boat and schooner building, and possibly rope and twine factories, &c., &c.

The bargain means that every gypsum deposit in the county, where there are good shipping facilities, is likely to be worked, giving employment to hundreds of men and a high-priced home market for the produce of the neighbouring **farms.**

It means that the pulpwood works of this county, which are now doing nothing, will be rebuilt and on a far larger scale than ever before contemplated.

I believe, Sir, there is a strong probability that what Mr. McCurdy says will come to pass. We have the fish, we have the gypsum, and we have pulpwood, and there is nothing lacking except the opportunity of developing them, and this seems to me to be the opportunity. I wish to point out the industries of Nova Scotia which have given the greatest return for the last year. They will receive great benefits from this arrangement. Our products last year were:

Coal..	$15,675,000
Coke..	1,960,000
Gold, iron and other metal.	379,500
Gypsum, limestone, &c	830,000
Building materials..	260,000
Pig iron..	1,000,000
Steel, steel rails, rods, &c.	14,200,000
Fisheries..	8,400,000
Manufactures, ships & freight.	41,000,000
Products of the farm..	29,100,000
Products of the forest..	5,480,000
Total..	$118,684,500

Those products are quite large for a country of the area of Nova Scotia. But there is no reason in the world under this arrangement why our products of the forest, our products of the farm, our products of the fisheries, and our mineral output should not be three times, if not four times, what they are under present conditions. We are hopeful, therefore, Sir, that the coming into force of this agreement will be of great benefit not only to the whole country but particularly to the province of Nova Scotia.

The leader of the opposition tells us that the country is sufficiently prosperous and he quotes figures to prove the case he makes out. I noticed that the hon. gentleman was making one quotation, or taking the whole stretch of time from 1868 to 1910, without making any subdivision or analysis of the figures. I took the trouble to divide the time from 1868 into three periods which I thought was fair in questions of trade and particularly fair in the matter of pointing out the condition of the country with one party in power, and the condition of the country with another party in power. I divided the time from 1868 to 1878, from 1878 to 1896, the period during which our hon. friends opposite were in power, and from 1896 down to the end of 1910. If my hon. friend the leader of the opposition would make that division it would be a fairer division to show what was done under the different regimes, and he would find that he could not come to this House, and say that we were doing first-class during the eighteen years of the National Policy, and he would not take the responsibility of telling us to leave well enough alone. He would find that, taking these figures from

1878 to 1896, the country made less progress during that period on the average than it was making up to the time of the inauguration of the National Policy. Giving the figures exactly as they appear upon the blue-book from 1868 to 1878 the increase in trade in that ten year period was $44,175,823, or an average increase per year of $4,417,582. During the period of 18 years when our hon. friends opposite were in power, from 1878 to 1896, the total increase was $66,000,000, making an annual increase of $3,666,666, or about a million dollars less per year during that 18 years than during the ten year period following confederation. That is the record which my hon. friend would have to show if he had confined his calculation to the period when his friends were in power. From 1896 to 1910, the proud period of the regime of my right hon. friend and those he has gathered around him, the increase was $457,000,000, making an average increase per year of not $3,000,000, not $4,000,000, nor four times that, but of $326,365,711. That is a record of increase of which the government, the friends of the government, and the country have reason to be proud and satisfied. But, I do not think the leader of the opposition would be satisfied with the advance that was made by the country under the regime of his own friends. But if you lump the whole sum, if you put it altogether it makes a good showing and gives him a better opportunity of saying: Let well enough alone. I do not think in all seriousness that the leader of the opposition is sufficiently ambitious for his party or his country when he asks us, under present conditions, to let well enough alone. The whole country may be making fair progress, but I must say that while I am fairly proud of the conditions in the maritime provinces, and the growth that is going on there, I do not think we have any reason to be satisfied with the progress we are making, and I submit without any hesitation that the progress which is being made in the maritime provinces to-day is not well enough compared with other parts of the country. Within the last twenty years we have lost three of our representatives in this House. We have three members less from Nova Scotia to-day than we had when the population began to go down, or at least when we were unable to hold our own with the rest of the Dominion. New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have lost members, and, therefore, I submit that the leader of the opposition has no right to say that we in the maritime provinces should sit down and say that we are content with the present conditions when we are not holding our own with the rest of Canada. We have a right to expect assistance from that hon. gentleman, and when he has reason to believe, as he has, that this agreement would help to build up our population, that it would aid our fishing industry, mining, farming and everything else and give an impetus to our prosperity as reciprocity did before, that we would hold our representation in parliament, that we would hold our end up better under this arrangement than we do now, he has no warrant to say to the people of the maritime provinces to leave well enough alone, and not put forward an effort to better their condition.

I submit, Sir, talking not very seriously, that if the leader of the opposition wants to apply that doctrine to his own job, to his own position in this country, we have no objection from the Liberal standpoint as far as my hon. friend being leader of the opposition is concerned, because we are quite content to let well enough alone, and to let him occupy his present position, but we are not satisfied to let him apply that doctrine to the trade, commerce and general prosperity of the country. If it comes to that I think my hon. friend should amend his motto and say: What we have, we'll hold, and what we have not we are after. That is what I think would suit us better in the maritime provinces, and generally all over this country. It will not be contended, Sir, in this tremendously large, prosperous and wealthy country that we occupy—wealthy in natural resources, in area and extent—that we can afford to let well enough alone with a population of only 8,000,000 at the outset when we have a territory capable of supporting a population as large as that which the same area is supporting on the other side of the line. Is it not our duty not to be contented with the growth we are making, but to move along as rapidly as possible, and to build up this country so that without any undue delay we may be benefiting our people side by side with those of the great nation to the south of us, and placing them in a position of equality in every line of life.

I was going to say something more about the figures quoted by the leader of the opposition and those of other gentlemen, but after all his speech and the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) are the keynotes to the speeches made by hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. What did the leader of the opposition say in giving evidence of the prosperity of this country? He said that all we had to do was to look at the speeches of the Minister of Finance in support of the budget for the last fourteen years, and we would see evidences of the great prosperity of this country. So that there should be no mistake about where I am quoting the hon. gentleman, this was on the 7th February, and it appears at page 3366 of 'Hansard.' We were invited to look at the history of the budget of the

Liberal party for the last fourteen years for evidences of the prosperity of this country.

It is quite true—in what possibly, from a party standpoint, might be regarded as a moment of weakness in the tactics of the leader of the opposition—that he refers us to the history not of his own party but to the history of the Liberal party. And what is the record that the leader of the opposition invites us to study? It is a proud record for this country and a proud record for the Minister of Finance. Practically the first year the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) was in power he announced a surplus of $1,722,112.33; the next year he announced a surplus of $4,837,149, the next year a surplus of $8,054,714, the next year a surplus of $5,648,333, the next year a surplus of $7,291,388, the next year a surplus of $14,345,166, the next year a surplus of $15,056,984, the next year a surplus of $7,863,099, the next year a surplus of $12,898,719, the next year a surplus of $16,427,167, the next year a surplus of $19,413,054, the next year a surplus of $1,029,171.97 and the last year for which we have a record a surplus of $22,091,184.47. That is the record to which the leader of the opposition invites us to inquire for evidence of the prosperity of this country. The hon. gentleman took care not to refer us to the records of his own party because there we find deficits and not surpluses. In 1885 the Conservative government had to announce a deficit of $2,240,058, in 1886 a deficit of $5,834,571.87, in 1888 a deficit of $810,031.26, in 1893 a deficit of $1,210,332.45, in 1894 a deficit of $4,153,875.58, in 1896 a deficit of $330,551.31. That, Sir, is the record that was presented to us by the budgets of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) when he was Minister of Finance. I suppose it was quite right for the leader of the opposition to refer us to the speeches of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) for evidences of prosperity, and it is only fair that the people of this country should know what that record is as compared with the record of the Conservative party when they controlled the finances of Canada.

Without breaking away from this subject I come to say a word on the question of the authority of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs to make this arrangement. I hold that when the Liberal party submitted their programme to the country in 1893 and told the people categorically what they intended to do and the subjects with which they would deal if they were placed in power and the Conservatives turned out, then when the people of the country placed Sir Wilfrid Laurier's government in office with a knowledge of the things they promised to do I submit that until that programme is exhausted and everything promised by the leaders of the Liberal party carried into effect this government has a mandate from the people with respect to every plank in their platform of 1893. I do not think there is anything illogical in that; I think it is a position that can be sustained before any jury in this country. I would not hesitate to submit to the electors of any county in Canada, that the Liberal government having had a mandate from the people to carry into effect every item in their programme when they came to power, the Liberal party has a perfect right to go on without any further mandate. Our friends of the opposition profess to be very logical in their reasoning and argument and they often say to the leader of the government: Why dont you carry out your promise to reform the Senate for which you have a mandate from the people. Surely if the Liberal party had a mandate in 1896 to reform the Senate on the platform of 1893, it has a mandate to make a trade agreement with the United States because the two propositions were submitted to the people at one and the same time. If our Conservative friends are consistent and logical in saying that the government have a mandate to reform the Senate, wherein lies the strength of their argument that the government have no mandate to carry out a trade agreement with the United States? For my own part I confess I am not very much concerned whether they have that mandate or not. If this is a good agreement, if this is in the best interests of the Canadian people, if it is calculated to develop trade, if it brings about more friendly relations between this country and the United States I am not concerned very much about whether there is a very full mandate given or not. I submit that we have the power as representatives of the people to do everything which in our judgment is for the best interests of the people, and if this is a good agreement in the best interests of the people that is the only thing I am particularly concerned about. And, Sir, I am satisfied that as time goes on, as day by day this question is discussed in this House and in the provincial legislatures and in the newspapers and on the hustings, the people will better understand this question and so, day by day the policy of the government will become more popular. I believe, Sir, that if the people of Canada were to-day called upon to pass judgment on this agreement an overwhelming majority of them would decide in its favour. While, it is not necessary for me at this stage to trace the history of the effort of the Canadian people to obtain better trade relations with the United States, it is possibly encumbent upon me to point out that the Conservative party as well as the

Liberal party have always been advocating better trade arrangements with the neighbouring republic. I have here a quotation from the first budget speech of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in this House, as found in 'Hansard' at page 449, volume I of 'Hansard' of 1889. On that occasion he had reason to refer to the question of trade relations with the United States, and he said:

The government is ready and willing to come to the aid of the country now and implement to the best of its ability this desire which is growing and stretching out from the true and solid basis of trade prosperity at home, in a foreign trade with other countries, so that we may compete with foreign countries in the different wares that we make and the different products that we raise. This country and this government has always been desirous of extending its trade to foreign countries. In all honesty and candour that can be maintained and it cannot be denied. No matter what government has been on the Treasury benches, no matter what party has been in power, there has been a continuous and a persistent attempt to cultivate better trade relations between this country and the United States of America in a reciprocity that should be fair and equally beneficial to both countries. The negotiations of 1866, of 1869, of 1871, and of 1888, all bear testimony to that. But, Sir, if the country to the south of us will not go upon the lines of the late reciprocity treaty, if it will not trade upon lines which are fair and equal to both countries, and if it continues to show, as it has done in the Senate Bill, and as it has in the President's message, delivered only yesterday, its reiterated adherence to the high and strong protective system that it has placed about its trade—then, Sir, it becomes this country to build upon its own foundations, to develop its own vast natural resources, and to further strengthen the internal industries of the country which will enable her to extend her trade into other countries.

The hon. member for North Toronto, the then Minister of Finance, said that the Conservative government were ready and willing, always ready and willing to make trade arrangements with the United States, but if they could not do so, it was their duty to make trade arrangements with other countries. We hear a great deal to-day about looking to Great Britain and to Great Britain only; but if you look at the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto on that occasion, you will find that the other countries which he mentions do not include Great Britain. They were South America, the West Indies, China, Japan, the islands of the South Pacific, New Zealand and Australia—not a word about Great Britain or about any effort to bring about better trade relations with Great Britain. From the same volume, at page 478, I take a quotation from no less a person than Sir Charles Tupper in support of better trade relations with the United States; and what he says in this:

But no matter how they may endeavour to confuse the public mind, the people understand that the Liberal-Conservative party, as a whole, are still ready to make a fair trade arrangement with the United States, whenever the United States are prepared to enter into such an arrangement. We have said, time and time again, to the government at Washington; we have said it in all the official correspondence as these gentlemen themselves admit, our plenipotentiaries have said it; and true to that policy, we are not taking an attitude unworthy of Canadians, we are not taking a cringing attitude. I believe we will yet succeed in making a fair arrangement with the Republican government lately installed at Washington, and we will do it as men and as Canadians, just as independent in Canada in reference to our future and our present as the Americans to their credit, are independent in the United States.

On another occasion, in 1888, at page 674 of volume I of 'Hansard,' of that year, Sir Charles Tupper said:

I may say that I took the opportunity, when delivering my speech on the financial condition of the country a year ago, to draw the attention of the House to the results of that treaty, and I will just call the attention of the House again one moment to a single extract in that speech, in which I referred to the trade results of what is known as the reciprocity treaty of 1854. It will be found that the United States during those twelve years, from 1854 to 1866, exported to British North America home products to the extent of $300,808,370 and foreign products to the extent of $62,379,718, the total exports to British North America being $363,188,088. The imports from the British provinces into the United States during that period amounted to $267,612,131, showing a balance during the twelve years in favour of the United States of $95,575,975. That is to say, that they sent under the operation of that treaty into the British North American provinces over $95,000,000 more than we sent into that country. I have often been at a loss to know how any person in the United States, and much less how any person in Canada could disparage that treaty, or could speak of it as a one-sided treaty, altogether in favour of British North America, and not equally in favour of the United States. I noticed, shortly after the delivery of the speech, that the Hon. T. F. Bayard, the Secretary of State of the United States, was interviewed in relation to this question, and, so far as the account of that interview went, I understood him to confirm the accuracy of the figures which I had used on that occasion. I say I have been greatly at a loss to know how, under the circumstances, any person can be found, especially in this country, to treat this as a one-sided measure in the interests of Canada. So far as what is known as Canada is concerned, we know that the trade of our country took a very great bound, and that the result of the reciprocity treaty was to give a very sudden and great and steadily continued impetus to our trade with the United States;

but, as I said before, the result was to give a still greater expansion of trade to the United States in relation to British North America. I am glad, after spending some three months in Washington, to be able to say that I had very intimate intercourse with gentlemen of different politics holding high positions in the Senate and House of Representatives, that I took many opportunities of discussing this question with them, and that the result is that I did not find one statesman in the United States who expressed his satisfaction with the termination of that treaty. I believe the general expression in that country is that commercially it was a mistake to have terminated that treaty, and that it would have been infinitely better for the United States and for Canada if it had been continued. As I said before, and as I said the other day, I feel it is only right, in passing, to say, that the effort to obtain the freest possible commercial intercourse between Canada and the United States, consistent with the rights and interests of the two governments, is a policy that does not belong to one party alone, but it is the property of both parties in this country. The hon. member for East York showed his hearty appreciation of the value of such a policy, when he was leading his administration, just as much as my right hon. friend showed it on the occasion of going to Washington in 1871, and on all and every occasion when that question has come up for consideration.

I have several other quotations right in line with those, and I submit that if trade relations with the United States were very desirable then, they are equally desirable now. But coming down closer to the present day, since we have been told that what happened in 1888, 1889 and 1903 is ancient history, let me show what stand the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) took last fall when discussing the trade question in a magazine published in this country. He was then quite aware that negotiations were going on between Canada and the United States; he was quite familiar with the conditions, and could not have been ignorant of the effect his words would have. Do we find him taking any objection to trade relations with the United States in December, 1910? Talking apparently to some representative of the United States, he said:

> We owe you much, we admire your enterprise and your wonderful growth, and sympathize with the efforts you are making to grow rightly and develop the best forces of a great democracy. We covet your virtues and try to avoid your faults, individual, municipal and national. If we can make easier channels for trade between the two countries, consistently with the above conditions, we will be glad to co-operate. Meanwhile, as a neighbourly beginning could you not give our products tariff entrance to your market at the same rates which we accord to yours in our markets? You are bigger, older, richer, more skilled, and more populous. What competition should you fear on a basis of equivalent tariffs? If you were to do this it would be an earnest of good feeling and might dispose us to further converse.

That was the position taken by the hon. gentleman last December. If he then thought that, subject to the conditions he mentioned—all of which are conserved in this agreement—that it was a good thing to negotiate a trade treaty with the United States, surely nothing has happened since to make it so disastrous as he would now make us believe it is. A few weeks after, I cut a clipping from the speech made by the same hon. gentleman in this House, and I shall read it to show the tremendous contrast between the two deliverances. In the one I have just read, he talks in a very friendly way to this representative of the United States about trade relations. But in the speech he made in this House, he said:

> They are coming to the parting of the ways. Who? Canada. What ways? One the broad highway that we began to construct in 1867 running transversely across this continent with its east and west lines and ending, for our markets, in the grand old mother country, the emporium of the markets of the world. And what is the other way? It is the way brushed out and trailed by Messrs. Paterson and Fielding, leading off this old and well-beaten highway down amongst unknown obscurities and hazards, but ending in the United States of America. These are the two ways; and we are at the parting of the ways, says President Taft, and something must be done.

You would imagine that reciprocity was the broad way which leadeth to destruction in its most dreadful form and that the opposite policy is the narrow way which leads to life everlasting. The trouble however, is that my hon. friend is influenced solely by party politics in his last deliveries. In the first instance, he was evidently speaking his mind without prejudice, when he did not expect such an excellent understanding to be arrived at and was off his guard. He evidently then did not anticipate that the plenipotentiaries of Canada would obtain such an excellent agreement as they did, and, therefore, was taken off his guard and without having any party consideration before his mind. In the other case he was simply trying to make party capital. In the first instance he was showing what is best in the interests of the country so far as trade relations are concerned, but in the other he said the country was going to the dogs, and was trying to lead the people to believe that this policy of the government was a ruinous one.

I have read sufficient quotations from Sir Charles Tupper and the hon. member for North Toronto to show you what their minds were on this question. But what did the right hon. Sir John Macdonald, when he was leader of the government say:

We said to the Americans, we are perfectly willing to deal with you upon equal terms. We are desirous of having a fair reciprocity treaty, but we will not consent to open our markets to you whilst yours remain closed to us.

It is perfectly clear from all those extracts, that every one of the great leaders of the Conservative party was for reciprocity with the United States. As a climax to all this, let me quote the words of the present leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) delivered on the 26th of January last. What did he say, page 2555 of 'Hansard:'

The Conservative party stands to-day, as it has always stood in the past, for the policy of reciprocity within this great British Empire.

Where can you find in the past of the Conservative party any evidence of this? If the Conservative party had any past, surely that will be found in the speeches of those excellent gentlemen I have quoted and I challenge any one to find anything in that past to show that that party ever stood for reciprocity within the British Empire.

Such a policy was not known and has no well founded existence. As was pointed out by a gentleman in Manitoba the other day, it is the ghost of a corpse buried in Britain at the last general election. That was the language used by a gentleman named Scallion, who is the president of the Grain Growers Association of Manitoba.

I submit, Sir, that there is no such policy, as a practical matter under present conditions, as reciprocity within the empire. A bargain can be made only when two or more parties are willing to enter into it. It is impossible for us to make any trade agreement with the British Empire while the British Empire does not want to enter into any trade agreement with us that will suit our conditions. Therefore, I submit, this free trade or reciprocity within the empire is not within the pale of practical politics, and that the people of this country would not be well advised to sit down and twirl their thumbs waiting until the river flowed by or until we could get reciprocity within the empire.

There are many considerations in connection with this agreement which we should take under advisement other than the mere question of dollars and cents. Let me quote the opinion given by so distinguished an American as ex-President Roosevelt:

I feel that we are to be congratulated as a nation upon the likelihood of obtaining a closer reciprocity of tariff and trade relations with Canada. Among all the powers of the earth there is none with which we should desire to be upon more intimate footing of equal rights, to which we should be more closely bound in relations of mutual helpfulness, esteem and good will than in the case of our great neighbour to the north, whose prosperity and growth should be a matter of pride to all who dwell on the American continent. I welcome the proposed reciprocity treaty as marking a signal advance in bringing about the closest and most friendly relations between the two countries.

It is no small matter for Canada to get an opinion of that kind from so distinguished a statesman as the ex-President of the United States. I could quote the opinion of the present President and other distinguished men in the United States, if I thought it advisable to do so. I have opinion upon opinion here from the newspapers of Great Britain scouting this idea of disloyalty being involved in this trade agreement. I have already quoted the opinion of Mr. Bryce, the plenipotentiary of Great Britain at Washington, to show that he does not take any stock in that doctrine. I could quote from such a strong English paper as the Manchester 'Guardian' and other papers of that standing in England that this idea has no justification. Let me quote a few words from an editorial utterance of the London 'Times.' The following appeared in that great newspaper on the 7th of March:

We cannot tell how far the sporadically raised cry of annexation is influencing Canadian opinion, but there is no reason to suppose that the reciprocity agreement would produce any tendency in that direction. On the contrary, bargaining on equal terms with the States might tend to foster rather than diminish the self reliance and independence of the Canadian people.

That, in short, is about the substance of the opinion of the different English papers as far as I have been able to follow them. We are told that the Americans have no purpose in this arrangement except annexation. A Mr. Bennet moved certain annexation resolutions in Congress. And here is a quotation, from so reputable a paper as the New York 'Times.' I do not know the 'Times'' politics, but this is, I think, a fair expression of American opinion on the conduct of Mr. Bennet:

Mr. William S. Bennet, who for a little more than a fortnight longer will represent the Seventeenth New York District in Congress and then retire to private life, has thoroughly justified his defeat at the last election. The impertinent resolution requesting the President to begin negotiations for the annexation of Canada, which he shamelessly introduced Thursday, is an example of a kind of politics that would not astonish anybody if, say, Mr. Macon of Arkansas was the offender. Mr. Bennet, who has hitherto posed as a man of serious character, an energetic if somewhat juvenile statesman looking to the welfare of his country, has fairly put himself in the blatherskite class. A fine ending to his public career this solicitous friend and supposed confidant of Governor Hughes has made!

The resolution was offered only to be rejected. Its sole purpose is to cause trouble in England and Canada. Probably some of the

English newspapers which have been opposing Canadian reciprocity will point out that Mr. Bennet's record, until lately, has been fairly good, and that he has won some sort of repute for ability. He has permitted himself to be used as a catspaw. The reciprocity agreement will prevail in spite of a thousand Bennets. Intelligent Englishmen understand the Bennet kind of politics. There is plenty of the same sort of things in parliament. The measure cannot be beaten in Canada. All the mischief it can accomplish has already been accomplished, and that is not worth worrying about. The voters of the Seventeenth District who elected Mr. Henry George to Congress in November will congratulate themselves on their judgment and foresight.

That is the position taken by the United States on this question, and that was their appreciation of the conduct of this cheap upstart who tried to make trouble in both countries by moving that resolution. I am not going to say that we have any such people in this country, but I think we have people in this House who are making opposition to this agreement that the facts of history will not justify. I hate to weary the House, but I have one quotation more, and it is so important and so directly to the point that I feel obliged to put it on 'Hansard.' This is from the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' a newspaper which is supposed to be owned and controlled by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). This article appeared in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' the next day after the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) made his celebrated utterance in this House on the 28th of February last. This is what the paper says, and the people can decide for themselves whether the points are well taken or not:

This is a free country and every citizen has a right to make himself heard when a departure, such as is involved in the acceptance of the reciprocity agreement, is proposed. Nevertheless there are grounds for wondering whether some of the principal objectors have calculated all the possible consequences of the action. Without doubt there is a very considerable volume of independent and disinterested opposition to the agreement. A blind man can see that the agitation to a large degree is not spontaneous. It is being planned, nursed, stage managed, financed and advertised. Who are the men on the job? First, of course, the leaders of the Conservative party who, living up to the full opportunities of their positions are there opposing the government with all the resources at their command. The Toronto machinery of the party is an adept at forming raging and tearing propagandas. Kindly recall the Dundonald affair, the school question and the naval controversy. Each of these agitations started off at a terriffic clip with the 'News' and the 'Telegram' pounding on the big war drums and working up the marching posts to a frenzy. They mostly petered out, it will be recalled, and nobody was a bit worse for all the terriffic cursing in which Brer Willison indulged. If the Toronto Conservatives think this the time and opportunity for another spasm let them have it, as possibly they need one so often to relieve the pressure. But it is quite clear that party heat is being powerfully supplemented. Behind this agitation, which starting in Toronto, is involving the industrial and commercial centre of Ontario and is acting and reacting all over Canada, are others and more effective powers. Beyond doubt organized and powerful business interests have thrown the full weight of their enormous influence into the fray to prevent, if possible, the ratification of the agreement. The interests are not difficult to identify. They are chiefly the manufacturers of Ontario. Scratch a manufacturer and you find almost invariably an inveterate foe of reciprocity.

That is the position of the paper said to be owned and controlled by the hon. member for Brandon. I think we can well say that this paper expresses the opinion of the province of Manitoba fairly well. I have here another resolution passed in Manitoba the other day.

RESOLUTION BY MANITOBA GRAIN GROWERS.

Dear Sir,—The following resolution was unanimously passed at a meeting of the executive officers of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association held on the evening of March 2, 1911, to which we invite your serious attention:—

Whereas the Hon. Clifford Sifton, from his place in the House of Commons, on February 28, claiming to speak for the west, declared that reciprocity with the United States was not in the interest of the western people;

And whereas the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, the Winnipeg Board of Trade, and the Manitoba legislature, by resolution, have also, in the name of the west, declared against reciprocity;

Therefore be it resolved that we, the executive officers of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association emphatically assert that the above mentioned gentleman and public bodies, by their public utterances and resolutions upon the question of reciprocity have absolutely misrepresented popular opinion in Manitoba;

And we further declare and reaffirm that the tariff resolution placed before the government by the Canadian Council of Agriculture on December 16, 1910, is a correct representation of the opinions of the people of Manitoba to-day;

And we further declare that the people of Manitoba will not be satisfied with anything short of the following action by the Canadian parliament during the present session:—

1. The ratification of the reciprocity agreement now before parliament;
2. The complete abolition of duties upon agricultural machinery and implements;
3. An increase in the British preference to fifty per cent of the general tariff.

Signed on behalf of the executive.

R. C. HENDERS,
President.

Winnipeg, Man., March 3, 1911.

I shall not read you a lengthy manifesto published by Mr. Scallion, a gentleman of high standing in Manitoba who has given his political adherence to the opposition, who has been a strong supporter of the Rob-

lin government, and whose character and business ability cannot be questioned by any Conservative in this House or out of it. He has given his full adhesion to this agreement and has declared himself absolutely opposed to the tactics of the Manitoba legislature and every other machinery put in motion against this contract. I submit that the opinion of Mr. Scallion and of the Grain Growers' Association as represented by Mr. Henders and the other opinions we have seen in the press give us full evidence and full assurance that if any gentleman from Manitoba speaks in this House against this resolution he is not representing the mind of the great province of Manitoba or of the great interests of that province. Now passing through the province of Manitoba I will deal with the resolution that was before the House in Saskatchewan the other day. I am sure it must have been a startling revelation to our Conservative friends to find so prominent a man as the leader of the opposition of the legislature of that great province coming out fearlessly and openly and declaring himself in favour of this compact. I was in this House in 1905 when there was a great controversy in the west and the great leader in the Conservative party then was Mr. Haultain. He was held up as a great man, but I presume he is no less great a man to-day than he was held to be by the Conservative party in this House when we were asked to follow his lead and take his opinion on the great question in the west in 1905. If he was such a leader then I presume our Conservative friends will be prepared to accept his opinion to-day. I submit that there is not a man in either of the western provinces who has had a better training in political matters than this hon. gentleman. He was premier of the Northwest Territories for a great number of years and had an opportunity of studying conditions in that country. There is nothing as far as I know or can judge to indicate that he had any other reason in the world for breaking with his party on this subject. I suppose that everything would be the other way. He was the leader of a great party in a great province, and if he had the right end of it by standing by his leaders in this House and in the country I should certainly suppose he would stand by his party. I submit that the evidence is that in coming out in support of this policy he has given his best judgment to what he conceives to be the best interests of his people. In conclusion Mr. Haultain said:

> We out here are just as able as the magnates in the east to decide what is patriotic and unpatriotic. I am not prepared to sit at the feet of any of these eastern Gamaliels and study loyalty.

Mr. McKENZIE.

But that is a sweeping indictment by so able a gentleman as the leader of the opposition in Saskatchewan. He is not going to sit at the feet of Gamaliel Borden, Gamaliel Foster or Gamaliel Whitney or any other Gamaliel from the east; he is prepared to take his own course. He would not even follow the lead of our hon. friend Gamaliel Maclean, who has been addressing the House. I suppose he would put him in the same pot as the other Gamaliels and pursue his own course. I am satisfied that so far as the west is concerned we have the judgment and opinion of as good a man as can be put on the stand in favour of this agreement and against those who for party purposes are opposing it.

I received from a member for the west this afternoon some evidence that seems to me very striking. In the great province of Saskatchewan they have 51 members, local and dominion. I am told, Sir, on the authority of an hon. member from that province that out of 51 there is only one man who is opposing this contract. That one man is the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) in this House. All the rest are in favour of the agreement. That would look as if, should we accept the challenge that is often thrown out to go before the country, that there is at least one province in which we are sure of a very fair majority because there is in that province only one of those who is elected who dare express an opinion against this agreement.

I do not think that there is very much more I should say in support of this proposal. I have pointed out that everything in the contract which I have read is in favour of the Canadian people and in favour of fair mutual trade relations between the two countries.

Mr. BLAIN. How about British Columbia?

Mr. McKENZIE. I am afraid the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) falls sometimes into the habit of quoting evidence that he is not sure of. I am not going to quote any evidence from British Columbia because I do not happen to have any. I am satisfied to let men speak for British Columbia who know that province better than I do. On general principles I believe that British Columbia is all right. British Columbia is an immense lumbering country and I cannot understand why this arrangement would not be good for that industry. British Columbia is a great coal country and I cannot understand why an arrangement of this kind would not be good for the coal industry. I do not think any man should be called upon to stand for the condition of forcing a trade or industry in a country for which it is not adapted. If there is any condition in British Colum-

bia which is not suitable to fruit raising, if the conditions are such that a man should give his attention to something else, or put his capital to better use, I am not going to condemn this agreement because it would perhaps strike a forced situation of that kind, but I say that any industry carried on under conditions that are natural to Canada, that are not forced, should be suited and assisted by this trade agreement. I hope that the fruit growers of British Columbia will have very much better success in connection with this bargain than they think. If they are trying to raise fruit where they should be raising barley, wheat or cattle, I do not think that they should find any fault if they are obliged to abandon that and go into something that is suited to the province of British Columbia and in which they may have better fortune. I hope their fears will not be realized, and I cannot see any reason why the opening up of a market of 90,000,000 or a 100,000,000 people should not put them on a better footing than if they have a market of only 8,000,000 people and a very small part of that 8,000,000 people within range of their trade.

Now, there are some other opinions about this agreement which I wish to quote. These are quotations of hon. members holding seats in this House, and I am afraid that the opinions which these hon. gentlemen have recently expressed have not been consistent with those which they expressed at an earlier stage in the session. I quote here an opinion which will be found in 'Hansard', page 408, 29th of November, 1910. It is the opinion of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) given while speaking in the debate on the address. He is taking the address paragraph by paragraph and he takes this paragraph:

> An arrangement may be made which will admit many of the products of the United States in on satisfactory terms.

Mr. BRADBURY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point or order. I do not think an hon. member is allowed to quote from a past debate in this House.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am not ignorant of this rule, Mr. Chairman, and if my hon. friend insists upon it, I suppose that I will be obliged not to refer to it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A passing reference to a debate at an earlier period of the session would probably not be out of order, but the rule is, that a reference to a previous debate is not in order.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, if any hon. friend will insist upon it, all I have to say is that this statement was made on the 29th of November last when the hon. member for East Hastings expressed himself strongly in favour of reciprocity. He assured us that he would hold up both hands in favour of such an arrangement. I would ask my hon. friend from East Hastings if he will put up one hand in favour of it if it comes to a vote now. In case anybody may think I am not quoting him properly I have taken the page and day when he spoke, so that anybody will see what the hon. gentleman said. The same thing is true of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) who spoke on November 24, 1910, as reported at pages 258 and 263 of 'Hansard.' The same expression of opinion was given by that hon. gentleman. He thought it would be a splendid thing if we could get it. The only thing that was bothering the hon. member for East Huron was how to get it. He was a man of an independent type—put it before us and I will vote for it! That was the opinion of the hon. member for East Huron. I will expect that the hon. gentleman will show this brand of independence and vote for this agreement if it comes to a vote.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have quoted a great many opinions but I have quoted none with greater satisfaction and greater faith than the two last opinions, because, judging from what has been going on around me here for the last three weeks, the fiery eloquence of the hon. member for East Hastings denouncing and condemning this agreement in all the moods and tenses, I certainly could not think that he had ever expressed a view in favour of the proposal. Then, having discovered this oasis in the desert, I find there are saints in Caesar's house and that from all quarters we are getting support for this agreement. As I said at the commencement it is getting stronger and gaining strength as the days go by. I am not going to quote from this Manitoba paper called the 'Tribune,' but I will ask any hon. gentleman to look at it. It is a Winnipeg paper of some repute, I believe, it is dated the 6th March, 1911, and at page 4 hon. gentlemen from Manitoba who are interested no doubt in what is going on in that province, will see resolutions passed at different points in Manitoba by which the legislature is condemned and in which members are condemned to their faces, being present at these meetings, for the course they have taken and told emphatically that they misrepresented the people of Manitoba when they took the course they did take in supporting the resolution introduced by the premier of that province.

That is the condition there, and in so far as the maritime provinces, Quebec, and I think the most part of Ontario outside of

the centres which are on party grounds against us now we have nothing to fear and everything to hope from this bargain. I have here a paper called 'Farm and Home' published in Springfield, Massachusetts, and Chicago which has a circulation of over one million copies in the United States, and on its front page is an editorial stating that this agreement is a bad thing for the American farmer and gives the Canadian farmer much the best of it, and certainly if it is a bad thing for the American farmer according to this newspaper, it must be a good thing for our agricultural community. I now, Sir, have gone over the ground as fully and as rapidly as I could, but I presume my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) who follows me will be obliged to take the same course as I did the other night and adjourn the debate. He must excuse me for having taken up so much time, but I can assure my hon. friend that I would like to have concluded at an earlier hour in the evening. I am satisfied, Sir, that upon every ground this is an excellent agreement for the people of Canada, that it gives them opportunities which otherwise they could not have, that it is letting us in on the ground floor of the trade of a great country with a population of 100,000,000, a country that every day is needing a greater supply of the products which we can produce, and a country which before many years will possibly be in the same position as England is to-day, importing enormous quantities of food stuffs while exporting none, and devoting itself entirely to its great manufacturing industries. If that should come to pass, and if Canada for many years to come will be a producer of such commodities as will be required for the supply of this industrial nation to the south, is it not well that we should get in now, and hold that market and develop it, rather than that we should let the opportunity slip, and give a chance to other countries to occupy the field against us. We are told that Argentine grows the same kind of natural products as we do, and is our competitor, and is it not in our interest to see that the Argentine Republic does not get a foothold in the United States market ahead of us. Would it not be a good thing for us to hold that market as against all the world? I can see no ground on which we have anything to fear or anything to lose, but I can see on the other hand that we have everything to gain. Then, so far as our loyalty is concerned I hardly think it is worth while discussing it at all. As I pointed out the other evening, where are they going to find the traitors, where are they going to find the man who will not be true to the British flag? We are getting too old in this country to cast off our allegiance; we are proud of our flag, we are proud of the history and traditions of our country, proud of our institutions, proud of being Britishers. What consolation would I or any other Canadian feel in throwing up our caps on the 4th of July? Surely it would take us a long time to get trained to that. We will not try it, and the American people know better than to try to put that yoke over us. We are willing to trade with them, we are willing to develop with them, we are willing to take advantage of the growth and prosperity that would come to us by reason of that trade, but we shall always be true to Canada, true to our own flag, proud of being part and parcel of the greatest empire the world has even seen, an empire on which the sun never sets. I do not think it is worthy of this parliament to discuss such a question as whether or not we will remain true to our own country. We certainly shall. But, while being true to the British Empire we are also as sensible business men bound to take advantage of every trade opportunity that presents itself to make this a great country commercially, and, Sir, as Canada grows in strength, so grows the strength and the standing of the British Empire.

Mr. BRADBURY moved that the committee rise.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 10.46 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 15, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS APPOINTMENTS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That the recommendation of the Hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons, laid on the table of the House on the 21st day of February last, with reference to the appointment of Mr. Arthur W. Glasier as assistant clerk of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, be concurred in.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I believe there are a number of these references. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman will let that motion stand until to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very well.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

BEAUSOLEIL INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Who is the Indian agent of Beausoleil reserve, Christian island?

2. When was he appointed, on whose recommendation, is he a practical farmer, what evidence had the department of this at the time of appointment; was it made a condition of his appointment that he should reside upon the reserve and instruct the Indians in agriculture, cattle feeding and the like, and has he resided on the reserve at any time? If so, during what periods, and is he residing upon the reserve or the island now?

3. In order to attain his object, did the government erect a residence for the agent upon the reserve, and at what cost; has the Indian agent ever resided in this house, and by whom is it occupied?

4. Where does the Indian agent reside, and when did he last visit the reserve?

5. Who was the immediate predecessor of the present Indian agent, and for what alleged cause was he retired?

6. Does the government propose to insist that the agent shall reside upon the reserve?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Mr. H. G. Todd.

2, 3 and 4. He was appointed on the 6th July, 1910. His name was suggested by the Indians of the band, who stated that upon the reserve and give the Indians practical advice in farming. For the first two months after his appointment he spent about half the time at the island. Early in the winter he was taken ill and spent five or six weeks at his own home unable to go out. Since then he has visited the island, spending more than half of his time there instructing the Indians, and he has made arrangements to move permanently to the island. During the time the agent was ill, he allowed a man and his wife to occupy part of the house in order to look after his household goods while he was absent. This was for the winter months only. A residence was erected for the agent on the reserve at a cost of $3,470.

5. Mr. Charles McGibbon. He was retired because he had no qualifications to give the Indians practical advice on farming.

6. The government proposes to insist that the agent shall reside upon the reserve.

CANADA AND SOUTH AMERICA STEAMSHIPS SERVICE.

Mr. DANIEL:

1. Is it the intention of the government to subsidize a line of steamers between Canada and South America, more especially to Brazil and Argentine? If so, will tenders be called for the performance of this service?

2. Is it the intention of the government to pay subsidy on any steamer flying the Norwegian or any foreign flag, when British or Canadian steamers are available?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. The matter is now under consideration.

2. No.

EXPORTS OF MICA.

Mr. BEST:

What quantity of mica was exported from the several provinces of Canada in the years 1900 to 1910 inclusive, and to what countries was it sent?

Mr. PATERSON:

The quantity of mica exported from Canada, by countries during the fiscal years from 1900 to 1910 inclusive, was as follows:

Countries to which exported.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
Great Britain	14,429	211,833	115,388	658,081
France	.....	4,734	11,000	5,000
Germany	.....	700	2,032	1,150
Mexico	.....	.....	100	.....
United States	1,064,924	761,991	868,645	729,489
Total	1,079,353	979,258	897,165	1,393,720

	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907 (9 mos.)
Great Britain	268,889	436,333	272,454	234,434
France	.....	22,317	18,615	9,050
Belgium	260	.....	.....	.....
Germany	620	.....	.....	.....
Holland	.....	3,000	.....	.....
Mexico	.....	.....	100	.....
United States	595,558	555,013	1,038,465	1,148,613
Total	865,327	1,016,663	1,329,634	1,392,097

Countries to which exported.	1908.	1909.	1910.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
Great Britain	245,779	190,430	42,201
Newfoundland	.....	.....	4
France	11,967	5,474	3,886
Germany	9,076	.....	.....
Mexico	100	.....	.....
Switzerland	.....	.....	20
United States	634,570	338,824	829,340
Total	901,492	534,728	875,451

MR. DUNCAN GRAHAM.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. What was the date of the appointment of Duncan Graham, of North Ontario, as Indian agent?
2. What was the amount of his salary?
3. Who was appointed to succeed Duncan Graham, what was the date of his appointment and the amount of this salary?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. He was appointed by order in council of 21st November, 1908.
2. $400 per annum.
3. Murdoch MacKenzie, by order in council of the 12th November, 1910; $400 per annum.

COAL MINING RIGHTS IN SCHOOL LANDS.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar):

1. To whom were the eight leases issued last year for coal mining rights in school lands?
2. How many acres were covered by each lease?
3. What is the respective revenue from each lease?
4. How is the revenue calculated, by the ton of ore mined, or is it calculated at so much per acre?
5. How much ore has been mined under each lease to date?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. The eight leases of school lands for coal mining purposes issued during the fiscal year ending the 31st March, 1910, were issued to the following persons: S.W. ¼ 11-39-22, W. 4th, coal berth 54, 160 acres, to William L. Waines; Pt. of 23-9-13, W. 4th, coal berth 55, 120 acres to Jonathan J. Mills; Pt. of 29-8-4, W. 5th, coal berth 56, 160 acres, to the McGillivray Creek Coal and Coke Company, Limited; All of 29-6-2, W. 5th, coal berth 58, 640 acres, to D. Conn and William Kerr; L.S. 4 of 29-10-16, W. 5th, coal berth 59, 40 acres, to George C. Millar; All of 11-10-22, W. 5th, coal berth 60, 636 acres, to the Chinook Coal Company, Limited; Pt. of 29-10-16, W. 5th, coal berth 61, 598 acres, to J. G. Douglas; N. W. ¼ of 29-16-21, W. 5th, coal berth 62, 160 acres, to J. and S. Henderson.
2. Information included in No. 1.
3. The revenue from each of the above leases to date is as follows: Coal berth 54—$160; coal berth 55—$240; coal berth 56—$320; coal berth 58—$1,280; coal berth 59—$80; coal berth 60—$1,272; coal berth 61—$598; coal berth 62—$160. These amounts cover the rental only, there being no royalty, as no coal has so far been mined.
4. The revenue from coal leases of school lands consists of rental at the rate of $1 per acre, and royalty at the rate of 5 cents per ton on the coal mined.
5. No coal has so far been mined.

FAVOURED-NATION TREATIES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask the first minister a question. An article appeared in the Toronto 'Globe' of Monday last in reference to the Colonial conference, one paragraph of which I will read:

> When Sir Wilfrid Laurier goes to the Imperial Conference in May next, he will take up with the imperial government the question of the revision or abrogation in so far as Canada is concerned of the favoured-nation treaties with the Argentine Republic, Austria-Hungary, Bolivia, Colombo, Denmark, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Venezuela and Switzerland.

I would like to ask the first minister whether that statement is correct, and whether it is his intention to place before the House a list of the proposed changes that he intends to suggest on various matters, or the propositions which he intends to lay before the Colonial conference?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Such a statement as that which has been read by my hon. friend has not been authorized by me. I never said anything about those treaties except what I have stated in the House.

LORD STRATHCONA AND CANADIAN ASSOCIATED PRESS.

Mr. FIELDING. I have received a telegram which I think the sender must have intended to be placed before the House, be-

cause it has reference to a matter which was discussed a day or two ago by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) concerning a certain expression attributed to Lord Strathcona, and for which the hon. member for Kootenay called the Canadian Press Association to account. The object of this telegram appears to be to show that the Canadian Press Association was not at fault, and if there is no objection, I will read it to the House. It is addressed to myself:

Toronto, March 15, 1911.

Canadian Associated Press not responsible for error attributing expression of opinion on reciprocity to Lord Strathcona. Cable in question is London 'Standard,' and is cabled as such.

PRIVILEGE—MR. NORTHRUP.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I wished to bring a matter to the attention of the House when the orders of the day were called, and I dropped a line to the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) asking him to be in his place at this time. As he is not in his place, I will let the matter stand until to-morrow, and I again request that he be present then.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. JAMESON. I wish to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) when the return relating to the Bear river rifle range will be brought down, in response to an Order of the House passed on February 15th last, asking for all the correspondence.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The return is being made out.

Mr. JAMESON. Also correspondence in regard to the Deep Brook wharf, ordered on the 27th February.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will make inquiry with regard to it.

Mr. JAMESON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) with regard to the return relating to Barrington Passage.

Mr. BRODEUR. I made inquiries about the return which my hon. friend is asking for. The papers are somewhat voluminous but they are being copied.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to bring to the attention of the government certain utterances by the President of the United States, as reported in the press. Speaking at Atlanta, Ga., on the 10th day of March, he is reported to have used these words:

When we entered upon the negotiations I asked the Secretary of State and his commissioners to offer free trade in everything, but this Canada could not grant us, because she has a protective system and she was afraid of the competition of our better-organized industries.

I would like to ask whether or not this is a correct statement, and I would like to call attention to this further circumstance: We have not, in respect to these negotiations, any information in this House as to offer or counter-offer one way or the other. In that respect the information with regard to these negotiations is very much less than the information which has usually been given to the House when treaties or arrangements of this kind have been brought down. If that is a correct statement of fact the House and the country are entitled to know it, and I think the House and the country are also entitled to know what other oral negotiations in reference to these matters took place. It is not desirable that we should have a one-sided or partial statement. If the President of the United States feels himself at liberty to make this part of the oral negotiations public, I see no reason why all of the oral negotiations should not be disclosed to this House. They would certainly, it seems to me, have been disclosed to this House and the country if they had been conducted in writing. They were not conducted in writing, apparently, but nevertheless they are equally important, and it is equally desirable that we should have the information. I should like also to ask what is the understanding of the government with respect to one further matter. Is Canada, on the one hand, or the United States, on the other, under the terms of this arrangement, at liberty to grant or to continue bounties, or to impose export duties on all or any of the articles and products which are included in the agreement? I mention that because some question has arisen in the discussion before the Committee on Ways and Means in the United States Senate in respect to a matter closely touching that particular point, and I would think it only right that we should have the view of the government with respect to that particular question.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Perhaps I may be permitted first to answer the last question that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) put. There is no agreement, understanding or anything of the kind as between the Canadian government and the United States that is not set forth in the documents in the possession of the House. That is my best answer to my hon. friend regarding bounties, countervailing duties, export duties or anything of the sort. The document speaks for

itself. With regard to the other question, my hon. friend quotes from the President of the United States as follows:

When we entered upon these negotiations I asked the Secretary of State and his commissioners to offer free trade in everything, but this Canada could not grant us, because she has a protective system and she was afraid of the competition of our better-organized industries.

That statement may be entirely correct, and I have no doubt is, as to the instructions that the President gave to his officials. But, as to what actually occurred in the conference, the matter did not advance to a position which would enable these gentlemen to make such a formal offer in that way. At the very earliest stage in the negotiations we certainly gave them to understand that we could not undertake to have any free trade in manufactures, speaking generally. There are certain articles which are on the free list and which were not the subject of discussion, but speaking generally, we gave them to understand that we were not prepared to deal with them on the basis of free trade in manufactures. That circumstance was clearly expressed by us at the beginning and no formal offer such as that suggested was ever made. Yet the statement is no doubt substantially correct as to the willingness of the President of the United States. I do not agree with my hon. friend that the information furnished as to the proceedings of the conference differs in any way from information furnished under similar circumstances at other times.

WAYS AND MEANS—FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Mr. Speaker, I propose to bring to your attention a matter which I judge to be of sufficient importance to engage the attention of the House for a short time. I refer to the failure of the Farmers' Bank. This question is one of very deep interest to myself, inasmuch as my constituents, whom I more particularly represent here, are very deeply interested. In the small county of Halton, perhaps one of the smallest counties in Ontario, there was subscribed to the stock of this bank $196,200, involving a liability to these shareholders of $392,400 if the double liability of the shareholders should be exacted. Apart from that, there were deposits in two agencies in the county of $69,581, making a total possible loss—and I say possible loss, because I have at the present time very little hope indeed that much will be saved out of this wreck—of $461,981. In a small county like that hon. gentlemen can readily understand that to the farmers who are most deeply interested, they being chiefly the subscribers to the stock, it will almost mean a panic; in fact, if no redress is obtained the county will be paralysed by this loss. The bank was called the Farmers' Bank, a name well chosen to enlist the sympathy of the farmers. The farmers were proud to have a bank taking their own name, and to my mind this was perhaps the strongest reason why these men so largely fell into line and subscribed so liberally to the stock. The farmers, as I said before, were the chief subscribers to this stock. There were others, some business men, some professional men, but chiefly those engaged in agricultural pursuits undertook to float the stock of this institution. Some of those farmers will be able to stand the loss, I have no doubt, but there are many to whom it will mean the loss of the savings of a lifetime, and when the loss falls on old men and old women, who have invested their spare means in this way the matter is one for very serious consideration.

I fear that a mortgage will have to be put on the farm in order to enable them to meet their obligations, and the trouble is that many of these people are too far advanced in years ever to redeem that mortgage. Living in this small county there are four directors who are farmers. One of these was placed on the board only at a late date, and to my mind he could not in any way be held responsible for what brought about the wreck of this bank. The other three were, I believe, directors from the organization of the bank, and these four directors together stand to lose $98,200. The question I wish to discuss is: who is responsible for the trouble that has been brought upon these people. Are the shareholders responsible? No, I look upon them as innocent. They were farmers following their regular pursuits, induced by, I believe, largely the name of 'Farmers' Bank' to engage in this undertaking. They did it in perfect good faith, they thought the matter was perfectly safe. They nominated the directors of the bank, and I believe also appointed the general manager at a meeting held about the 26th November, 1906, a few days before the certificate was given to put this bank into operation. We must bear in mind that until the certificate was granted these directors had very little power indeed. The provisional directors secured the subscriptions of stock and I believe they paid in to the Attorney General of the Dominion a sum of $250,000 in order to secure this certificate. But beyond that, so far as I know, the directors of the bank had no power to spend any money, and I am not aware that they legally spent any other money, although I believe there was some money paid out, not in accord with the terms of the Bank Act. I say that apart from this $250,000 which was paid into the Minister of Finance for the purpose of securing a certificate to enable this bank to go into operation, I do not think the directors had anything to do in the way of expending money. They could do

no business, they could not borrow, they could not lend in the name of the bank, and consequently the shareholders up to this time felt a great deal of security in as much as no certificate had yet been granted to do business. All the power they had, to my mind, was to complete the organization up to that date. Without the certificate the shareholders money would have been intact; every dollar they had paid in would to-day have been there because the directors had no power to pay it out. The $250,000 paid into the Receiver General would have been intact had the bank gone into operation and be perfectly safe in the hands of the Minister of Finance and could have been returned and paid back to those who subscribed the money, and thus no loss would have accrued. No branch bank could have been opened until authority was given by the Treasury Board to start business; there would have been no liability to depositors, and that is one of the serious matters connected with the whole affair, namely, that the depositors innocently believing the bank was organized on a sound basis came forward readily and placed their money on deposit in the various branches that were opened throughout the country. Only two of these were in the county of Halton, but I think there must have been some 20 or 30 throughout the province, and the sum of $1,281,774 was deposited. Had the certificate never been granted by the Treasury Board the bank could not have gone into operation. There could have been no such thing as the deal in connection with the Keeley mine, which was one of the unfortunate circumstances which brought the bank to ruin and neither could there have been a Trust Company deal, and I do not look upon that with very much favour. Had the certificate not been issued there would have been no bad debts, there would have been no double liability for the shareholders to meet, and to-day the shareholders would have been in a comparatively happy position.

Mr. LOW. How could the Treasury Board withold the certificate when the money was tendered?

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibly before I finish the hon. gentleman will learn what my opinion is on that matter, and I am under the impression that he will very strongly agree with me. Under the Bank Act $500,000 had to be subscribed and $250,000 of that had to be paid to the Attorney General of the Dominion. That $250,000 could not be made up in any way, partly by subscriptions of stock and partly by borrowed money because every dollar of it had to be money received from payments on stock, and I think if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Low) had read the report of the liquidator in Toronto he would have learned that a very considerable part of that money was not money that was paid in on stock, but money that was borrowed on the strength of notes of those who instead of paying in the money gave these notes for a portion of their subscriptions.

Mr. LOW. How was the Receiver General to know that the money had been received from that source; the curator's report was not out at that time?

Mr. HENDERSON. If the hon. gentleman will bear with me for a few moments I will be very happy to tell him. I said that this $250,000 must be paid out of cash actually paid on stock. If my hon. friend reads the Bank Act he will find there is no doubt about that, and it was the duty of the Treasury Board to ascertain that that was an actual fact. If the Treasury Board did not do so they failed in their duty because that was one of the things it was necessary for them to know before they could issue a treasury board certificate and launch this bank on the country. I have perused the minutes of the annual meeting of the bank and the minutes of the directors' meeting in the early stages of the bank's history, and I have failed to ascertain that either the shareholders or the directors gave any man authority to ask the Treasury Board for a certificate, and I think the authority should have come from that direction. The man who asked the Treasury Board for a certificate was the man who had been appointed as managing director. On the 27th of November, Mr. Travers as general manager, by a letter written from Toronto, applied to the Minister of Finance for a certificate to enable him to proceed to open the bank and to do an ordinary banking business. That letter was no doubt received by the Minister of Finance on the 28th of November, and on the 30th of November the Treasury Board granted the certificate. Evidently very little trouble or time was taken to find out the bona fides of the whole matter, and whether this money was really the money of the stockholders or from what source it came. Now, the certificate granted to Mr. Travers enabled him to do practically as he pleased with the funds of the bank; it enabled him to play ducks and drakes with all the money which the shareholders had paid to him. Only one day intervened between the receipt of the requisition and the granting of the certificate. I think one day was too short. I do not hesitate to say that this man, when he asked for the certificate, misled the Minister of Finance. I would not think anything else. I am quite sure the representations he made were not correct; they are practically admitted to be untrue, and there is no doubt that the Treasury Board, the Minister of Finance particularly, were to a certain extent

misled by this representation. I do not think the Treasury Board took the time that was necessary to see whether everything that was put before them was absolutely right, or whether they were justified at all in granting the certificate. The affidavit made by Mr. Travers was submitted to the Deputy Minister of Justice for his opinion as to whether that was sufficient authority for the Treasury Board to grant a certificate, and I want to draw the attention of hon. members to a very significant expression in the answer of the Deputy Minister, a shrewd lawyer who could see through the matter as quickly as any one. He said that the statements of Mr. Travers were sufficient on which the board could exercise their power of granting a certificate 'if they are accepted.' These four significant words in the letter of the Deputy Minister of Justice to my mind were a warning to the Treasury Board to be careful. He apparently did not think that the statements made by the general manager were reliable or acceptable. Now, there is no doubt that there had not been sufficient money paid in to the provisional directors on account of stock to make up the $250,000. I presume that a great many hon. members have read the proceedings of the curator and the liquidator in Toronto, and it is perfectly clear that no such sum of money was available to pay to the Receiver General to obtain this certificate. I contend that in the granting of this certificate there was a direct violation of the Bank Act. That Act is most explicit that every dollar of this $250,000 should be paid in on account of stock, should not be borrowed money or money derived from any other source; and that not having been done in this case was a clear evasion of the Bank Act, and the Treasury Board should have inquired into the facts. I have before me a copy of the 'Monetary Times,' a journal printed in Toronto that devotes attention to matters of finance, and it deals with this question in a better way than I could; so I am going to read from it a few words to show how the government, or those acting for the government in this matter, were warned. The 'Monetary Times' says:

> The day on which the Farmers Bank obtained its charter was the first day of Farmers' Bank deceit. The 'Monetary Times' admits that the government was placed in a delicate position. It could not have gone to Mr. Travers, saying that dishonesty was rampant in his institution, and notifying its intention to withdraw the charter. But the department had six different warnings at various periods of the bank's existence. On October 8, 1906, about a month and a half before the certificate was granted, Mr. Leighton McCarthy wrote to Mr. Fielding that a number of subscribers to the shares of the Farmers' Bank would dispute the bona fide character of the subscriptions. 'Grave conditions have arisen,' he said, 'which require careful consideration before the Treasury Board grant any certificate to the organizing of this bank.' In a subsequent letter dated October 19, Mr. McCarthy again wrote the Minister of Finance formally asking that the Treasury Board stay any action on the application of the Farmers' Bank for a certificate.

Now, I may be told that later on Mr. McCarthy withdrew his protest, assigning as a reason that his clients had been settled with by the bank, and therefore he had no further claim to make, but even supposing that his clients had been settled with the fact remains that the government had information that there was something decidedly wrong.

Mr. Fielding wrote to Mr. Travers, stating that in a previous case there had been an evasion of the intention of the Bank Act, and that subscribers to stock had given their note instead of paying in cash. Mr. Travers replied, 'I have to say that in the case of the Farmers' Bank of Canada the provisional directors did not raise the money in the way maintained by you.'

The information was that the provisional directors or Mr. Travers had raised this money, or a considerable portion of it, by taking the notes of shareholders who had paid for only a part of their stock, discounting these notes in the bank or in a trust company, and using the proceeds for the purpose of making up what was required of the $250,000, after exhausting the money they had from such stock subscriptions. Now there were two occasions on which the attention of the government was drawn forcibly to this very circumstance which Mr. McCarthy complained of, because the trouble with Mr. McCarthy's clients was that they had given notes for part of their stock and discovered afterwards that their notes had been endorsed by the provisional directors and discounted in other banks for the purpose of raising money to meet the deposit necessary to secure a certificate, which was clearly an evasion of the banking law.

I am now going to mention another circumstance, which, I think, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will quite well remember. As I told you, Mr. Speaker, I felt a very deep interest in the affairs of this bank owing to the fact that so much money was at stake in it from the county I have the honour to represent. I felt very much worried, not because of any personal interest for I had refused to subscribe to any of the stock, although asked to do so. I refused because I had not sufficient faith in the concern to warrant my doing so. It was not, therefore, for any personal reason that I felt so much interested but simply because I had a deep regard for the wel-

fare of the men in my county who had pledged their credit, ranging from $100 up to as high as $22,000, which, with the double liability, would mean a liability of from $200 to $44,000. I went therefore to the Minister of Finance myself and spoke to him about this. I told him that I felt very uncomfortable over the matter and was afraid there was going to be trouble.

An hon. MEMBER. Was that before the certificate was granted?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, and I told him the reason why I was anxious. That the reason was that very many of my constituents were deeply involved in the matter. I said to him: I have personal knowledge of this because I have seen notes in the hands of the solicitor who was acting for some ten or a dozen of these men, and who had taken proceedings against the bank and had forced it to give back the money they had paid and the notes they had signed. He had forced the bank to do this because the provisional directors were not carrying out the spirit and intent of the Bank Act. I had seen those notes. They were endorsed by the provisional directors for the purpose of raising money, presumably to provide the necessary deposit of $250,000 to get the certificate and enable the bank to begin business. Let me now read the answer given by the Minister of Finance to a question asked by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and I consider that I am justified in mentioning these facts because of the position I occupy in this House as representing these men. Under the 30th January last the hon. member for North Toronto asked this question:

Did the Finance Department, or any of its officials, the Finance Minister or any other member of the government, receive any communication, verbal or written, previous to the issue of the certificate of the Treasury Board to the Farmers' Bank, cautioning, warning or suggesting an inquiry as to the standing or character of the promoters, or the proceedings by which the deposit was procured.

The hon. minister replied as follows:

The government did not receive in any form any information which afforded ground for a refusal of the deposit.

The hon. member for North Toronto was not satisfied with that answer, and later on in the day repeated his question and pointed out that the answer given was not really a reply to the question he had put. He said:

I beg leave to point out to the House that the answer given is not an answer to my question. I think I have a right to an answer to my question, then the House, as well as myself would form its own opinion as to whether it afforded ground for any interference.

To this the Finance Minister replied:

There was some gossip in banking circles concerning the Farmers' Bank, of which we became aware. I do not see how we can take cognizance of that. There is an answer as to any representation that was made in the proper way. There was gossip abroad concerning the Farmers' Bank, I was well aware of it.

I presume that the hon. minister intended to include me among those who were retailing gossip.

Mr. FIELDING. I can relieve my hon. friend's mind on that point. I had no such intention.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am very glad indeed to have that statement because I can assure the hon. minister that I had no intention of retailing gossip. I went to him with a straight fact that came under my personal knowledge, and I felt it my duty, as representing a county in which large amounts of money were at stake in this concern, to make the representation that I did. The Minister of Finance treated me with the greatest courtesy. He told me that he would hold the certificate back as long as he could. That certainly is evidence that my representation to him was made before the certificate was granted.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. gentleman says that he was uneasy and anxious because people in his riding had invested in the stock of that bank. Would he say definitely what information he gave to the minister and whether he asked the minister to withhold the certificate.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think I made my statement sufficiently clear. I shall repeat again so that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) may understand it. I told him I was deeply interested in the matter of the Farmers' Bank for the reason that a very large amount of money, practically almost half the stock of the bank was subscribed in my county. I realized at this time that it might create a panic in the county if the worst came to the worst, and the bank should fail and the double liability be exacted. I told him that I myself, had seen promissory notes made by farmers in my county, endorsed by the provisional directors that had been used, as I was informed and verily believed for the purpose of raising money presumably to make up the $250,000 required in order to get a certificate. No other money was wanted by the provisional directors. They did not require to borrow money for any other purpose; they had no authority to borrow money at all, and this borrowing was altogether improper. Now, I made that statement, and I thought that was a warning to the Minister of Finance to beware of the men with whom he was

dealing, and that he should be on his guard. The Minister of Finance accepted my statement in that light, and, as I said, with all the courtesy that was required, he told me that he would hold the certificate back as long as he could. I confess that I left the Minister of Finance feeling quite safe. I thought the matter was in the strong hands of a strong man, who stood between the subscribers to this stock and the government, a man who was in a position to defend my constituents and prevent them being defrauded. Shortly afterward, the minister met me in the corridor—there was no secrecy about this conversation, never so intended by me, or I believe, by the minister—and informed me that Mr. Travers had been down, and that he had brought his money. And the minister said - (I will use his own words)—'I put it up to him and he denied it.' What was it the minister 'put up to him?' What did the minister wish me to understand he had 'put up to him,' but the very statement I had made to him a short time before? And Mr. Travers denied it. He then asked Mr. Travers to give him a letter to that effect, declaring that my statement was untrue. And he accepted that letter and gave Mr. Travers this certificate. He believed Mr. Travers whom he had never met, perhaps, until a few days before—because I believe he was introduced to him by Mr. Calvert,—he accepted Travers' words, and repudiated mine, although I had sat in the House with him for fifteen years and we had always been on the best of terms. I confess that, when I heard the minister say, in answer to a question in this House that 'certain gossip' had come to him, I felt somewhat hurt; and I am delighted today to hear the minister say that in using these words he had no reference to myself, and I candidly believe he had not.

Now, I may as well follow this matter to the end. In fact, I am compelled to do so, because my constituents think I ought to have something done, something to prevent this terrible holocaust. I met the minister, possibly about two years ago, and he confessed to me that he had some alarm about the Farmers' Bank and related to me the circumstance—which had not then come to my knowledge—that the bank had been peddling in the city of New York a deposit receipt for $150,000 and could not find a purchaser. I confess this looked very suspicious as to the standing of the bank. Before the close of last session, I called on the minister and drew his attention to a matter that had come to my knowledge through a gentleman in Toronto—the clippings of the correspondence that took place in reference to the matter that came up in Syracuse, the purchase of some insurance company. I again repeated to the minister my anxiety over the standing of this bank; for I confess I was anxious, I was worried; not on my own account, but for those who lived in my county, many of whom I knew personally, and for whom I had the greatest respect. And I wish to say in passing, that I am not speaking particularly on behalf of my political friends, because the men who stand to lose the most money in that county are men who are the political friends of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. I make no point of that, but I do not wish it to be understood that I interested myself in this matter along political lines. As I say, I called on the minister and told him that, owing to the correspondence that appeared in the paper, I thought there was danger to the Farmers' Bank. The minister was familiar with what had taken place, and, seeing that I was somewhat worried over the matter, he very kindly said to me, 'Henderson, I don't see why you should worry over this; you are not responsible; besides, you did warn the government.' Those were the explicit words of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING. I am bound to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) that I shall have to take exception to that statement later on.

Mr. HENDERSON. I make that statement of my own knowledge, from distinct recollection;—and you can understand, Sir, and I think the House will understand, how vividly it was impressed upon my mind from what I have said of the anxiety I had concerning the standing of this bank. The minister says he will have to take exception to my statement, but I must ask him, as one member of this House, as one has a right to ask another, to accept this statement. I will not put it in the extreme form, but I adhere to it; the statement I made is absolutely correct.

So much, then, for the reason why the Treasury Board should have been on their guard, and should have refused the certificate at the time. The government unfortunately, did not heed the warning. Had they delayed and investigated, I am hopeful that they would have disovered that this man was not entitled to the certificate to open this bank; and I repeat, if no certificate had been issued, this unfortunate affair would have been avoided.

Now, we ask the question: Who is responsible?—for I look upon this as the crux of the whole matter. I may be told that the officers of the bank named by the shareholders are responsible. I cannot agree to that proposition, because as I have already stated, the officers named by the bank had no power to squander the money of the bank. All the money they could pay out legally was the $250,000. That they

had the right to do and did, I think, about the 23rd of October prior to the issue of the certificate. So, I fail to see that the shareholders are responsible in any way because their officers were guilty of wrongdoing. The Bank Act, in fact, delegates to the government, the power to safeguard the shareholders. That is the business of the government. Why was the clause put in the Bank Act forbidding the issuing of a certificate until all the formalities had been complied with? That was certainly to safeguard the public, those who had put their money into the institution, and one of the matters that I refer to more especially is the fact that the money that was sent down here to make the deposit was only in part the money derived from the sale of stock. Those who have been following the reports of the curator or liquidator in Toronto will have ascertained that only $170,000 of the shareholders' money was available for that purpose, and that there was borrowed from another institution $80,000 to make up the $250,000. I assume that if the evidence came out, that money was paid back to that institution which advanced the $80,000 after the $245,000 had been returned by the Receiver General to the bank in Toronto.

Now I contend that the most rigid inquiry ought to be made into this whole matter. I do not think that a liquidator in Toronto, or the curator who is dealing with that matter, has the power to deal with it, as it ought to be dealt with. What right have they to come down here and investigate the doings of this government? To the actions of this government, or to those on the Treasury Board, I think we must look for the origin of the trouble, and for the cause of the calamity. Therefore, I say we must pursue some other course, and my suggestion is that a full and thorough inquiry by a Royal Commission alone could bring out the information that is desired. If the shareholders alone are responsible through the men that they appointed, I could not argue but that they would have to suffer the loss alone; they would have to suffer any loss if they alone were responsible. But if these officers did not do anything that could dissipate their money, if they were not alone responsible, then I believe that we must look further; and if the government of this country was misled or deceived, or through lack of care in any way neglected to investigate the matter before a certificate was given to launch this bank, before giving the general manager power, as I said before, to play ducks and drakes with what was left of the shareholders' money, then I think that not the shareholders, but this country ought to come to the rescue for any loss that has been made. I submit that this country is big enough, rich enough and generous enough to maintain its honour, and I do not see how the honour of this government or of this country could be maintained in this matter unless they came down with something to assist these poor people, and help them out of the difficulty which they have unfortunately fallen into. To do that requires an inquiry over and above anything that could be brought out under the Winding Up Act. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move:

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be omitted and the following substituted therefor:

This House is of opinion that a Royal Commission should forthwith issue to inquire into and investigate the incorporation and organization of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, and the granting of a certificate by the Treasury Board permitting said bank to issue notes and transact business, and all the circumstances connected therewith; and generally to inquire into and investigate the operation and efficiency of the Bank Act in relation to the affairs and transactions of said bank.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). With that portion of my hon. friend's remarks which deals with the misfortunes that have fallen upon these good citizens of Canada, and upon other good citizens of Canada, I am sure we all deeply sympathize. But though we may deeply sympathize with these good citizens in the misfortunes which have come upon them, it does not follow that we would be justified in treating them differently from all other citizens who have the misfortune to make an unhappy investment. A short time ago my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) put a question on the Order Paper, and an answer was given on behalf of the government. I propose to read the question and the answer, because in a very short form they present the case on both sides:

Mr. HENDERSON. What action does the government intend to take on the two requests preferred by the deputation on behalf of the shareholders and depositors of the Farmers' Bank, viz., that a Royal Commission be appointed to make a thorough examination into all matters connected with the incorporation and management of the Farmers' Bank; and that legislation be enacted to relieve shareholders of their double liability and to enable depositors to be paid at least fifty cents on the dollar?

Mr. FIELDING. The government have no reason to doubt that the exercise of the powers given to the liquidator by law, and the performance of the duties imposed upon that officer by like authority, and the proceedings now engaging the attention of the courts of justice in Toronto, will lead to a full investigation into and disclosure of all the affairs of the bank, and that, therefore, there is no need of the appointment of a Royal Commission. Should anything arise later to indicate that the investigation is insufficient, the question can be further considered. Re-

plying to the latter part of the hon. gentleman's question, the government deeply regret that a number of people who are not well able to bear the loss are likely to suffer from the failure of the bank, but in the judgment of the government it would be contrary to public policy to recoup the losses of any class of investors from the public treasury.

There has been no change in the condition of affairs since that answer was given. An investigation has been undertaken in part by the curator, and subsequently in part by the liquidator, the machinery of the courts has been invoked, and has been occupying a great deal of attention of the courts in the province of Ontario, and I see no reason to doubt that the investigation will be thorough. With regard to the investigation of the circumstances connected with the issue of the certificates, all that is a matter of record which is before the House. No investigation would bring forth anything material that is not now in the possession of the House, or is not within easy reach of the House. Therefore, we are unable to see that the situation is in any respect changed, or that there is any need of a Royal Commission to investigate matters which are already being fully investigated in the courts.

There are three stages in the proceedings in connection with the Farmers' Bank. There is, first, the incorporation of the bank; second, the issue of the certificate; third, the operations of the bank after organization. I desire to invite the attention of the House to each of these stages separately. My hon. friend, in his address, made no reference whatever to the incorporation although I see that in his motion he has included the incorporation of the bank as one of the matters which might require investigation

Mr. HENDERSON. I certainly understood the issue of the certificate to be part of the incorporation.

Mr. FIELDING. I am glad in that respect that my hon. friend has mentioned it, because he did not mention it in his remarks. But, inasmuch as the incorporation of this bank has been the subject of very much discussion outside, it is as well that in considering the matter, we should give some attention to the circumstances under which the Act of incorporation was obtained. We have a general Act governing banking operations, but each bank has its individual and separate charter. Each bank comes to this House with a private Bill for the purpose of obtaining incorporation. It is not a matter particularly of government concern. Any individual member has the right, and exercises the right, of bringing in a Bill to provide for the incorporation of a new bank. The matter is usually investigated by the Committee on Banking and Commerce. In that committee the government have no particular rights. A member of the government at the committee has precisely the same right as all other members have. While the government will naturally feel an interest in all legislation, I am one of those who think that in the matter of private legislation, it is not well that the government should at all times project itself into the discussion and endeavour to have these matters take a party turn. So, in private legislation there is always very great freedom claimed by an individual member, which is not always the case with regard to general legislation initiated by the government or perhaps by hon. gentlemen opposite. The government, of course, have an interest in all legislation, and in that sense are responsible for legislation generally, but it is a fact that the method of dealing with private Bills differs somewhat from the manner in which general legislation is handled.

This bank was incorporated in 1904. I do not remember that any exception was taken to the incorporation at that time. The bank was not organized at that time. The promoters came back in 1905 for an extension and received it. In the year 1906 they came back again. Now, as I said a moment ago, that committee is composed of gentlemen from both sides of the House, and if there had been any objection to the incorporation of the bank, it would have been well that we should have heard it and that those who opposed it should have placed themselves on record. As far as my memory goes, the only objection that was ever raised to the incorporation of this bank, came from myself and from some members who may later on, have shared my view. But, to the original incorporation, I do not remember that any objection was taken. We have to consider a moment the general principles governing bank incorporation. The business of Canada has been increasing faster than the available banking capital. It is desirable that we should have from time to time additional banking capital. Whether that should be obtained by increasing the capital of existing banks or by the creation of new banks, is not, perhaps, a matter of great concern, but that the country with its rapid growth should have further capital will be generally admitted. Whenever a proposition is made to incorporate a new bank, the committee is rather disposed to view it in a friendly light. I do not know whether there was any objection taken to the incorporation in 1904 nor can I recall anything in particular with regard to the application which was made in 1905. In 1906 the promoters came back again and I then opposed the granting of a charter. My view was that the fact that they had not

been able to organize promptly, indicated that they were having difficulty, and I confess that from the beginning I did not quite like the name of the Farmers' Bank. My fear was, that possibly the granting of the charter in 1905 would have the effect of inducing people to engage in the banking business, who were not likely to realize the responsibility they were assuming in becoming shareholders. However, the sentiments of members differed as they sometimes do in the Banking and Commerce Committee. Some hon. gentlemen were not in harmony with my own view and after some discussion, I found I could not carry my views as to the rejection of the charter, but, it was agreed that they should at all events, be permitted a six months extension and I think I probably assented to that. At all events, I know that I succeeded in obtaining a reduction of the period for which the extension was granted. If it had not been granted what would have been said? At the time this argument was put to me, members friendly to the venture came and said: You must not oppose this charter, Mr. Minister. The country needs banking capital and there is a good deal of feeling in the country that the old banks have a monopoly of the business. I do not quite endorse that, but there is a good deal of that feeling, and these gentlemen said: If you are going to oppose the efforts of the farmers to have a share in the banking business of the country, you will be met with the cry that parliament is giving the old banks a monopoly, and is not willing to give a fair chance to the farmers. In the Banking and Commerce Committee that feeling leads us to grant charters sometimes when possibly some of us would prefer that they should not grant them. At all events under these circumstances and with that feeling on my part, the charters was granted by this parliament after it had been reported by the Banking and Commerce Committee of which many hon. gentlemen opposite are members and for which I take whatever share of responsibility I have as a member of that committee. Therefore, I think I can say at once that in so far as the granting of the charter is concerned, there is no room now for any complaint against the action of this government, or for that matter, against the action of this parliament. I am taking my responsibility as one member of this committee and of this parliament. Although I would have preferred that the charter should not continue to exist I accepted the compromise of a six months extension, and of course, I accept responsibility for that with my colleagues on the committee. Therefore, I say that parliament is responsible for the granting of the charter and I do not think that any reasonable ground of objection can be taken to the incorporation of the new bank in face of the fact that the incorporation of new banks is still regarded as generally desirable.

Now, we come to the second question, the granting of the certificate. I want to say in that connection that my chief regret is that I have to have a difference of opinion with my respected friend from Halton. I know him too well to hesitate for a moment in accepting any statement that he might make. I credit him with all good faith and sincerity, and if he and I do not agree as to what has occurred that does not imply that I for one moment question the good faith or veracity of my hon. friend, but it simply means that I am obliged to say that my hon. friend is mistaken. I am obliged to say when my hon. friend tells me that he warned me against the issue of this certificate that he is mistaken. My hon. friend and I have had frequent conversations over the question of this bank. I do not recall, however, that we met in any formal way, but we met at different times as members of the House do, and we had conversations concerning the bank. That arose from the fact that my hon. friend knew I was opposed to the granting of the charter and that I viewed it with anxiety. The conversations between my hon. friend and myself were always along the line that we regretted the necessity for the creation of this Farmers' Bank, we were sorry to have the farmers of the country engaging in banking when, in the case of many of them, they were not familiar with the responsibilities which would be involved in the acceptance of shares of a bank. All our conversations were along that line. We were feeling sorry that the farmers were going into this matter, but I can assure my hon. friend that when he says that he warned me against the issue of the certificate, although I know he makes the statement in all good faith, I am bound to say that to the best of my recollection he is entirely mistaken. Nothing of the kind occurred.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) wish that denial to apply to the three interviews at which there were conversations or only to the last one?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not remember how many conversations I had with my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. There were three that were mentioned.

Mr. FIELDING. No matter how many there were, in so far as they took place before the issue of the certificate, I mean my denial to apply to all. I had conversations with my hon. friend from time to time as to the regret which we both had about the farmers going into this bank, but I dis-

tinctly state that my hon. friend is wrong when he says that he warned me against the issue of a certificate. He says that I decided to accept the statement of Mr. Travers as against him.

I am bound to say that if the matter ever did take that shape—with my hon. friend a witness on one side—knowing my hon. friend for many years as well as I do—and having on the other side a gentleman who I did not know at all, I would unhesitatingly accept my hon. friend's statement. But I wish to say that the matter never did take that position at all; there never was any conflict with my hon. friend on one side and Manager Travers on the other. My hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) says that I told him—he is very clear about it, and he presumes to quote the exact language—that I 'put it up' to him (Mr. Travers). Well, if I were not sure otherwise I would certainly be sure from that, because I do not believe that I ever used such a phrase in my life. Whatever faults I have in the elegance of my language, I am quite satisfied that I never used such an expression, and therefore I can say my hon. friend does not recollect that correctly. However, that is not very important.

Mr. HENDERSON. I must say that my recollection of that is very distinct, and I think that the minister ought to accept my word.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman must remember that I am no more bound to accept his word than he is to accept mine.

Mr. HENDERSON. I made my statement.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, I make my statement.

Mr. HENDERSON. You have no right to contradict my statement.

Mr. FIELDING. Nor has my hon. friend any right to contradict mine.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not contradicting yours.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, we need have no conflict over that. I say at once that I have too much regard for my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) to suggest for a single moment that he would make any statement in this House that he did not make in all sincerity, and believe to be absolutely correct. I would do my hon. friend and myself an injustice if I suggested anything of the sort; but I am bound to say that his memory is wrong as to what occurred.

Mr. HENDERSON. Not at all.

Mr. FIELDING. While my hon. friend and I had occasional conversations about the affairs of this bank they all arose out of the fact that I had opposed the granting of this charter and viewed the matter with some anxiety.

Mr. HENDERSON. I must take exception to that statement. I have no recollection of ever discussing with him the impropriety of granting these people a charter. I was on the Banking and Commerce Committee and supported the granting of that charter which was originally, I think, in the hands of the hon. member for South Wellington, and I representing farmers of Canada never objected to them getting a charter.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say that my hon. friend objected to giving the charter. I said I had objected to giving the charter, and as hon. members who sat with me on the committee are aware I reluctantly agreed to give them a six-months' extension, and it was out of that discussion arising in that way that my hon. friend and I occasionally had conversation. Certain portions of the conversation he has repeated and certain others he has not, but that is not material. I must say frankly that while I am not complaining of his repeating the conversations, and while I would not think myself free to repeat them under the circumstances, I do not complain. I said nothing to my hon. friend that might not be said from the house tops.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. gentleman consider that the conversation on a public matter of that kind was private? I certainly never considered it so. When I make representations concerning a public matter of interest to my constituents I would consider that they are perfectly open.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not complaining; I said that I did not consider myself free to repeat the conversation I had with my hon. friend, but my hon. friend has a different view as to that. Might I ask the hon. gentleman how it is, if it was a grave and serious matter affecting his constituents as he now says, he did not take the trouble to put his views in writing so that they might go on record and be beyond dispute) If my hon. friend felt as keenly in the matter as he now does, if he believed that the granting of this certificate was about to come to pass, and if he had good reasons against it, surely my hon. friend would be bound by his duties to his constituents to have addressed me a letter and have his views on record, and then there would be no room for dispute.

Mr. HENDERSON. While I believed there was trouble I was extremely anxious not to say anything more than was absolutely necessary in case that might bring about the collapse of an institution which eventually might work its way through. I considered that my personal verbal statement to the minister which was intended for him as a warning was just as good as

if I had put it in writing, and I stated the reason why I preferred that mode rather than putting a document on file which might have been read by others and construed into an attempt on my part to wreck a bank which might otherwise pull through.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend will see that that remark might apply very well after the bank was organized, but it does not apply to a time when the bank was not organized at all, and when there was no bank to wreck. He says it is before the certificate was granted he warned me against it, and if so there is no reason why that warning should not be put in writing. Did my hon. friend then attach the same importance to it that he does now he should have done himself the justice of putting that warning in writing.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not regard it at the time as a necessity.

Mr. FIELDING. As a rule public business is transacted in writing; as a rule when men wish to bring about important transactions they exchange letters which will make the matter clear and place it beyond the possibility of any dispute, and if the hon. gentleman fails to do that and leaves it to a matter of memory, well, his memory is just as likely to be treacherous as that of any other hon. gentleman. I want to say distinctly that the conversation my hon. friend and I had, had no reference to any warning and that I never received from him any warning as to the issue of the certificate to this bank.

Mr. BOYCE. Is not the minister's memory likely to be treacherous on that point?

Mr. FIELDING. It is possible. I am admitting that my hon. friend from Halton makes the statement in absolute sincerity, but I say that my recollection is that he is wrong. If he wishes to think that my recollection is wrong and his is right we will have to leave it at that. The fact that he failed to put it in writing is rather a misfortune in view of the difference of opinion that has arisen.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would tell the Minister of Finance that I have ere this put my views in writing and a minister of the government of which he was a member, although these views were marked 'private,' published them in a blue-book and sent them broadcast all over the country to try and do me an injury. I do not mean to say that the minister of finance would have published this in order to do me an injury. I am quite satisfied he would not.

Mr. FIELDING. How could I have done my hon. friend an injury?

Mr. HENDERSON. It might be insinuated that I made an attempt to wreck the bank.

Mr. FIELDING. It would stand now to my hon. friend's infinite credit if he had warned me and if I had gone on despite the warning. However, my hon. friend did not take that course, and I will leave that matter as it is. The first stage in this matter of the issue of the certificate is to be found in a communication from Mr. Leighton McCarthy, who says he is instructed by some shareholders, his clients, to object to the issue of the certificate, and he states in a subsequent letter that he complains that in some cases where large sums of money have been paid, notes have also been given. Now, at that time the application for a certificate had not yet been received. Mr. McCarthy was informed there was no application, and that when the application did come his representation would have all due consideration. Mr. McCarthy's letters on that subject were dated October 8th and 19th. My hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) has spoken of very great haste on this question, and he has said that the application for the certificate was written on the 27th, presumably received on the 28th, and the certificate was granted on the 30th November; but if my hon. friend will look through the correspondence he will see that on the 23rd of October Mr. Travers took the first step toward the organization by depositing the $250,000 in the Bank of Montreal, and notifying the department that he deposited it for the purpose of organizing the bank. So my hon. friend will see that we had notice of the application and the money in our possession for some considerable time before the dates he has mentioned.

Mr. LALOR. May I ask the hon. minister if he had any letters warning him as to this bank other than that of Mr. Leighton McCarthy?

Mr. FIELDING. I think I am right in saying that there were no other letters. The day after the certificate was granted, a letter came from the Canadian Bankers' Association.

Mr. LALOR. As a matter of fact, did not a local manager write to you warning you of this bank?

Mr. FIELDING. Any letter written to us by a local manager had no reference to the issue of the certificate at all. I think I know what my hon. friend refers to. It had reference to another matter later. Mr McCarthy filed his objections, and on the 2nd of November Mr. McCarthy withdrew his objections in a letter in which he says:

Referring to my letters of the 8th and 9th inst., with referenece to the application for a certificate made on behalf of the Farmers' Bank, I am advised by those who are instructing me that the claims made by them in the action brought have been settled by their subscriptions being taken up by some parties

interested in the bank and refunding the money paid by the individuals or returning the notes which had been given. The objections which I made on their behalf to the issue of the certificates are, therefore, withdrawn. Would you mind therefore returning to me the papers which I forwarded to you?

The papers were, accordingly, returned to Mr. McCarthy. The next stage of the matter was that, anticipating the application, the Deputy Minister of Finance, Mr. Boville, wrote to Mr. Travers that it would be desirable that he should furnish a detailed statement of the actual amount of cash paid up in the case of each shareholder. Mr. Travers, in his affidavit, to which I will come in a moment, gave the most positive assurance that the amounts set forth, had been paid in cash. After the declaration of Mr. Travers had been received, although it was in proper order, I thought it desirable that I should see him on the subject. Mr. Travers came to the department in connection with the certificate, and I had a conversation with him, arising out of this note business. At that time—to the best of my knowledge and belief, the only time in my life that I met Mr. Travers,—I had a conversation with him, in which I called his attention to the fact that there were rumours in banking circles that sometimes the organization of banks was brought about by the use of notes instead of cash. Mr. Travers in the most positive terms declared that there was no foundation for any suspicion of that kind in the present case.

Mr. THORNTON. What made you suspicious of Mr. Travers at that particular time?

Mr. FIELDING. The letter itself says that I had heard of rumours in banking circles that in the case of previous organizations of banks the Bank Act had been evaded by the use of notes. I called Mr. Travers' attention to that and cross-examined him as well as I could on that aspect of the question. He assured me in the most positive terms that the cash was paid in, in every case. I think I had dictated a letter to Mr. Travers that was on its way to him, and I said I would like him to give me a written answer, which he did. So that we had before us at the moment of issuing the certificate Mr. Travers' affidavit and Mr. Travers' letter. Now, before we proceed to quote the statements of Mr. Travers, let us reflect for a moment on his present position and on the position he occupied at the time these events occurred. Mr. Travers is now a convict in prison, a discredited man. When you talk of the testimony of Mr. Travers to-day, you evidently think of him as a convict, the prisoner, the discredited man. But do not forget that at the moment Mr. Travers came before the Department of Finance, he was a man in as good standing as any member of this House, as far as I know. Do not forget that at that time he was the recognized manager of a new bank, associated with reputable men, and that he came to us on behalf of those reputable men in order that he might do business with us. Now, who were the men associated with Mr. Travers in the matter? By reference to the charter of the bank, you will find that at that time Mr. Travers was acting in co-operation with a number of gentlemen who are named as provisional directors: James Gallagher, of the village of Teeswater, John Watson, of the town of Listowell, John Ferguson and Alexander Fraser, both of the city of Toronto, and Alexander Shepherd Lown, of the village of Drayton. I have not the pleasure of knowing any of these gentlemen, but I am told that they are men of good standing in their respective communities. Mr. Travers was associated with these gentlemen in the beginning and when the prospectus of the bank was issued it stated:

The following gentlemen have consented to act as directors if elected:—His Honour A. E. Forget, Lieutenant Governor, Saskatchewan; Major Thomas Beattie, President London City Gas Company, director Agricultural Savings and Loan Company, London; Lieut.-Colonel R. R. McLennan, contractor, Cornwall, Ont., director Manufacturers' Life Insurance Company, director Trust and Guarantee Company, director Cornwall Paper Company; John D. Ivey, president, John D. Ivey & Company, Limited, Toronto; Thos. Charlton, lumberman, Collingwood, Ont., North Tonawanda, N.Y.; H. W. Anthes, president and managing director Toronto Foundry Company, Limited; W. S. Calvert, M.P., manufacturer, Strathroy, president Cameron Dun Company, Limited, president Canadian Oil Company, Limited, vice-president Northern Life Insurance Company; D. P. McKinnon, Finch, Ont., ex-president Board of Agriculture and Arts, director International Portland Cement Co., Ltd.; Colonel James Munro, M.P.P., banker, Embro, Ont.; Hon. A. G. McKay, K.C., Owen Sound, ex-Commissioner Crown Lands; George W. Neely, M.P.P., farmer, Dorchester, Ont.; Thos. Urquhart, ex-mayor, Toronto; D. N. McLeod, general merchant, Parkhill, Ont.; John Ferguson, M.D., M.A., director Excelsior Life Insurance Company; Robert Noble, miller, Norval.

These were Mr. Travers' associates according to the statement furnished us.

Mr. BEATTIE. As my name is mentioned, I wish to make a personal explanation. One Sunday night about 10 o'clock I was rung up by the long distance telephone. I answered the call and a gentleman at the other end said: Mr. Travers is speaking. I know Mr. Travers, manager of the Bank of Montreal, and thought it was he, and did not suppose it was Mr. Travers,

manager of the Farmers' Bank, whom I did not know. On the following morning at the breakfast hour a gentleman called on me with a paper which he asked me to sign. He came so sharp and early that I became suspicious and asked him when he left Toronto. He said he left at midnight and went on to tell me that I had spoken to Mr. Travers the night previous over the telephone, and that he had come to see me in consequence. I said to him: When did Mr. Travers leave the Bank of Montreal? He replied that Mr. Travers was formerly in the Merchants' Bank. I then said to him that I had been speaking over the telephone to some man whom I did not know, under the impression that I was speaking to Mr. Travers of the Bank of Montreal whom I knew very well, and I consequently refused to sign the papers. I then went and saw one of the clerks in the Merchants' Bank, and he gave me Mr. Travers' history, and I made up my mind to have nothing to do with the Farmers' Bank of which Mr. Travers was the manager. This Mr. Travers, whom I supposed to be Mr. Travers of the Bank of Montreal, asked me over the telephone on Sunday night if I would take stock in the new bank, and I replied that if he were associated with it I might take some shares, but I had no idea that I was speaking to a man whom I did not know. The following morning when this other gentleman came to London with a prospectus, to which my name was attached, I refused to sign for any stock. and if my name was kept on the prospectus, it was without my authority.

Mr. FIELDING. Of course I am not seeking to make any point against my hon. friend, but I am simply showing that when Mr. Travers came to the Finance Department, he came under these excellent auspices.

Mr. BEATTIE. I quite understand the hon. minister, but I wish to explain that I had not given any authority at all for the use of my name.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not in the slightest doubt the hon. gentleman, but am simply pointing out the names which appeared on the prospectus. Then we come to the names used in the application itself. I shall read the whole application in a moment, but for my immediate purpose I shall simply give the names. I have given the names of the provisional directors which appeared in the original charter, and of those who, in the prospectus, appeared as having agreed to act as directors. My hon. friend has declared that his name was used without his sanction, but the fact nevertheless remains that his name was there.

Mr. BEATTIE. I had no stock in the bank, and they had no right to use my name.

Mr. FIELDING. I accept my hon. friend's statement without hesitation, but what I say is that all these names were those of highly respectable men and calculated to give Mr. Travers strength when he came to deal with the government, and my hon. friend's name was among them, and it was one calculated to give the application some strength. I now come to the names of the provisional directors in that application. They are as follows:

Lt.-Col. R. McLennan of Cornwall, Ontario.
Lt.-Col. Jas. Munro, M.P., of Embro, Ont.
Allan Eaton, Esq., of Mount Nemo, Ont.
Robt. Noble, Esq., of Norval, Ont.
W. G. Sinclair, Esq., of Zimmerman, Ont.
A. Groves, Esq., M.D., of Fergus, Ont., and
N. M. Devean, Esq., W. Beattie Nesbitt, M.D., and John Gilchrist, Esq., of Toronto, Ont.

All these gentlemen were at that time apparently the associates of Mr. Travers. Mr. Travers came to us buttressed by all these good names. More than that, he came to us as the agent of the very shareholders that my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) talks about. He could not have come in any other capacity. It was from these shareholders, in one form or another, that the money was obtained which he deposited with our department. He further came to us on his own reputation as a man of good standing—because I had heard nothing to the contrary—with the names of these men associated with him in the charter and with a list of gentlemen who were willing to act as directors and whose names are set forth in the application. Let me now read the application:

In the matter of the Bank Act and amendment and of the Farmers' Bank of Canada.

I, William R. Travers of the city of Toronto, in the county of York, general manager of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, do solemnly declare:

1. The Farmers' Bank of Canada was duly incorporated by Act of parliament of Canada, being chapter 77 of the Statutes of 1904; the said Act of Incorporation was amended by a further Act of parliament of Canada, being chapter 92 of the Statutes of 1905, and was further amended by an Act of parliament of Canada, being chapter 94 of the Statutes of 1906. A true copy of each of the said Acts are now shown to me and marked exhibit 'A' to this my declaration.

2. The provisional directors of the said bank proceeded in accordance with the Bank Act to open the stock books and issued a prospectus. A true copy of the said prospectus is now shown to me and marked exhibit 'B' to this my declaration.

3. On or about the twenty-second day of March, 1906, I was appointed by the provisional directors general manager of the bank and still occupy the same position, and have knowledge of the matters hereinafter set forth.

4. On the twenty-third day of October, 1906, there had been actually bona fide subscribed five thousand seven hundred and fifty-seven shares of the capital stock of the Farmers'

Bank of Canada, and I have had personal knowledge of the applications and subscriptions, and each and all of the said subscriptions is and are on the printed form of application—a copy of which is now produced and marked exhibit 'C' to this my declaration, and that the said subscription appeared on the stock books of the said bank, and that a sum beyond $250,000 thereof in cash has been actually paid in by the subscribers of the same.

5. Now shown to me and marked exhibit 'D' to this my declaration is a list of the subscribers to the capital stock of the said bank, correctly setting forth as to each subscription the name of the subscriber, his address, the number of shares subscribed for by him, the amount of such shares and the amount paid in thereon. Each of the said subscriptions is a bona fide subscription to the capital stock of the bank.

6. The provisional directors of the said bank on the said twenty-third day of October, 1906, caused $250,000 of the moneys so paid in and which actually had been received in respect of the shares of the capital stock of the said bank to be deposited in the Bank of Montreal to the credit of the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General, and that the deposit receipt therefor was forwarded to the Deputy Minister of Finance who acknowledged receipt of the same under date of the twenty-fourth day of October, 1906.

7. In accordance with the provisions of the Bank Act the provisional directors by public notice for at least four weeks, called a meeting of the subscribers to the said stock to be held at the offices of the bank in the Stair Building, corner Bay and Adelaide streets in the city of Toronto, in the province of Ontario, on Monday the twenty-sixth day of November, 1906, at ten o'clock in the forenoon.

8. The said notice appeared by advertising in the issues of the 'Canada Gazette,' dated October 27th, November 3rd, 10th, 17th and 24th, and the same notice also appeared in the issues of the Toronto daily 'Globe,' dated October 24th, 25th, 26th, 27th, 29th, 30th and 31st, and November 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 24th and 26th, and the said notice also appeared in the issues of the Toronto daily 'Mail and Empire,' dated October 24th, 25th, 26th, 27th, 29th, 30th, 31st, and November 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 24th and 26th. A file of the issues of the Toronto daily 'Globe' and of the Toronto daily 'Mail and Empire' containing the said advertisement are produced and marked exhibit 'E' to this my declaration.

9. A printed copy of the said notice was also sent by post letter prepaid to each of the subscribers of the capital stock of the bank at the address of each subscriber upon the books of the bank by depositing the same in the general post office branch B, Toronto, on the twenty-third day of October, 1906. One of the said individual notices is now shown to me and marked exhibit 'F' to this my declaration.

10. I acted as secretary to the said meeting of subscribers holden on the said twenty-sixth day of November, 1906, and at the said meeting upwards of eighty subscribers were present in person and upwards of three hundred and seventy subscribers were represented by proxy. The subscribers adopted by-laws for the bank and determined the day upon which the annual general meeting of the bank is to be held, being the fourth Monday in November in each year, and the subscribers elected nine directors duly qualified under the Bank Act to hold office until the annual general meeting in the year 1907. The directors so elected are as follows:

Lt.-Col. R. McLennan of Cornwall, Ontario.
Lt.-Col. Jas. Munro, M.P., of Embro, Ont.
Allan Eaton, Esq., of Mount Nemo, Ont.
Robt. Noble, Esq., of Norval, Ont.
W. G. Sinclair, Esq., of Zimmerman, Ont.
A. Groves, Esq., M.D., of Fergus, Ont., and
N. M. Devean, Esq., W. Beattie Nesbitt, M.D., and John Gilchrist, Esq., of Toronto, Ont.

11. The provisions of the Bank Act as to the subscribers to the capital stock of the said bank and the deposit with the Receiver General and as to the notice of the said meeting of subscribers and the proceedings of the said meeting have been fully complied with, and pursuant to the direction of the said meeting of subscribers and board of directors elected at such meeting application hereby is made for the certificate of the Treasury Board to permit the said bank to commence the business of banking in accordance with the said Act.

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

Declared before me at the city of Toronto, in the county of York, this twenty-seventh day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1906.

W. R. TRAVERS.

W. H. Hunter,
A Com., &c., in H.C.J.

Here was, in the most positive terms, a declaration on oath, or its equivalent, by Mr. Travers that this money had been subscribed in accordance with the terms of the Bank Act, and this at a time, I say, when Mr. Travers had the same position before us as a man of good repute, and not only one of good repute but one who was able to associate with himself these gentlemen whose names I have mentioned in one capacity or another. This being the case, I think it would not have been unreasonable if we had given him the certificate without further ado. As it was, we had an exchange of letters with Mr. Travers. On the 30th of November, the day when he came for this certificate I addressed him a letter. In the meantime, I had seen Mr. Travers and discussed the matter with him, but I asked him to confirm his statements in writing. I had cross-examined him, as I say, on his affidavit, and his statements were as complete and full as anybody could desire, but

I asked him to put them in writing. The following is my letter as it appears at page 26 of the Return:

Minister of Finance, Canada,
Ottawa, November 30, 1906.

W. R. Travers, Esq.,
General Manager of the Farmers' Bank of Canada,
Russell House, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I regret that owing to pressing engagements yesterday, arising out of the budget, I was unable to meet you to consider your application for the issue of a certificate to authorize the Farmers' Bank of Canada to commence business. I shall be glad to see you to-day, at my office, at any time before one o'clock if you can call. Or I might be able to see you later, between four and five, at the House of Commons, if that will be more convenient.

There is a phase of the matter which I should like to bring to your notice so that you may consider it at once. It has been represented to us that in some previous instances where an application was in all respects apparently regular, there was actually an evasion of the intention of the Bank Act in relation to the paid-up capital. We have been told that in some cases the subscribers did not actually pay in cash but gave notes to the provisional directors which were used to raise the money. On account of information of this kind, which has reached us in relation to a previous case, we deem it proper to scan very closely every application for a certificate which comes to us. I shall be glad to have an assurance that nothing of the kind has taken place in relation to the subscriptions for the Farmers' Bank, but that the amounts set forth in the application as having been paid up have in every case been bona fide cash payments.

W. S. FIELDING,
Minister of Finance.

Mr. Travers, replying to me on the same day wrote:

Ottawa, November 30, 1906.

The Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Minister of Finance, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 30th of November, I have to say that in the case of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, the provisional directors did not raise the money in the way mentioned by you. You will find the statement put in by me absolutely correct as to the amount of stock subscribed and the amount paid up.

W. R. TRAVERS.
General Manager, Farmers' Bank of Canada.

We already had the affidavit of Mr. Travers. This letter adds nothing to it, but it shows that, even after receiving that affidavit, we cross-examined Mr. Travers as to the statements in it.

Mr. PORTER. What does the minister mean by 'cross-examine'? Does it mean that he simply asked him questions and accepted his answers, or does it mean that this was under the solemnity of an oath?

Mr. FIELDING. No. Perhaps the expression 'cross-examine' may be taken by my legal friends in a broader sense than I intended. I mean to say that I discussed the matter with him and told him that it was a subject on which we wished to have information beyond all question. He answered in most complete terms.

Mr. BOYCE. In the letter of the minister to the general manager of this bank, he puts the proposition in the abstract. May I ask the minister why he did not state that the information he had as to the discounting of notes had to do with this bank and not with a previous case? Why did not he use the information he had at his disposal, instead of putting it in that way?

Mr. FIELDING. I am bound to say that I had in mind at that time more the recollection of previous cases than the case of this particular bank. However, 'cross-examination' may not be the proper expression; I used it in the general way a layman would.

Mr. HENDERSON. Had not the minister in mind the conversation I had with him?

Mr. FIELDING. I can assure my hon friend (Mr. Henderson) in good faith, that I had not in mind any conversation with him bearing on the issue of the certificate. The idea that I had in mind, on one side my hon. friend's (Mr. Henderson's) statement and on the other the statement of Mr. Travers is, I am bound to tell my hon. friend, an entire mistake. We had before us the declaration of Mr Travers; we had his letter—if it gave any additional value—and we had the fact that he came to us representing his shareholders, the very men on whose account my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) now complains. Mr. Travers came as their agent. So far as the papers showed, the directors had been appointed at a regular meeting of shareholders, and they in turn had appointed Mr. Travers general manager. So he came to us, not only as a man of good repute—and I want that borne in mind, that he was, at the time he came representing the provisional directors, a man of high standing in the country—but also he came representing the shareholders in the bank. We had before us every bit of information such as we had had in the granting of any previous bank certificate. That being the case, what would have been the result had we refused to grant the certificate as in the previous cases?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Will the minister say that on any previous occasion when an application was made for a certificate the Treasury Board had been warned by such a letter as that of Mr. McCarthy?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not agree as to the 'warning' in Mr. McCarthy's letter. Mr. McCarthy made a statement and then withdrew his objections, But, even then, we had the sworn—because it is sworn—statement of Mr. Travers. I do not see what better evidence you could get. Again, I ask the House to note that he was not a convicted prisoner at that time, but a man of standing; and I had the right to attach the same importance to his statement as I would attach to the statement of any other man of good repute coming before us. That being the case, having before us all the information that we had had in any previous case, if we had not granted the Farmers' Bank certificate, my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) would have been the first to rise and complain that we were not treating his farmers fairly. Surely, my hon. friend must see that when his farmers send to us, through their directors and general manager, an application for a certificate, we ought not to be condemned, by them at least, because the certificate was granted.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not wish to interrupt, or I might give a reply. But I do not wish to break into the hon. gentleman's speech.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not objecting.

Mr. HENDERSON. If I may be permitted to break in——

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON—I would ask the minister to explain those words of the Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. FIELDING. The Deputy Minister of Justice was asked whether the papers were in proper order, whether the law was complied with, and the Deputy Minister of Justice, who is not the first judge as to the facts of the case, reports that the papers are in proper order. But they have no special significance, such as that which my hon. friend seems desirous to give them. So I claim that in granting that certificate we were simply dealing with these promoters as we have been dealing with all others. I know it is difficult to-day, in view of the calamity which has occurred, in view of the fact that Mr. Travers is now a convicted man, to give the same consideration to Mr. Travers' statements and affidavits that were given to them then. Those who want to look at the matter fairly will say that, whatever Mr. Travers may be now, at the time he made these statements, and wrote that letter, and gave us that affidavit, he was a man in good standing, and he came to us representing men in good standing, and there was no reason in the world why we should not accord to him and to them the same consideration that we accorded to others who came to us with the same information and under like circumstances.

That is the story of the certificate that was issued on the 30th of November. As I have already stated, after it was issued a statement came from the Bankers' Association taking exception to it. There is one point in the case I would like to make. Undoubtedly that certificate, as has since been ascertained, was obtained fraudulently. There was the deception. The minister was deceived, the Treasury Board was deceived, the whole country has been deceived by the whole proceedings of the Farmers' Bank. There is this important point to be borne in mind, that, although there was that irregularity—irregularity is too mild a term—although there was that fraud in connection with the payment of the capital at the beginning, although the notes were given when cash should have been given, and all that was wrong and fraudulent; nevertheless, in most cases those notes were ultimately paid, and the cash went into the bank, and the bank did possess the capital at a later stage, though it did not possess it at that moment. The bank did not get into trouble because of any lack of capital; the trouble with the bank was that although they had the capital, not at the beginning, but later on—some portion of the notes I believe had not been paid—but the curator's report shows that the most of those notes have been paid, and the bank therefore, ultimately got the capital, and that irregularity was ultimately corrected. The bank got the capital, the bank was able to do business, the bank had the cash, and the failure of the bank came about, not through any lack on that score, but because of the mismanagement of its affairs, which might have occurred no matter what had happened with regard to the issue of the certificate. That I think is a point of great importance to be borne in mind.

Now the next and last stage of the bank's affairs is with regard to its operation after it was organized. I confess that I was one of those who did not regard the institution as very strong. In fact I was reluctant to give them a charter, and would have been much more willing to find reasons for refusing the certificate than for giving it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. In view of the letter written by Mr. McCarthy on the 19th of October, in which he stated that he had brought action on behalf of certain persons, and of the persons who were subscribers to the funds of the bank, does not the minister consider that that was sufficient warrant, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. McCarthy on their behalf subsequently withdrew his objection, for believing that there was irregularity?

Mr. FIELDING. If we had had no later information, I think my hon. friend's criti-

cism would be just, but after that we did receive the solemn declaration of Travers.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Did not that affidavit in itself arouse the suspicion of the minister, seeing it was made before the man's own solicitor who was prosecuting this application on his behalf?

Mr. FIELDING. My knowledge of law is not sufficient to enable me to deal with that aspect of the question. The affidavit appeared to be all right, I think the affidavit was taken before a duly qualified official and sworn to. However, whatever may be said on that score we have the fact that Mr. McCarthy withdrew his objection, and after he had withdrawn his objection, later on we come to the same evidence that was held in every other bank case—in some cases less evidence was afforded.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. My point is this, that the fact that Mr. McCarthy withdrew his objections is proof that the statements which he made were true, because he said that the matter had been settled, and it would have been settled if the affidavits were true.

Mr. FIELDING. I take it that Mr. McCarthy had a number of claims, that his clients wanted to withdraw from the bank, and he wrote on their behalf, and having withdrawn his objections that was the end. Subsequent to that, we had the declaration or affidavit of Mr. Travers. I want to point out that it was in the same form as every similar affidavit upon which we issued other bank certificates; there was no difference, the proceeding is the same, the information was the same. If there was any difference at all it was more complete in this case than in others. Yet time has shown that it was given fraudulently, it was deceptive, and as I said a moment ago, the fact that Mr. Travers is a convicted man, and is now in prison, makes it difficult to-day to give the credence that was given to his statement. But at the time that statement was made, at the time he wrote his letter, at the time he called upon me, when he made his declaration, Mr. Travers was a man in good standing, and we had the same right to treat his representations with respect as we had to treat with respect the representations of the last bank manager who obtained a certificate from us.

Mr. PORTER. Was not that affidavit contradicted and shown to be false by the information given from the Bankers' Association? And if that is so, even although the certificate had been granted, if the affidavit was false, did the minister take any proceedings to revoke the charter that had been granted or to prosecute the man who had made the false affidavit?

Mr. FIELDING. We did not have any such information. We did not think that a statement from the Bankers' Association in general terms afforded ground for prosecuting anybody. The certificate had been issued. I do not hink we had any right to revoke the certificate which, having once been granted, the bank was duly organized I do not think we had power to revoke the certificate.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Who was it that had actual possession of the certificate at the time the minister got information from the Bankers' Association?

Mr. FIELDING. I would have to inquire of my officials; I presume it was given to Mr. Travers who came to Ottawa for the purpose of receiving it. The next stage of the matter deals with the conditions and operations of the bank after organization. I have already stated that I viewed the institution with doubt. I was reluctant to give them a charter, and would have been glad if an opportunity had been afforded to refuse the certificate. But I thought I was doing my duty in giving it to them. I was making no distinction between the treatment accorded to Mr. Travers and his associates, and the treatment accorded to other gentlemen who had come to me under similar circumstances. But after the bank was organized and had been running for several years, and was apparently complying with the law and doing well—at all events, no complaint was made—by and by a difficulty arose in regard to an insurance company in the United States. They had some transactions with the Farmers' Bank, and the Superintendent of Insurance of the state of New York desired to investigate the matter from the point of view of his department. He communicated with our department and wanted us to send a man with a representative of the New York State Insurance Department to Toronto for the purpose of inquiring into the affairs of the bank; and we had to point out that we had no power to send any man into the bank.

We can call for returns of the bank's operations, but there being no government bank inspection, we had no inspector who had the right to go into that bank. We told the insurance superintendent in the state of New York that we could do nothing, but we advised him to go to the bank and frankly ask for the information, and we were satisfied it would be granted. We communicated from time to time with the Farmers' Bank in certain matters with regard to returns, &c, but we did not feel that we had any right to send an officer into the bank as had been suggested by the gentleman from New York state. In the discussion of the correspondence which was published some time ago one of the

newspapers said: Well, granting now that the certificate had to be issued, granting that there was no irregularity, why did not the Minister of Finance, knowing that the bank was in a bad position, do something then? Do what then? It is the easiest thing in the world to say 'do something,' but in most cases the man who says 'do something,' has no conception of what you can do. It would have been a very awkward thing for the government to have taken an adverse step with regard to that bank at that time. Those two or three years of the bank's history were rather critical times in finance, it was a period when the bank's affairs were in a very acute position, and if the Department of Finance, exceeding its authority, had cut into the matter, had made any public statement, had made any public demonstration with regard to matters connected with the bank, what would have happened? The bank would have closed its doors, there would have been a run on the bank and every one of these farmer shareholders would have turned around and said: What right had the Minister of Finance to butt into this matter; the bank was getting along well, the bank was having a little trouble, but it would have worried through; the Minister of Finance, in taking this action has interfered with our business, brought on a panic and ruined the shareholders of the bank. They would have held the Minister of Finance responsible for the wreck. We had no right or power to do that, it would have been a most unwise thing to do, and although we knew the bank was not in a strong position, it would have been a great mistake for this government to have brought a panic in the bank's affairs by taking the action that has been suggested by some hon. members and by a portion of the press.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary for me to say anything further. There are just these three points with which I have dealt; first, that the government do not grant charters, that the charter was granted in the usual way by parliament for which we all, as members, must take the share of responsibility which may fall upon us. I tried to prevent the renewal of the charter but failing in that, I succeeded in cutting down the term of the extension. In the second place it is contended that we should not have issued the certificate. I have shown that the procedure was exactly the same as in all other cases. I have shown that when Mr. Travers and his associates came to us they were men of reputable standing at that time, and that if we had not granted the certificate we would have been giving them different treatment than that which we had accorded to all others. As to the last matter, a moment's reflection will show that it would have been a great mistake for the government to go into the affairs of the bank at a time when it was having trouble, to have brought on a run and to have brought about the close of the bank. It is a misfortune that this thing has occurred and no doubt we will learn some lesson from it. No doubt, in the amendment of the Bank Act we shall be guided in some things by our experience of the Farmers' Bank. We have been in regard to one thing; hon. gentlemen will remember that in the proposed Bill it is provided that a man who takes around a subscription paper to obtain subscriptions for stock in a bank, must inform the prospective shareholder in the most prominent way that by signing that document he makes himself subject to double liability. In other respects, I am quite sure that we will learn something and profit by our experience. I am satisfied, looking back over the whole matter, that, while it is a great misfortune and while we deeply sympathize with the hundreds who have lost money in the matter, the loss is not due to any act on the part of this government or of the Department of Finance, but the loss is due to the fact that people were induced to go into an enterprise that they should not have gone into, because they were deceived and misled by Mr. Travers, but that is no reason why any complaint should be made as respects the government.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister has detailed at some considerable length the reasons why he did not proceed when he obtained information from Syracuse. He did not want to do anything that would jeopardize the bank or which might bring about a collapse. Can he not give me credit for the very same kind of reasoning, when I said I went to him personally, and did not make a public display of my objections in writing and putting them on file. I think I acted just along the same line as the minister.

Mr. FIELDING. I must say that I did not attribute to my hon. friend at any stage of the matter any action which was not actuated by just that purpose. If it is necessary to deal with the point, let me remind him again that the conversations which he alleges he had with me on that point were before the bank was organized and, therefore, no harm could have been done if he had given the information at that time. The bank did not exist, there could have been no run on the bank and there was no difficulty about the matter.

Mr. HENDERSON. But they may never have got the certificate. It was about the certificate that I spoke to him.

Mr. FIELDING. That is where my hon. friend and I differ.

Mr HENDERSON. All right; we will have to agree to differ.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, it is an unfortunate thing that two hon. gentlemen differ in their recollections of what occurred three or four years ago, but such is the case. Both have stated their positions and it will simply be left to the House and the country to form their own conclusions with respect to the matter. We have, I suppose, to take the word of both hon. gentlemen in reference to their personal acts at that time. I do not think the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), has exhausted the subject by any means, and I feel exactly now, as I felt when I brought my motion as to the return of papers—that this is a matter which requires careful thought and, as far as we are able to give it, requires just and proper handling on each side of the House. We are not either of us surely animated entirely by a desire to make political capital out of a question of this kind. We are all of us, or ought to be, very desirous of finding out just what are the defects in our Bank Act, if there are defects, just what are the defects in the management of our Bank Act, if there are defects, and we are equally as interested in finding out whether the parties, either members of the governmnt or officials in any of the departments, whose duty it is to stand between the people and possible consequences, have in each case done their whole duty and done it properly. If they have done their duty, they stand all right; if they have not done their duty then they stand for censure and, without attempting to make politcal capital or to make a political defence or an attack, let us settle ourselves down as far as possible to a thorough investigation of the circumstances that have developed in this matter. I will agree with the Minister of Finance and get rid of that part of the discussion entirely, so far as we two are concerned, that as regards the incorporation of this bank, the House is responsible and not the Finance Minister. The House is responsible and not the government, and every member must take his share of that responsibility. So that, it boots nothing for either of us in this investigation we are carrying on as to the incorporation of the bank. That is a non-essential point in my mind. We cannot fairly attribute any fault to the government in the matter and I do not attribute any fault to myself or to other members of the House in that respect. On what ground could you refuse a charter to those who asked for the incorporation of the Farmers' bank? You could refuse it only; it seems to me, on the grounds that we had either enough or too many banking institutions in this country already and therefore there was no room for another. If that approved itself to the committee and the House it would have been fair ground for refusing the charter. Or, we might have refused the charter because of the personnel of those asking for the charter; if we did not think they had a standing, financial or otherwise, which would give fair belief that they would carry to a successful conclusion the important operation of a banking institution in this country. If these two things were not proven in the negative then the parliament had no right, and the committee had no right, to refuse this bank its incorporation charter, and still less had it ground for refusing it because it was called a farmers' bank. That would have been, to my mind, a reason why the Act of incorporation should have been granted if all other things were equal, and the conditions were complied with; so that we may drop that feature of it out of our consideration. Now, when a bank is incorporated under the Bank Act, it is absolutely innocuous until it is allowed to go into operation. When it is allowed to go into operation it may be a medium of great benefit and it may be a medium of equally great harm and damage and wrong. The important part of this discussion is, what was the part enacted by the gentlemen in whose charge the Bank Act places the important responsibility and duty of standing as trustees for the shareholders of the proposed bank and not allowing a single dollar of their money to be put in jeopardy in so far as the working of the bank is concerned until the provisions of the Bank Act are actually carried out—not carried out in a ' prima facie ' way, but carried out in a way which proves their actuality and reality. Now, I think all will agree with me that the incorporation could have lain here, if it had been allowed to, for 100 years, and nobody would have been damaged. The possibility of damage dated from the very day that the certificate was granted which allowed this force to be put in operation and the party to it, that was, and is, and will be held responsible for that certificate, is the party into whose hands it is confided by the Bank Act, namely, the Treasury Board. And if you come to look to the Treasury Board, as you look to a company or to a society, as to where the respnsibility lies, you will always find it lies in one or two, or at least in very few hands. In whose hands did this responsibility lie for the granting of this certificate which gave the power to Mr. Travers and his coadjutors to begin their operations? It lay theoretically in the hands of the Treasury Board; it lay actually in the hands of the Minister of Finance, and I call you, Mr. Speaker, to witness that

through this whole discussion not a single allusion has been made by the Minister of Finance to any other member of the Treasury Board. It was he who received the document, it was he who asked the opinion of the Minister of Justice, it was he who conducted the correspondence with Mr. McCarthy, it is he who signed the communications with Mr. Travers, he and nobody else, and it was upon his recommendation entirely that the certificate was finally recommended. Now, I think that commends itself to the minds of those who have heard this discussion as being in accordance with the facts. The things for us to consider, not only in the light of two parties sitting opposite each other, but in the light of the efficiency of the banking institutions of this country, is to look very closely into the conduct of the Minister of Finance, which resulted in this certificate being granted. The Minister of Finance has based his defence on this: I had a 'prima facie' case, I took the evidence given to me in that case, and if I did that I cannot be called upon to go any further; it is as far as ever was gone before in other cases. Well, I do not think that holds good. I do not think we ought to admit it, and for two reasons, one of which will be best put in the form of a question. I ask any member of this parliament if he had half a million dollars which he proposed to stake on a business venture, if he would stake that on the same quality of evidence and no more than the Minister of Finance had in connection with granting the certificate to this bank. I would not; the Minister of Finance himself would not. He said here to-day that he did not know Mr. Travers and never had met him before. Would he entrust half a million dollars to the management of Mr. Travers and gentlemen whom Mr. Travers might tell him were associated with him, when he did not know that a single one of these gentlemen was so associated with him, and when he did not know Mr. Travers himself and had never met him until a few days before the certificate was granted? But, did not the Minister of Finance stand in exactly that position with reference to the $500,000 and more that was subscribed by the shareholders of this bank. Was not that money put in his hands in trust? The promoter of a bank comes to a man and the man says: yes, I will subscribe $5,000, because in this country up to the present time—I am not going to say it is so now—I feel sure that whatever happens after we all get together and are able to make our own board and manage our own affairs, whatever happens after that will be our fault, but up to that the Minister of Finance is my surety, first, that it will not be simply my subscription which goes in there as bona fide, but that $500,000 with mine is to go in there as a bona fide subscription; it will not be only my money that will be paid up but it will be $250,000 which is bona fide put up, and until the conditions of the law are complied with my money is as safe as if it were in the bank, my money is in the hands of the Minister of Finance and it cannot be spent and cannot be squandered in any way. Now, that is the fair play which the Bank Act gives to any man; it is a guarantee that he is protected in that way. Therefore, I say the Minister of Finance should be equally as careful in connection with this money as he would be in the investment of the same amount of money for himself; he ought to be more careful for reasons which will commend themselves to the mind of any hon. gentleman in this House.

Now, the Minister of Finance had certain information, and it was his duty to come to a conclusion from evidence which was satisfactory to himself. I am glad to see that he does not depend on the opinion of the Minister of Justice, as some hon. gentlemen seemed to do when we discussed this question before, because he has acceded to the view that the Minister of Justice simply gave his opinion on the regularity of the papers, and that the matter of fact was to be decided by himself. So it must be. I ask the Finance Minister to correct me if I am wrong: If he asked the Minister of Justice for an opinion on the merits of the case, did he put before him all the information that had been brought to himself? He could have done nothing less if he was asking for an opinion on the merits. But he did not ask for an opinion on the merits. He simply wanted to know from the Justice Department if the papers were sufficient, and the Justice Department told him: The papers are sufficient, if you accept the evidence, for you to issue the certificate upon. The Justice Department threw back upon the Finance Minister himself the duty of seeing whether the evidence were sufficient or not. Now, note this, that the minister had his doubts in 1906 as to this bank. He has acknowledged that to-day. He said in 1906, after two failures to raise the funds: My view was that they were not the men to carry this bank to a successful conclusion, and I did not favour another extension. There is guard number one. The minister knew that this very outfit had attempted twice and had failed to get the money, and two year's time had been spent, and he was of the opinion that if they could not get the capital in two years' time, they were not likely to be successful, and, therefore, he was against granting them another six months. So he was on his guard. Why should we, he said to himself bother with them any

longer? There is danger in it; don't let us grant them another term of six months. There was caution number one, and from that time on the Minister of Finance was bound, because of his own impression, to take especial care to see that there was bona fide capital, and nothing less. But there was something else. The minister had knowledge in this case which I had not when I was Finance Minister. He wrote a letter to Mr. Travers on the 30th of November, from which I will read this extract:

There is a phase of the matter which I should like to bring to your notice so that you may consider it at once. It has been represented to us that in some previous instances where an application was in all respects apparently regular, there was actually an evasion of the intention of the Bank Act in relation to the paid-up capital. We have been told that in some cases the subscribers did not actually pay in cash but gave notes to the provisional directors which were used to raise the money.

The Minister of Finance had in his own mind, then, a knowledge that in previous cases there had been an attempt, whether successful or not—this letter would make it appear that it had been successful—to provide capital not in a bona fide way, but by the use of notes. There was guard and caution number two. If there were nothing else, the Minister of Finance, as according to his own letter, should go below what was apparent on the surface. You notice his words: 'Where an application was in all respects apparently regular,' this thing had taken place. Here was an application in all respects apparently regular, yet it might be wrong. Why did he not use the knowledge that he possessed to probe a little into this case to find out whether there was anything wrong underneath the 'apparently regular' application that was made? But the minister had more than that. On the 8th of October, on the 11th of October, and on the 19th of October, he had the letters from Mr. Leighton McCarthy. Now, the minister did not attach all the importance that I think is due to those letters. On the 8th of October came this letter:

My dear Mr. Fielding,—I have been consulted on behalf of a number of subscribers to the shares of the Farmers' Bank, and from the instructions I have received a number of the subscribers will dispute the bona fide character of the subscriptions.

Bear in mind the information that the minister already had. Here was another piece of information which said, not in previous cases, but in this case, some of the subscribers to this bank are going to dispute the regularity of the subscriptions. Mr. McCarthy's letter goes on:

I have not time to-night to give a full statement of the grounds of this request to you, but I beg to assure you that grave conditions have arisen which will require careful consideration before the Treasury Board would grant any certificate for the organization of this bank.

There is no need of reading the rest of the letter; that is the pith of it. On the 11th of October, Mr. McCarthy had not received any word. He gets anxious, and he sends the following telegram to Mr. Fielding:

Please wire me assurance in reference to stay of certificate of Treasury Board mentioned in my letter of Monday night.

He gets the assurance from Mr. Fielding, and that is followed up by a letter from Mr. McCarthy confirming and carrying out the substance of his telegram. Then, on the 19th of October there is this most important letter, which is more than a letter of information from a man. It is the actual transcript of an action undertaken before the High Court, which is more than gossip, more than rumour, more than what you meet with upon the street. I will read that letter:

Re the Farmers' Bank of Canada.

My dear Mr. Fielding,—I beg to inclose the special endorsement upon a writ of summons in the High Court of Justice for Ontario, which will be issued by: William A. Dixon, John Sproat, George Castle, William McLean, Finlay McCallum, Robert Hume, James Murray, George Denoon, John McLeod, Jane Shuert, William Harris, on behalf of themselves and all other persons alleged to be subscribers for shares of the capital stock of the Farmers' Bank of Canada who may desire to come in and be parties to this action, against the Farmers' Bank of Canada, James Gallagher, John Watson, John Ferguson, Alexander Fraser, Alexander Shepherd, Lown, W. R. Travers, C. H. Smith, A. G. H. Luxton, and the Traders' Bank of Canada, and W. J. Lindsay, and I respectfully request that the Treasury Board will stay any action upon the application of persons professing to act in the name of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, or in the name of the provisional directors of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, for a certificate under section 15 of the Bank Act on the grounds alleged in the inclosed special endorsement, and other grounds which may be disclosed upon the examination of the alleged subscribers for shares.

My hon. friend knew Mr. McCarthy, he had met him before, he knew him as a bright man of the party, and a good man in this House, and a stable man in the country. What does Mr. McCarthy say? He says:

I have received information that the alleged subscribers for shares paid a large sum of money in cash and have signed notes for other large sums of money, and that the persons professing to act in the name of the bank have transferred notes and received the proceeds, and that a deposit either has been made or will be made of the cash received and the proceeds of these notes, or sufficient amount to make up $250,000.

That was special information, no rumour about that.

I wish you to have the kindness to acknowledge the receipt of this protest against the granting of a certificate so that I may advise the shareholders who are disputing their legality, and I would be pleased to go to Ottawa upon any appointment you may make for the further consideration of this matter.

What was the reply to that, and I want the minister's attention to this. This was dated October 23:

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th instant, to Mr. Fielding's address, respecting the Farmers' Bank of Canada.

When application is made by the Farmers' Bank to the Treasury Board for a certificate to enable them to commence business, the representations contained in your letter with its inclosure will be laid before the board.

T. C. BOVILLE,
Deputy Minister of Finance.

The Minister of Finance made a point as he thought, against my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) by saying: You are not quite right when you say that only three days intervened for examination, the application being made on the 27th November, and the certificate being given on the 3rd of the same month. The Minister of Finance said: Bear in mind that on October the 23rd the application was in, in the shape of a deposit of $250,000 to my credit. Now I will put this question to the hon. minister. From the 23rd October, 1906, until the 27th of November, 1906, will the minister say that either he or his department took any step whatever to convince themselves of the bona fides of this application or made any inquiry as to the standing or actions of the men behind it? That is a simple question, but there is a good deal in it. I will go further. The information which Mr. McCarthy gave was to go before the Treasury Board. Let me ask the minister if the Treasury Board met to consider this matter before the 30th of November, the very day when the certificate was granted. And I will ask him if he ever put before that board the information which Mr. McCarthy gave him, and which he declared would be put before them? That can be very simply answered.

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot remember what exactly happened between these dates.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has his deputy there. If the Treasury Board met, and if that board did consider that information, it must be on record, but I am just asking him if that is not the case. So far as we can gather from the whole tenor of this thing, no investigation at all was made, either by Mr. Boville, the Deputy Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Finance himself or any other official with reference to the bona fides of this proposition. If I am wrong, that can be very easily shown. Mr. McCarthy's letter was accompanied by a document, and this is a copy of the document which accompanied it. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) tried to justify himself by saying that as Mr. Travers had assured him on the 27th of November that Mr. Beattie, of London, was a director, that was prima facie evidence of the respectability of the whole affair. But in this very document which Mr. Leighton McCarthy sent to the Finance Minister on the 19th of October, there occurs this as one of the indictments or one of the charges in this high court suit:

That Major Thomas Beattie, represented by the prospectus to have consented to act as a director, had not subscribed to any shares, and refused to be a director, and refused to allow his name to be used in any way in connection with the bank; and the plaintiff alleged that the names of other persons were represented by the prospectus to have consented to act as directors, who had not subscribed to any shares or given any authority for any such publication.

That was in the hands of the Finance Minister, and ought to have been in the hands of every member of the Treasury Board, because the minister had promised that it should be. Was it? What does this allege? On every hand it puts the minister on his guard. The minister seemed to think that there was nothing in this question, but this one point: Were those who were alleged to have been defrauded settled with? If they were, the objections were taken away and nothing remained.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. For the Finance Minister, everything remained, and what was removed was nothing, absolutely nothing. What remained? There remained the charge of fraud, the charge of misrepresentation, the charge of having directors on the prospectus who were not directors, the charge of paying immense sums in different ways that were unauthorized—all the grave charges that were made in the suit in the high court remained, and Mr. McCarthy could not and did not take them away. My hon. friend, the Finance Minister, knows that well enough. Did he read the judgment? The judgment was given on the 27th. What does it say, as clearly as any words can say it?

It says: On the 27th day of the month appeared before me, solicitors for both plaintiffs and defendants. The plaintiffs had been bought out and all their claims and obligations had been cancelled, and the two solicitors agreed to remove the case without costs. What does that prove? Would these men have been settled with if they had had no case? What was their

case? It was: You got our names and our subscriptions by fraud and misrepresentation; in one case a man subscribed $1,000, and you put him down for $10,000. And other cases were specified of similar transactions. The defendant's lawyer comes and says to the opponent: Let's settle; we have bought out the plaintiffs. If you want to go to the evidence, you will find the evidence. Mr. Travers made a personal loan and sent Mr. Hunter and Mr. Lindsay out to the county of Halton, bought out the claims, squared them up, took away the case from his opponent, and then came back into the court and a settlement took place. And any man who knows anything about these things could judge it to be nothing else than an absolute confirmation of the charges of fraud.

Now, let me put one more case to the Finance Minister,—the confiding Finance Minister, the simple-minded Finance Minister, the man who never looks below the surface, but just sees what is on the top and if that is apparently all right goes no further down. He held in his hand the affidavit of Mr. Travers swearing to a list of bona fide subscribers as of that date who had subscribed what was put opposite their names and had paid what was put opposite their names. And, if he had taken the trouble to make the investigation, he would have found on that list the names of these very plaintiffs who had been bought out, who had no stock and whose names should not have been upon that list.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall read to the House the list of subscribers to which I have just referred.

Name and Residence.	No. of Shares Subscribed for.	Amount Subscribed.	Amount Paid.
		$	$
McLeod, John, Milton, O.....	1	100	50
Sproat, John, Mansewood, O..	100	10,000	1,000
Castle, Geo., Milton, O	10	1,000	1,000
McCallum, Finlay, Milton, O.	10	1,000	1,000
Dixon, W. A., Milton, O.....	50	5,000	500
Shuert, Jane "	3	300	30
Hume, Robert "	10	1,000	100
McLean, Wm., "	5	500	50
Murray James, Mansewood, O.	25	2,500	.....

In all 214 shares, $21,400, $6,500 paid.

Now these are in the list which, on the 27th day of November, Mr. Travers swore to be the complete and true list of subscribers, with what they had subscribed, and with the amounts they had paid; and that list was under the hand of the Minister of Finance, or he had it in his possession. Yet on November 2, Mr. McCarthy had written to the Minister of Finance that these had all been bought off, and were no longer subscribers. That was nearly one month before Travers had made his declaration, and on November 27, Travers swore to the list containing these names, and made the affidavit before Hunter, who had gone with Travers or Lindsay and bought these men's claims one month before. Now that is the kind of testimony upon which my hon. friend relied when he took the testimony of Travers, a man whom he had not known until three days before, and preferred to take his declaration rather than look further.

Now, I want to show a little more in detail what the plaintiffs allege in this suit, which Mr. McCarthy had put in the possession of the Minister of Finance. Among other things the plaintiffs allege:

That the provisional directors who professed to act for and in the name of the bank had no lawful power or authority to receive subscriptions for shares or to accept them; and (2) that the subscriptions for shares which were procured from the plaintiffs and others were procured through fraud and misrepresentation, and the plaintiffs allege, amongst others, the following particulars of fraud, viz.: (a) that Robert Noble, whose name was entered in the prospectus as one of those who consented to be a director, had subscribed for shares to the amount of $10,000, whereas he had in fact only subscribed for shares to the amount of $3,000; (b) that John Sproat had subscribed for shares to the amount of $10,000, whereas he had in fact only intended to subscribe for shares to the amount of $1,000, and that he was induced to sign an application in the belief that it was filled up for $1,000, and that the general manager afterwards claimed that it was a subscription for $10,000, and the said John Sproat then repudiated the entire subscription; (d) that James Murray had subscribed for shares to the amount of $10,000, whereas he had in fact only subscribed for shares to the amount of $1,000; (e) that Dr. Stewart was subscribing for shares to the amount of $10,000, whereas in fact he was not subscribing for any shares; and other false representations of a similar character were made by the solicitors and agents in reference to alleged subscriptions of other persons. That Major Thomas Beattie, represented by the prospectors to have consented to act as a director, had not subscribed for any shares, and refused to be a director, and refused to allow his name to be used in any way in connection with the bank; and the plaintiffs allege that the names of other persons were represented by the prospectors to have consented to act as directors had not subscribed for any shares, or given any authority for any such publication.

And the plaintiffs allege that the acts and proceedings of the provisional directors were illegal and irregular; and the plaintiffs allege that the agents and solicitors professing to act under the name and authority of the provisional directors have procured a large number of subscriptions for shares, and have received the sum of $175,000 more or less on account thereof——

Here is the important part:

—and have also procured promissory notes to be signed by persons who were subscribing for shares, payable to the provisional directors of the bank, and the persons acting in the name and under the professed authority of the Act of incorporation and amendments thereto, are endeavouring to discount or procure a loan by the transfer of the said notes;

The plaintiffs further allege that the persons professing to act as aforesaid under the alleged authority of the provisional directors, have unlawfully deducted large sums of money for alleged services and commissions, and other purposes out of the money received by them;

The plaintiffs allege that the shares and the money and the promissory notes procured from them have been procured through fraud, deceit and misrepresentation;

The plaintiffs allege that all money, promissory notes and other obligations received as aforesaid by all persons acting or professing to act in the name and on behalf of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, or of the provisional directors, or any of them, are impressed with a trust in favour of all the subscribers for shares who may desire to come in and become parties to the action.

Now, Sir, those are some of the principal allegations made by these plaintiffs in this suit in the High Court. It was not allowed to come to trial, for this reason, that Mr. Travers and his friends immediately got busy; they procured a loan, visited these men, bought them out, and consequently took over their assignments of shares, and took away their claims and obligations. To use the expressive language of Mr. Travers himself, he took good care to scuttle this law suit so that they would make no headway against him. Now, a peculiar thing happens, I think it is peculiar. On the 22nd day of October this writ issued; on the 27th day of October this judgment was delivered, dismissing the suit, on the ground that the plaintiffs had been settled with, and on the 31st the judgment was signed.

I find that the Finance Department, on the 31st October, the very day the judgment was signed, wrote this letter to Mr. McCarthy:

October 31, 1906.

Dear Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 19th instant, addressed to Mr. Fielding, on the subject of the Farmers' Bank of Canada and the issue of a certificate to that bank to commence business under section 15 of the Bank Act, I notice recently a reference in the newspapers for a judgment given by Judge Anglin in a suit relating to this matter. In view of the decision rendered. I shall be obliged if you will let me know if you still desire the protest contained in your letter to be brought before the Treasury Board upon an application of the Farmers' Bank for a certificate to be considered.

Two things stick out in this letter, first, that up to that date there had been no consideration by the Treasury Board; second, that on the very day that the judgment was signed, and two days after the arrangement was come to upon which the judgment was given, we find the Finance Department in a hurry to invite Mr. Leighton McCarthy to take away this obstacle and remove it from the path of Mr. Travers. To say nothing more in the way of criticism this was a most peculiar letter to my mind. Mr. McCarthy tells the Finance Department that he will be up in a day or two to confer with them. Whether he comes up or not we find that on the 2nd of November he writes this letter to the Finance Department.

Dear Sir,—Referring to my letters of the 8th and 9th inst., with referenec to the application for a certificate made on behalf of the Farmers' Bank, I am advised by those who are instructing me that the claims made by them in the action brought have been settled by their subscriptions being taken up by some parties interested in the bank and refunding the money paid by the individuals or returning the notes which had been given. The objections which I made on their behalf to the issue of the certificates are, therefore, withdrawn. Would you mind, therefore, returning to me the papers which I forwarded to you.

Almost directly after that we find the Finance Department writing to Mr. Travers, on November 7, 1906:

Dear Sir,—Referring to my letter to you of the 2nd instant, inclosing copy of a letter addressed to Mr. Fielding by Mr. Leighton McCarthy by way of a protest to the granting of a certificate to your bank to commence business, I beg to state that I am advised by Mr. McCarthy that the objections which he made to the issue of a certificate have been withdrawn.

That also is significant. Then, on the 27th November, comes the application for the issue of the certificate. The Finance minister based his plea largely for not going behind Mr. Travers and his declarations in granting this certificate, upon the fact that he was associated with respectable individuals. Who said so? Mr. Travers. Did the Finance Minister inquire in any single instance whether any of these respectable persons was really associated with Mr. Travers? Nothing appears in the papers that he did. The Finance Minister says that Mr. Travers was buttressed by these respectable men. So Mr. Travers said. Did the Finance Minister take the trouble to inquire of any one of them whether they were buttressing Mr. Tra-

vers in these preliminary acts of his? Mr. Travers said that he was authorized to ask for a certificate to issue in order to enable the bank to do business. What evidence had the Finance Minister that he was so authorized? No one could give authority, but the subscribers meeting, or the directors elected at that subscribers' meeting. At the very moment when these are elected the provisional directors' functions cease entirely. One would have thought that the least the Minister of Finance could have asked was for Mr. Travers to show the resolution of his Board of Directors or of the subscribers by which they authorized him to apply for the issue of a certificate. The Minister of Finance did not do it. As a matter of fact no such authority was ever given to Mr. Travers. If he had taken the business precaution of asking for the resolution of authorization to Mr. Travers to make application for a certificate he would have had the minute book placed in his hands, and in that minute book he would have found no authorization at all. But the minister was above going to minute books or resolutions with the seal of the bank upon them. He would take the declaration of the man whom he had not met except about three days before, and he would make no inquiry. Everything, he concluded, was correct. Now, Sir, I make this contention that when Mr. McCarthy's letters and information came into the hands of the Finance Minister, when that suit and the plaintiff's demands therein came into his hands alleging what the Finance Minister says he had been informed had taken place in other cases on previous occasions, where everything looked apparently right on the surface, it was his duty to make some inquiry as to the doings of these provisional directors and of Mr. Travers. He, at least, I think, should have asked for the minute book of the proceedings of the provisional directors, and, Mr. Speaker, if he had asked for that minute book and had perused its first pages he would have found ample evidence on which to base a negative to Mr. Travers' proceedings from that moment onward, and he would have saved all this trouble that has arisen. The provisional directors began right. Here is their first resolution:

Moved by Mr. A. Fraser, seconded by Jas. Gallagher, that instructions be given to Mr. Travers that no note be accepted in lieu of cash for payments on stock and that no agent or sub-agent employed by him accept the same, but that the conditions set forth in the form of the application be adhered to on a cash basis unless otherwise specially authorized by the board.

That was carried on January 23, 1906. Later, on July 4, 1906, this motion appears:

Moved by Dr. John Ferguson, seconded by John Watson, that the amount of $10,000 on account of commissions for the sale of capital stock of the bank be paid to W. R. Travers.

And along side of that another one:

That the chairman of the board and the secretary-treasury of the board and W. R. Travers, general manager, be authorized to endorse all notes made in favour of the bank——

What for?

—for the purpose of raising money to make a deposit with the Treasury Board of the Dominion government.

There were the resolutions spread on the minutes of the provisional directors' meetings, and all that the minister had to do when these warnings came to him was to ask for these minutes. He could have had them, and if he had had them this trouble would not have occurred. But it went further. On October 8, 1906:

Moved by James Gallagher, seconded by John Ferguson, that the provisional directors——

I want the House to note how far this goes:

That the provisional directors execute a power of attorney to W. R. Travers for the purpose of endorsing all notes in their names as provisional directors and of signing their names to a note or notes for the purpose of raising funds to put up the deposit with the government, and we authorize the secretary to hand over all notes to W. R. Travers for said purpose.

Simple business precaution, especially when aided by the warnings to, and the premonitions of the Minister of Finance, by the statements of Mr. McCarthy, by the writ which was issued, by the result of that writ, would surely have advertised to the Minister of Finance that he ought to take a little trouble to look into this matter to the extent at least of having the minutes of the directors' meetings in his possession. When Mr. Travers was asked in court why this last resolution was passed he was frank enough to say: We could not raise the money in any other way. That is October 8th; on October 15, Mr. Travers took $100,000 odd of the notes of subscribers to the Trust and Guarantee Company, and made his loan personal of $81,000, and $80,000 of that went as a deposit as part of the $250,000 that was to be deposited to the credit of the Minister of Finance. But that was not enough. On October 22, he took other notes (not belonging to the subscribers to the bank), to the same company, raised a loan of $20,000, and had that by cheque sent to the credit of the Minister of Finance as a part of the $250,000 deposit. $100,000 of the $250,000 was not bona fide paid in cash by the subscribers; it was raised as a loan from notes they had given which might

be paid or might not be paid, but which were given absolutely in contradistinction to the doctrine of the Minister of Finance as well as to the express provisions of the Bank Act. Now, Sir, that evidence lay close at hand and was easily obtainable, and why in the world—can any one answer the question—with all these warnings, and with the means of getting the information, did the Minister of Finance not take the simple precaution to get it. Mr. Travers brought a stock list to the Minister of Finance, and he swore to it although the swearing was false. That was the stock list about which the Minister of Finance never asked the least question; he simply took Mr. Travers' statement that it was bona fide. Would it have been a difficult matter for him, to have asked Mr. Travers—about whom he knew nothing until three days before the certificate was granted—to kindly bring him the stock list as subscribed to by the subscribers, and if that list had been brought the evidence was all over it that the stock list which was handed in by Mr. Travers was a fake list. How was it done? Mr. Travers describes it—They had not enough money in the early subscriptions, and the early payments to make the deposit; they went to work and got notes from the subscribers, they discounted those notes and raised the money and they took the money thus raised, and to use their own language they spread it over the list of subscribers so that the man who had not paid a cent was credited with one or two or three thousand dollars as paid. John Jones subscribed 10 shares, paid 10 per cent thereon and gave his note for the rest, the note brought in a discount, and the amount of that discount was not written down to this man, but it was placed to another man who had not paid anything. That is the list that the Minister of Finance swallowed, that is the list he raised no question about, and all he would have had to have done was to ask for the original list, and he would find the evidence of the pencillings, and spreading on every page, but, he did not do it. There were officers and directors in that bank. How easy it would have been for the Minister of Finance if he had the least doubt, to write to some of these men and say: I find such and such a state of things, will you give me your view with reference to it. How quickly he would have got an answer from the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie). How quickly he would have got an answer from dozens and dozens of others. The Minister of Finance has very good financial friends in the city of Toronto; he could easily have written to any one of them, and they would have given him a proper estimate of what this matter amounted to, and what Mr. Travers amounted to. If he had written to any one of the members of the Bankers' Association of Canada they would have given him that information, and would have been glad to have given it. The Bankers' Association is a part of the machinery of the Bank Act, and is at the disposal of the Minister of Finance for information, and if anybody can get information on these things the associated bankers can. Lying there for a month were three cheques, to the credit of the Minister of Finance, one from the Trust Company, for $80,000, one for $20,000, and one I think for the other $150,000; there they were lying in the Bank of Montreal to the credit of the Minister of Finance. Are those things so hidden that bankers do not know what is there? Do you mean to say that the question would not arise: Why, if the Traders' Bank is the bank of the Farmers' Bank do we have cheques from the Trust Company, and the information did get to the banking association as I shall soon show, and the Minister of Finance could have had the information just as easily as not. Did he ever ask any one for it? Now, he read Mr. Travers' affidavit. Let me just recapitulate. Mr. Travers makes an affidavit as to the acts of incorporation. They are plain; they are written in the statutes; he could not make a mistake about those. He makes an affidavit with reference to the prospectus. The prospectus was there to answer for itself—that is all right. But he says:

> Now shown to me and marked exhibit 'D' to this my declaration is a list of the subscribers to the capital stock of the said bank correctly setting forth as to each subscription the name of the subscriber, his address, the number of shares subscribed for by him, the amount of such shares and the amount paid in thereon. Each of the said subscriptions is a bona fide subscription to the capital stock of the said bank.

Travers swore to that; that was a lie. Mr. Leighton McCarthy told the Finance Minister a month beforehand that that was not so; and yet the Finance Minister says, what could I do? I had to take Mr. Travers' declaration. Mr. Travers also swears:

> The provisional directors of the said bank on the said twenty-third day of October, 1906, caused $250,000 of the moneys so paid in and which actually had been received in respect of the shares of the capital stock of the said bank to be deposited in the Bank of Montreal to the credit of the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General.

Mr. Travers swore to that; it was an absolute falsehood. $100,000 of that was money that was not paid in by the shareholders, but was borrowed to make up the deposit under the condition that as soon as the Finance Minister let go the $245,000, this would be paid back, and it was.

An hon. MEMBER. At what interest?

Mr. FOSTER. 10 per cent interest and a bonus of $1,000; and if I had been a lender of money, I should have wanted that much or more on that kind of security.

Mr. AMES. Who lent it?

Mr. FOSTER. The money was loaned by the Trust and Guarantee Company, and the bonus went to that company, according to the evidence. Mr. Travers then swears:

I acted as secretary to the said meeting of subscribers holden on the said twenty-sixth day of November, 1906, and at the said meeting upwards of eighty subscribers were present in person.

According to the minutes of the bank 69 subscribers only were present in person.

The subscribers adopted by-laws for the bank, and elected nine directors duly qualified under the Bank Act to hold office.

They elected only eight directors, but a resolution provided that they should elect twelve. So that they did not elect the directors that were required by the law which they themselves declared necessary. Mr. Travers also swore:

The provisions of the Bank Act as to the subscribers to the capital stock of the said bank and the deposit with the Receiver General, and as to the notice of the said meeting of subscribers and the proceedings of the said meeting have been fully complied with and pursuant to the direction of the said meeting of subscribers and board of directors elected at such meeting, application hereby is made for the certificate of the Treasury Board to permit the said bank to commence the business of banking in accordance with the said Act.

The minute book of that meeting and of the directors shows no resolution authorizing an application for the Treasury Board certificate, which would have been made clear if the simple precaution had been taken of having a certified copy of the resolution or of the minutes. I have already spoken with reference to the stock list. So that all the things that were essential, that were sworn to by Mr. Travers, turned out afterwards to have been falsely sworn to. The Finance Minister says, I could not know that at the time. But he could have taken the precaution to get corroborative evidence which was at his hand and easily obtainable. That he did not do. He preferred to take a simple declaration of a man whom he had not met until about three days before.

Now I come to that wonderful 30th day of November. I do not think any more eventful day than that has for many years dawned upon the city of Ottawa. Business was done with hurricane haste. If the departments of this government always worked with such speed and alacrity, there would be no arrears in the government business of this country. On the 30th day of November an interesting number of people were in this city. Having made the deposit, having had the subscribers' meeting, Mr. Travers makes haste after the 27th of November to come to Ottawa for his certificate. With him came Mr. Hunter and Mr. Smith, who had been the secretary of the Provisional Board. Mr. Hunter came as the legal adviser of Mr. Travers. Mr. Smith came for a far different purpose. He had, figuratively speaking, blood in his eye or money on his heart, and he was to demand of Mr. Travers, before that Treasury Board certificate was got, that he should be paid $2,500, or worse would happen. He employed as his lawyers Guthrie & Pringle of Ottawa. Guthrie & Pringle put the claim before Mr. Hunter, who was acting for Mr. Travers. In the end Guthrie & Pringle settled Smith's claim by taking an I. O. U. for, $1,800 from Mr. Travers who also had to pay the cost, $100; and, to use the expressive phrase of Mr. Travers, 'I got rid of another difficulty.' When pressed to say why he should pay Mr. Smith, he supposed the reason was that Mr. Smith knew the fraudulency of the list, and that if he had told that to the Finance Minister, it would have been all up with Mr. Travers' application for the certificate of the Treasury Board. So that Mr. Smith received his $1,800 of hush money, Messrs. Guthrie & Pringle received their $100 of costs, Mr. Smith hied himself home, and Mr. Travers was happy once more. But a question arises here: Did Mr. Hunter, or did Messrs. Guthrie & Pringle know all the circumstances of the case when they pried that $1,800 of hush money out of Travers' pocket and into the pocket of C. F. Smith? Mr. Travers said they did. If so, that raises another interesting question. Now, all this was taking place on that 30th day of November. But here is a singular circumstance. On the 30th of November the Minister of Finance writes a letter to Mr. Travers. Mr. Travers says that letter was shown to Mr. Hunter. Mr. Hunter left this city on the night of the 28th of November. How did Mr. Hunter come to see the letter written by the Minister of Finance on the 30th of November—how did he come to see it two days before the 30th November? If I understood the minister aright this afternoon, I understood him to say that he had previously told Mr. Travers the nature of the letter he was going to send him. Then Mr. Travers must have had a conference with the Finance Minister, and my hon. friend must have intimated to him what he was going to require from him in the shape of a letter, and must have told him that he would send him a letter on that line. Then, Mr. Hunter, and

Messrs Pringle & Guthrie, who were both consulted about that letter, might have seen it two days before.

Mr. FIELDING. The letter was written on the date mentioned, the 30th November, and nobody could have seen it two days before. Mr. Travers came to my department in connection with the certificate and I asked that he be sent in. In the meantime I had drafted a letter to Mr. Travers, because I was not aware at the time that I could have a personal interview with him. When he came I discussed the matter with him along the lines I mentioned this afternoon, and I said to him that I was sending him a letter on the subject, and would like an answer. That was on the 30th of November.

Mr. FOSTER. Then my hon. friend had a conference with Travers previous to Travers receiving the letter, and yet the conference was on the 30th of November.

Mr. FIELDING. On the same day.

Mr. FOSTER. I take the minister's word, but if I take that, the other mystery is unsolved, for I find this letter written from Toronto on November 29th, 1906:

W. R. Travers, Esq.,
Russell House
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Travers,—Mr. Hunter called in this morning, and I was glad to learn that so far things are going on nicely, and trust you will have no trouble.

Mr. Hunter went over all the applications and informs me that they are in first-class shape, and that he would have no hesitation in exhibiting them if called for. At his request I inclose three blank checks out of the check book in case you have occasion to use them.

Wishing you success, I am,
Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) J. B. FITZGIBBON.

P.S.—Nesbitt has just called to inquire how things were going, and I have given him the gist of Mr. Hunter's report this morning.

So that on this 30th of November we have this interesting lot of business done. The Minister of Finance writes a letter to Travers in which, after regretting that he was not able to see him yesterday, which would be Thursday, the 29th—that was the date of the Budget speech I think—he says:

I was unable to meet you to consider your application for the issue of a certificate to authorize the bank to commence business.

Up then to November 30 the date of that letter, the Treasury Board had not had under its consideration the application for a certificate.

It was not the Treasury Board which was unable to meet Travers, but the Finance Minister. The Finance Minister takes the responsibility and no doubt is quite willing to take it. He goes on to say:

I shall be glad to see you to-day at my office at any time before one o'clock if you can call. Or I might be able to see you later, between four and five, at the House of Commons if that will be more convenient.

There is a phase of the matter which I should like to bring to your notice so that you may consider it at once. It has been represented to us that in some previous instances where an application was in all respects apparently regular, there was actually an evasion of the intention of the Bank Act in relation to the paid-up capital. We have been told that in some cases the subscribers did not actually pay in cash but gave notes to the provisional directors which were used to raise the money. On account of information of this kind, which has reached us in relation to a previous case, we deem it proper to scan very closely every application for a certificate which comes to us. I shall be glad to have an assurance that nothing of the kind has taken place in relation to the subscriptions for the Farmers' Bank, but that the amounts set forth in the application as having been paid up have in every case been bona fide cash payments.

That is the letter to Travers. In a note written the same day, after he had explained the circumstances and got the opinion of Guthrie and Pringle upon that letter, Travers replied:

Ottawa, November 30, 1906.

The Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Finance Minister, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 30th November, I have to say that in the case of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, the provisional directors did not raise the money in the way mentioned by you.

Did the minister take that as an answer to his question? Surely not. What was the minister's question? It was this:

I shall be glad to have an assurance that nothing of the kind has taken place in relation to the subscriptions to the Farmers' Bank, but that the amounts set forth in the application as having been paid up have in every case been bona fide cash payments.

He is told, not that this did not take place, but that the provisional directors did not raise the money in the way mentioned by him. And they did not, because in October and July they had given over the raising of money absolutely to Travers himself, and from that time forward Travers used their names. endorsed their notes to which he had signed their names, and got discounts in that way. Travers does not say that the money had not been raised in that objectionable way, but that the provisional directors did not do it. Did the Finance Minister take that as an absolute and definite answer to his question? If he did, I differ with him as to its being an answer at all. It is not an answer but an evasion which, though true in itself as

to the provisional directors, did not deny that the thing itself had been done as it really had been done by Travers himself.

Now, I asked my hon. friend to bring down the minutes of the Treasury Board meeting of the 30th of November. The minister brought down an extract, and the extract was that the Treasury Board had met and passed the application and had ordered the Treasury Board certificate to be granted. I then said to the Minister of Finance that it was not an extract I asked for, but the whole minute. And I got the whole minute. And the whole minute and the extract were exactly the same. Does the minister think that is an evasion?

Mr. FIELDING. I desire to say, there is a printed form for extracts from the Treasury Board minutes, and the return was made on that form. The moment the full return was asked for, I inquired, and found that that was the whole record for the day.

Mr. FOSTER. I have the two, and I will give them to the Finance Minister.

Mr. FIELDING. They are both the same.

Mr. FOSTER. No, one is the full minute and the other is marked in writing 'Extract.'

Mr. FIELDING. That is the usual form.

Mr. FOSTER. Printed; but this is written. Here you have it at page 27 of the Return, 'extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Hon. the Treasury Board, held at Ottawa, on the thirtieth day of November, 1906." It is not an extract; it is the whole minute: nothing else was done that day. Now, what I asked the minister was, at what hour was that Treasury Board held, and he refused to give me the hour. Why should the minister refuse that information?

Mr. FIELDING. I told my hon. friend I did not know.

Mr. FOSTER No, the hon. gentleman refused to give it. I refer him to 'Hansard' on that point. If he did not know, he had his office behind him and could easily find out. Why did I want to know that? In the interest of truth. The letter to Mr. Travers says: You may see me up to one o'clock at my office, or you may see me at the House of Commons any time after four o'clock. When did Mr. Travers see the Finance Minister? Was it in his office before one o'clock, or was it not until after four o'clock in the House of Commons?

Mr. FIELDING. I can answer that. It was in my office. I cannot give the hour, but, I should say, probably before the lunch hour. It was not in the House of Commons.

Mr. FOSTER. That is satisfactory. If the minister had told me that before—

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman (Mr Foster) did not ask it.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked what hour.

Mr. FIELDING. He asked what hour the Treasury Board met, but not at what hour I met Mr. Travers.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, there is not much difference between the two, is there?

Mr. FIELDING. So long as my hon. friend understands it. I give him the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister had given me this information, it would have been just as good for me as the hour of the Treasury Board. Now, I wish to point out something else. The Treasury Board Act says that the Treasury Board shall consist of the Minister of Finance and any five other ministers. If the Act is lived up to—and if any Act is lived up to, this should be—there will be six members of the Treasury Board. But, by the return I hold in my hand, only three ministers are reported to have been present at this meeting of the Treasury Board on the 30th of November. If that be so, there was not a majority. The ministers noted as present besides the Finance Minister are Sir Richard Cartwright and Hon. Mr. Brodeur. Now, what I want to ask the Finance Minister is this: Was the Treasury Board regularly called for that day, or is this what we would call a hole-and-corner meeting, got up hurriedly? And when it was called and these three members were there, were the facts of the case in reference to this application, as the Finance Minister understood them, laid before the Treasury Board for its consideration?

Mr. FIELDING. Does the hon. gentleman wish me to answer? I cannot say exactly how that particular Treasury Board was constituted. With regard to only three members being present, I shall be happy to show the hon. gentleman many occasions on which the Treasury Board business has been done with three members present. In that respect, there is ample precedent. What probably happened was that this Treasury Board took place at the Council. I wish to be very frank with the House about this matter. When there is abundance of time, the Treasury Board meets at my department, but we occasionally have a Treasury Board at the Council chamber where the members confer and agree upon what is to be done. But there are occasions, both with regard to matters of the cabinet and with regard to matters of the Treasury Board,

when it is not convenient or possible to get the members together, and you have to send information round and obtain the report in that way. My impression is that in this particular case the conference probably took place at the Council meeting that afternoon, but I would not speak definitely.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister does not say anything as to whether the precedent history of the matter was laid before the board.

Mr. FIELDING. The whole matter was probably discussed. As to what particular information was laid before my colleagues on that occasion I cannot say. Of course, they would ask for information and I would give it. I accept the full responsibility of advising my colleagues in this matter. They would ask my advice and I would give it.

Mr. FOSTER. That makes it all clear; we have now the modus operandi. I have only a few words more to say. The Minister of Finance says that the same evidence was accepted in this case as in other cases. I wish to ask whether there was any precedent case in which the circumstances surrounding an application were of the same nature as in this? The Finance Minister said: If I had denied this Treasury Board certificate, I should have been accused of not treating the farmers right. I do not think the Minister of Finance would take the position that, in order to parry criticism, or to keep himself from being wrongfully attacked, he should cease to perform his duty of guarding the interests of the shareholders which were confided to his trust. Which would the farmers like better—that he should make a thorough inquisition into this matter, and stop it on the demerits of the case and save them their money, or, for fear of criticism, should allow it to go through and them to be involved in this loss? There is only one answer to that question. It was the duty of the Finance Minister not to look at criticism one way or the other, but to perform his whole duty as the trustee for the shareholders, and that duty was to guard their rights. He says now: I have been deceived. When did the Finance Minister know that he had been deceived? He knew it, or had good reason to believe it, within twenty-four hours after he had granted that certificate, for there is the letter of Mr. Clouston, of the Bankers' Association, making the statement in black and white that he had reason to believe that this deposit was not a bona fide deposit and that therefore steps should be taken to prevent the bank going into operation. If, within twenty-four hours of issuing this certificate in 1906, the Minister of Finance knew that he had been deceived, what has he done up to the present time to punish the men who deceived him? Is it to go forth that in this administration men, in a matter of this kind, can combine and deceive the Minister of Finance, and by reason of that deception bring ruin upon hundreds and thousands of people, and yet the Finance Minister and the government not stir a hand to ferret out and punish the men who deceived him?

Why, Sir, Mr. Clouston wrote a letter on the very day that the Treasury Board issued the certificate. That came to the minister the next morning, the minister read it in his mail. Under that allegation by Mr. Clouston there was only one thing for the minister to do. He had given a cheque for $245,000 of the shareholders' money to Mr. Travers, and it was his duty simply to advise the bank not to honour that cheque, and to have written or telegraphed to Mr. Travers that he wanted to see him immediately, to have brought him here, and to have had that matter thoroughly explained before he allowed the shareholders' money to go into the hands of Mr. Travers. More than that, he knew that the associated bankers sent their man, Mr. Knight, up to Toronto, and Mr. Knight investigated in Toronto, and came to the conclusion that the deposit had been made with borrowed money. He telephoned Mr. Burn, Mr. Burn communicated with the department; and yet, with both Mr. Clouston and Mr. Knight, and the evidence standing out before him, he took no steps to collar that money and to prevent the bank from going into operation. If I am rightly informed, the bank did not open its doors to do business until the 2nd day of January, 1907. On the 18th of December, Mr. Knight made his report to Mr. Burn, and Mr. Burn presumably made his report to the Finance Department, and even then the Finance Minister did not do anything. The bank was not in operation, the money would have been saved, this gigantic series of mal-deeds would all have been impossible.

The minister says that the bank failed on account of bad management. Even though, he says, $100,000 of capital had been depleted, yet afterwards, he does not know quite when, the capital did begin to come in. Good management would have saved it, bad management was its curse. I go back a little further than that, and I say that a bad manager was the curse of that bank, a bad manager was the very man that could have been unmasked by my hon. friend and put out of business, because every transaction that he took in the formation of that bank was accompanied by perjury, and fraud, and misrepresentation. If the Finance Minister had taken hold of it and unmasked Mr. Travers and his operations, there might have been bad management, but it would not have been bad management by Mr. Travers, because Mr. Travers would have been impossible as manager of any

bank. There is where I think my hon. friend made a great mistake. Look at it. He had his own opposition to the extension: warning, premonition, No. 1; the other cases previously occurring in his mind, to his knowledge: warning No. 2; Mr. McCarthy's letters, and the judgment: warning No. 3. The appeals and conversations of my hon. friend from Halton, whose word I am bound to take, for this consideration, that while the Finance Minister is busy with many things, my hon. friend from Halton though a busy man, has less business, and would be more likely to follow this matter out in the interests of his constituents. So without any disrespect to the Minister of Finance, I would say that I am bound to think that my hon. friend beside me would not have made the mistake he has made in regard to his memory of those things. But Sir, will the Finance Minister tell me and tell this House that had no other warnings? I asked him again the question whether any of the officers of his department had had interviews and warnings. He never answered that.

Mr. FIELDING. I will answer at once. I certainly had no other warnings—I do not know what my hon. friend refers to—I had no warnings that have not been brought to the notice of the House in the discussions that has taken place.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, then. I will make what I think is a practical test of that question. My hon. friend has said that there is no work for a commission in this matter, the courts will do all the work that is necessary to be done. I deny that all the facts can be brought out in a police court examination. It does not seem to me that the most important part of the investigation into this business can be or will be taken up in the courts. There is a lot of information which lies at the very essence of this matter that the courts will not look into at all. And with reference to all that has taken place in granting the certificate, my hon. friend dismisses it with the simple statement that it is all a matter of record. It is not all a matter of record. I want to put the gravity of this case before my hon. friend and my right hon. friend. Up to this occurrence, the people of Canada had absolute faith that when the Minister of Finance granted a certificate for a bank to go into operation, everything was perfectly square. They had perfect faith. Have they now? It is absolutely shattered, and until something is done, and a thorough investigation is held, coupled with legislation wherever legislation is needed, to strengthen the preliminary operations, until the truth of the matter is brought out, this country will not have faith in any bank which is put into a position to do work through the Department of Finance of Canada. I believe it is absolutely necessary, no matter whom it hits or whom it hurts, to have a thorough investigation into everything connected with this matter. I would go further, and take in all the banks that have failed during the last four or five years, the curators' reports of which furnish strange reading to any person who will go through them.

I ask the government to grant that royal commission which my hon. friend has asked for in his motion, and I will bind myself to add material evidence in the line of the evidence of my hon. friend from Halton, if an opportunity is given me before that commission. There is other evidence to be brought out, give us a tribunal and we will bring it out. Who is to be hurt by granting this commission? Who can be injured? The government does not mind the expense of it. It is easy to get able men to carry it out; it can be carried out without great trouble and much time. What reason is there at all why it should not be granted? We ask that it be granted. There are questions after questions that we would like to ask the officers of the department, the Finance Minister and the members of the Treasury Board, and numerous others. If there was a tribunal before which these could be put, all the facts could be obtained. Why should we not have that information? It is not for the benefit of my hon. friend or of myself. It is not to pull one down and build another up, it is to get the absolute facts of the case? Why should we not have the commission?

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has said that his constituents are troubled over this matter of the Farmers' bank, many of them having become shareholders, many of them having deposits and many of them having suffered severe loss. The hon. gentleman says that it is expected that he shall do everything here that he is able to do. It is the right of every member of this House to keep himself squared with his constituents in any way that he legitimately can and perhaps this is not the only instance where men have occupied an hour or two of the time of the House in an endeavour to square themselves with their constituents at home. The hon. gentleman has said that the name of this bank—the Farmers' bank—won the confidence of the people of his constituency and of the country. It may be that there is something in that, but I take it that there was a great deal more in the prospectus that they issued to the public and in the representations made by smooth tongued and skilful canvassers who were engaged in the selling of the stock. I notice by the prospectus that one of the features of it is the statement of the large returns that have been made by Canadian banks in times past. I find a list of twelve

Canadian banks, the first of which is the Dominion bank. The prospectus says that the par value of the shares of the Dominion bank is $100, that at the time of the issue of this prospectus the selling price was $280 and that the dividend paid was ten per cent. Particulars are given with reference to the other Canadian banks showing substantial profits, a large increase in the value of the stock and also large dividends. Some particulars are also given as to a number of United States banks. The propectus also sets forth that:

Bank stocks, therefore, offer to the investor—

1. A profitable investment.
2. A safe investment.
3. An investment increasing in value.
4. An investment easily realizable.

I imagine that this prospectus induced many of the honest, hardworking farmers of Halton county to subscribe for the stock of this bank. The hon. member for Halton asks who is responsible for the loss and for the disaster that the failure of this bank has brought about. He does not directly answer his question but he makes the statement that the shareholders were innocent people. So they were innocent people; perhaps their innocence was greater in some instances than their wisdom. I have known in my own county, and in one instance in the county of Perth, where farmers just as innocent as these, subscribed for stock in cement and other manufacturing industries. They were told that the profit would be anywhere from 20 to 60 per cent. In some cases they mortgaged their farms to invest in these industrial stocks, but because of the bad management which existed in the businesses in which they had invested they lost their money. Yet, I do not think that the governments by whom the charters of these companies were granted were blamed for the loss.

The hon. member for Halton says that he was very uneasy as to what might be the result of the issue of this bank charter. That was very natural uneasiness. When the hon. gentleman says that one man in his riding, as I understood him, invested $22,000 in the stock of this bank, realizing as the hon, member for Halton did, that that meant not only the risk of the $22,000 actually invested but also the double liability making a total of $44,000, unless he were a very wealthy man, I would expect that the hon. member for Halton would be somewhat uneasy. I confess that at first sight it did appear to me that the statement of the hon. member for Halton that he had conferred upon more than one occasion with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and had given him certain warnings was the strongest evidence, or the only evidence that up to date had been produced to show any lack of precaution on the part of the Finance Minister. But when we look further into that matter what does it amount to after all? Being questioned by my hon, friend the Finance Minister as to why he did not submit his warning in writing, the hon. member for Halton said: I wanted to be very careful not to write or say anything that might blight the prospects of these people in their enterprise; I did not want to say anything in writing or verbally that might prevent this bank obtaining its certificate and going on to do business because there was a probability, or a possibility, that they might make their banking venture a success. That then was the position of the hon. member for Halton. He said: I being a shrewd business man and too cautious to invest my own money in that stock, naturally regret that my friends, no matter what their political leanings, are investing in it; I fear that they may suffer loss. Some of these shareholders living in my constituency are becoming alarmed but there is a larger number of them who apear to be perfectly satisfied. A smaller number may suffer loss, but on the other hand a larger number of shareholders in my riding would be put out and angry if I took any action that would prevent the completion of their enterprise or prevent the issuing of a certificate to the bank. Therefore, while I may speak to the Finance Minister and express to him my uneasy feeling in a casual way. I will be careful not to say anything that anybody might possibly regard as in any way injuring the interests of the subscribers or shareholders in that instittion. If that be the case, and I take it from the hon. gentleman's own words that that is exactly the case, then I say that his words to the Finance Minister did not constitute any warning whatever but a mere expression of uneasiness that this investment might not prove to be a profitable one. I would like to refer for a moment to the provisions of the Bank Act. I take it that the Bank Act, as it is upon the statute-book to-day, is not less stringent or less protective of the rights of the people than it has been for many years. I assume that the Bank Act as we have it upon our statute-books to-day is just as stringent in its measures and provisions as it was, for instance, when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) occupied the position of Finance Minister of this country. Sec. 13 of the Bank Act says:

So soon as a sum not less than five hundred thousand dollars of the capital stock of the bank has been bona fide subscribed, and a sum not less than two hundred and fifty thousand dollars thereof has been paid to the minister, the provisional directors may, by public notice, published for at least four

weeks, call a meeting of the subscribers to the said stock——

and then go on, organize and do business Sec. 15 of the Bank Act says:

No certificate shall be given by the Treasury Board until it has been shown to the satisfaction of the Board, by affidavit or otherwise, that all the requirements of this Act and of the special Act of incorporation of the bank, as to the payment required to be made to the minister——

The payment of $250,000 had in this case actually been made.

—the election of directors——

The directors had been elected in the regular way,

—deposit for security for note issue——

The required deposit of $5,000 had been made to the minister.

—or other preliminaries have been complied with——

The other preliminaries, so far as appeared by the affidavit, had all been complied with.

—and that the sum so paid is there held by the minister.

The $250,000 and the $5,000 had been so paid and were so held by the minister. So that as far as all the evidence made it appear, every single possible requirement of the Bank Act had been complied with. But, I am told that the affidavit which the Act stipulates may be accepted, and it is the only specific proof the Act mentions, was not sufficient and that further evidence ought to have been asked for. I claim that the position of the Minister of Finance in this respect is not different from that of the Provincial Secretary in the Ontario government or the Secretary of State in the Dominion government when a number of business men apply for a charter in the one case under the Dominion Companies' Act or in the other case to Mr. Whitney's government under the Ontario Company's Act. They show the particulars on printed forms furnished them for that purpose. They show the names of at least five shareholders, the names of the provisional directors, the amount of stock subscribed, the amount of cash paid in on the stock, and these statements are verified by affidavit of one of the promoters or interested parties. The member for North Toronto says that the minute books of the company might have been obtained and they would have furnished evidence that the certificate ought not to have issued. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) or any other man who has occupied the position of Minister of Finance in the Canadian government, whether in any single instance the minute book of a company has been asked for under similar circumstances?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Was there ever a case like this?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. NORTHRUP. When and where?

Mr. MILLER. There was no case different from this.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Name a single case like this.

Mr. FIELDING. My recollection is that there was no case of the minute book being required previous to this, although in a recent case I think we did require the minute book. I am safe in saying that in no case prior to this was the minute book required or demanded.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Was there ever a case like this before?

Mr. FIELDING. I think that substantially this case is not different from other cases before the board, except in one case where I know a certificate was granted without an affidavit at all.

Mr. MILLER. There were 250,000 good reasons in the shape of the $250,000 deposited to show the bona fides of the men engaged in the transaction. That was far better evidence than any affidavit as to the bona fides of these people. A quarter million dollars is not easily picked up, and there was no source whence the greater part of it could come than from the shareholders of the bank and from the shareholders of the bank it did come. Mr. Travers did not and could not put up $250,000 of his own money; it was obtained from the shareholders of the bank who had subscribed to the stock of the bank. The Minister of Finance has pointed out, and none can deny it, that at this time Mr. Travers had as good a reputation as a financier and man of integrity as has any member of this House. He had been manager of the important branch of the Merchants' Bank in Hamilton, and I am informed that when he left the employ of that bank he took with him from the general manager a splendid testimonial in the shape of a letter speaking highly of his integrity and financial ability. Long after the certificate had been issued and the bank opened for business, the government of Sir James Whitney showed their confidence in Mr. Travers and in the Farmers' Bank by depositing in that bank Ontario government funds to the amount of $25,000. Talk about a trusteeship; the Ontario government were trustees for this $25,000 of public money, and they deposited it in the Farmers' Bank, showing the confidence they had in the institution and in the men by whom it was managed. Mr. Travers, who at that time had the reputation of being an honest business man, was manager of the bank, and the

president at that time was Dr. Beattie Nesbitt, in whom, at least a large number of the people of Ontario had confidence. The Ontario government and Sir James Whitney had such confidence in him that they made him registrar in the city of Toronto. Therefore, not only had the general manager of the bank a good reputation at that time, but so had the president of the bank, and, in addition to that, some of the directors and shareholders were amongst the foremost business men of Ontario. The hon. member for Hastings asked was there ever such another case as this, and he proved there never was by his sarcastic laugh, and we were told by the hon. member for North Toronto that the letters from Mr. Leighton McCarthy should have aroused the suspicion of the Minister of Finance. Let us look at the letters. The first says that Mr. McCarthy is representing eleven subscribers of stock in the bank and on the 9th of October he writes:

My dear Mr. Fielding,—I beg to inclose the special endorsement upon a writ of summons in the High Court of Justice for Ontario, which will be issued.

This would seem to contradict the statement of the hon. member for North Toronto that the writ had issued because Mr. McCarthy says that the writ would be issued, and the inference is that when Mr. McCarthy obtained satisfaction for his clients the writ was withheld. But, Mr. McCarthy does not ask the Treasury Board not to issue the certificate; what he asks for is delay. Mr. McCarthy was acting for eleven shareholders whom he named, and 'for all other persons alleged to be subscribers for shares of the capital stock of the Farmers' Bank of Canada who may desire to come in and be parties to this action.' Apparently no other subscribers did come in and the eleven subscribers represented by Mr. McCarthy so far as we know were the only ones dissatisfied. The hon. member for North Toronto speaks of these eleven men having been bought up, which implies that they were bribed not to proceed with the action they intended to proceed with. Well, these men had subscribed for the stock of the Farmers' Bank, and I would not wonder that my hon. friend from Halton or some other equally cautious and shrewd man had advised them that their investment instead of being sure to be as profitable as they expected, was attended with certain risks.

They then thought it wise that they should withdraw, and if possible escape any liability. They engaged Mr. McCarthy. He proceeds to threaten, and possibly he may have issued a writ. The promoters of the bank say: We do not want any delay or litigation; we will go to these eleven dissatisfied shareholders, and we will give them back the money they have paid in, and take over their stock. These eleven subscribers had subscribed for stock to the value of $23,500, but they had only paid on that stock $6,530. So that all that the promoters of the bank had to do to stop the agitation of these eleven men was to raise $6,530, which they did, and took over their stock. Now, Mr. McCarthy's letter shows that eleven men out of a total of 557 subscribers were dissatisfied. There were at the same time 546 other subscribers who apparently were perfectly satisfied with the investment they had made, and were not making any trouble or asking for any relief. These 546 satisfied subscribers had subscribed stock to the amount of $476,500. Now, what were the irregularities pointed out in Mr. McCarthy's letter? The sole irregularities on the part of any person up to that time were that certain subscribers to the stock of the bank who had supposedly paid in $6,530 had not paid in all of that in money, but had paid a part of it in their promissory notes. Had these farmers and others, instead of giving their promissory notes to Mr. Travers, taken them to some bank and discounted them, and paid the money to Mr. Travers on their stock, they would not have been guilty, morally, legally or otherwise, there would have been no irregularities to point out, and no technical reason why they could have evaded their stock subscription. The hon. member for North Toronto asks: Would the Finance Minister in the transaction of private business, have invested $500,000 of private funds in the same careless way? I say, in reply to that, that the Minister of Finance did not invest one single dollar of that $500,000, and he was not in any way responsible for the investment of that or any part of it, to any subscriber of that stock. The man who was responsible primarily and above all was W. R. Travers, and what position did he occupy, and how did he obtain that position? He was general manager of the bank. He had not been made general manager by the Treasury Board or by the Finance Minister, but by the votes of the 557 shareholders, including the shareholders in the county of Halton. They are the men who had given to W. R. Travers the responsibility and the right of handling their money. The hon. member for North Toronto says that the Finance Minister was a trustee, or the Treasury Board were trustees, for the handling of the money, and the hon. member for Halton uses to some extent the same reasoning. He said that if the Treasury Board had refused to issue the certificate, then the $250,000 deposited with the Treasury Board would have been refunded, and could have been paid back to the shareholders. That is not the case. The $250,000 had been paid in by W. R. Travers. If the Finance Minister was a trustee at all,

or if the members of the Treasury Board were trustees at all, then surely they were trustees to those who had made the application for the $250,000 paid in, under the law, to the Treasury Board. But I direct the attention of the members of the House to section 17 of the Bank Act, which says:

In case no certificate is issued by the Treasury Board within the time limit for the issue thereof, the amount so deposited shall be returned to the persons depositing the same.

Who in this case was W. R. Travers? Then, subsection 3 of section 17 says:

In no case shall the minister be under any obligation to see to the proper application in any way of the amount so returned.

So not only does the Bank Act not say that the Treasury Board or the Finance Minister are trustees for the $250,000, but it takes especial care, in the plainest and most definite language, to say that they are not trustees for that $250,000, and cannot be so regarded. Then surely they cannot be held to be trustees for a single dollar of the money of the bank. The hon. member for North Toronto says that the hon. Minister of Finance could have had information and advice from the Canadian Bankers' Association, which would have put him upon his guard. I say that if the Bankers' Association, before the certificate was issued, had information which the Minister of Finance ought to have had, and which would have influenced him in the granting of the certificate, then they had not only a financial and a personal interest in seeing that the Finance Minister obtained that information in time to be of some use, but also a public duty in seeing that the information was given to him as quickly as possible. But the Bankers' Association, if they had that information, which I doubt, withheld it until after the certificate had been issued. I ask again if the hon. member for North Toronto, during the time he was Finance Minister, ever asked for the production of a minute book of a bank applying for a certificate or of any other financial institution applying for a charter or a license authorizing it to do business. We believe, and the people of this country believe, that the Minister of Finance is a very careful and capable official; but we do not claim that he is a seer or is omniscient. It is all right now, after loss has come, and there has been calamity, to endeavour to blame the Minister of Finance, it is all right to say that Mr. Travers made an affidavit that was utterly false in this particular, and that particular; but there was no possible way by which the Minister of Finance or any other mortal man could at that time have known that the statements contained in Mr. Travers' affidavits were not correct.

Suppose that this parliament had known years before the certificate was issued, as they know to-day, that Travers was not an honest man, what would have been the power of this parliament and the power of the Treasury Board? I say that the Banking and Commerce Committee, when the charter for this bank was being obtained, might very well have considered the character of the men who were promoting the scheme. I say that the members of this House, who were called on to adopt or reject the report of the Banking and Commerce Committee, might very well have considered the character and business ability and prospects of the men who were asking for incorporation. The Banking and Commerce Committee is composed of members on both sides, many of whom have large business experience, and all of whom have no doubt the interests of the people at heart. Of that committee my hon. friend from Halton is one of the most careful and efficient members. I say that that committee might have refused a charter of incorporation to Travers and his associates if it had any reason to doubt his character or ability. And after that committee had agreed to give these men a charter, the members of this House could still have refused to pass the Act. But when this parliament, under the advice of the Banking and Commerce Committee, did issue a charter to these people, it was beyond the power of the Treasury Board to withhold the certificate because of the character of the men applying for it.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Travers had nothing to do with getting the charter.

Mr. MILLER. It does not make any difference whether Travers had anything to do with getting the charter or not. The members of the committee or of this House can refuse a charter to any one applying for it, but the Treasury Board, once a charter is given, cannot refuse a certificate after the parties have complied with the conditions of their Act of incorporation. In this case, the conditions were complied with to the letter in every particular.

Mr. NORTHRUP. We say that they were not.

Mr. MILLER. I say further, suppose the Treasury Board, with its six members, had taken upon itself to say that they had information as to the character of these men or their lack of business ability and would not issue to them the certificate to enable them to do business, what would have happened? Would this House have been disposed to accept that position of affairs? Would this House be willing to delegate to any set of six men, no matter who, the right to pass judgment on the character or ability of any group of men to whom this House had given an Act of incorporation? In this

case Travers was a member of the Conservative party, Dr. Nesbitt, the president of the bank, was also a prominent member of that party; and if the Treasury Board had gone out of its way to refuse a certificate to these men, the Minister of Finance and the other members of that board would have been accused of having been actuated by political reasons in withholding that certificate.

I do not think that anything can be accomplished by a Royal Commissioin. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has had the privilege ot examining all the correspondence and all the documents in this whole matter, and I do not think that any commission could make a more searching inquiry into the facts than he has done. Hon. gentlemen opposite will agree that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is well able to make an investigation and examine every bit of evidence submitted to him, which is all that could be submitted by this House to a Royal Commission.

There is a lesson to be learned in this, and that is that we, as a parliament, should be more careful when we come to frame a new Bank Act, and I refer hon. members opposite to the new Act drafted by the Minister of Finance. If they will compare the sections of that new draft Act with the parallel sections of the present law regarding the issue of certificates, they will find that the hon. minister has taken many precautions to guard the interests of the public more fully than they are in the present law. But I repeat that every member of this House, who was a member of it when the old Act was passed, is equally responsible with the Minister of Finance for the Act as we have it to-day.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Perhaps it is just as well that I should read the amendment before the House, as it is some time since any reference has been made to the real question at issue. The amendment is as follows:

This House is of opinion that a Royal Commission should forthwith issue to inquire into and investigate the incorporation and organization of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, and the granting of a certificate by the Treasury Board permitting the said bank to issue notes and commence business, and all circumstances connected therewith and generally to inquire into and investigate the operation and efficiency of the Bank Act in relation to the affairs and transactions of the said bank.

I am free to admit that when an amendment such as this is brought before the House, the responsibility rests on those who bring it forward of making out a prima facie case to justify an investigation. But it would be idle to expect members on this side to prove the point they wish to have investigated. Of course, however, in order to compel even the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Miller) when he comes to read the amendment, to vote for it, as I hope he will, it is necessary that we should show that there is something worth investigation in the transactions referred to. What are the circumstances which we say justify an investigation? The people of this country, through their representatives, have provided that after parliament has granted a charter to a bank, that bank has no power to carry on its business until it has complied with certain formalities. But after it has complied with these formalities, the Treasury Board is allowed to give it a certificate, and on that certificate—and that alone—can it begin business. A great deal has been said about the shareholders, and I do not intend to add to what has been said on their behalf. But what about the depositors? The Minister of Finance may possibly say that he was led astray by Travers, the representative of the shareholders? But what has he to say about the unfortunate depositors throughout the land? What has he to say of those men who were in comfortable circumstances a few months ago and who are to-day in the depths of poverty because the hon. minister blundered. In my own constituency, I met an old soldier, about 75 years of age and his wife of the same age. This man had worked hard during 20 years since leaving the army and accumulated a little property, but he had deposited his savings, some $11,200, in the Farmers' Bank in March last, and all he had left after all these years of industry, was $3. It is such people as those, people who put their money into this bank relying on the Minister of Finance seeing that the law was complied with to the letter, who say, surely we are entitled to an investigation. I am not implying that the Finance Minister himself was corrupt in any respect; but I do say that if he has any proper regard for his own reputation, he should be the first man to ask for a complete investigation into all the circumstances which, to say the least are most extraordinary.

Now, there are certain facts which cannot be gainsaid. They have been laid before the House very fully by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), but perhaps I may be allowed, briefly to refer to some of them. In the first place, as I said before, the responsibility is, by statute, thrown on the Treasury Board. The statute provides that $500,000 must be subscribed and $250,000 paid up, bona fide payments in cash, and certain other conditions complied with without the performance of which the Treasury Board has not the power to grant a certificate. Now, I would like to ask the Finance Minister, sitting in this House to-night: If he had known on the 13th day of November, 1906, all that he knows on this 15th day of March, 1911, about the state of affairs at the former

date, would he have granted that certificate to the Farmers' Bank of Canada? The hon. gentleman declines to answer——

Mr. FIELDING. I do not decline to answer. I thought it did not require an answer. Certainly, with the information now available, I would not have issued the certificate.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Well, we have got that far. The hon. gentleman admits on this 15th day of March, 1911, that he issued a certificate under such circumstances that, had he known——

Mr. FIELDING. We can all be wise after the event.

Mr. NORTHRUP. But the Finance Minister was the one man who had it in his power to have the information that would make him wise before the event. And I desire to call attention to the care, persistence and assiduity with which the hon. gentleman prevented his own eyes being opened despite every effort to that end on the part of those who were in possession of the facts. That is the reason why we are entitled to an investigation, to find out what hypnotic power was around the Finance Minister on that unhappy 30th of November, 1906. It was well known that those connected with the bank had had a great deal of difficulty in getting the required stock subscribed. The time of the charter had been extended, I think, twice. So, if ever there was an occasion on which the Finance Minister, on the merits of the case, might well have been justified in looking into the facts, it was this case. But, while proceedings were on, a letter was received by the department from one of the leading lawyers of the city of Toronto; I presume the Finance Minister read this letter—or he did not. Might I ask: Did the hon. gentleman take the trouble to read that letter and the information——

Mr. FIELDING. The information was conveyed to me by my officials in substance.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Then, we find, in substance, the Finance Minister knew that the writ was about to be issued. The names of all the parties were given, some 10 or 11 of them; the grounds of the action were fully set out in the endorsement of the writ, which I will read in a moment, and also stated in the letter itself. In the letter it is stated that this action was to be brought. It says:

I have received information that the alleged subscribers for shares paid a large sum of money in cash and have signed notes for other large sums of money, and that the persons professing to act in the name of the bank have transferred notes and received the proceeds, and that a deposit either has been made or will be made of the cash received and the proceeds of these notes, or sufficient amount to make up $250,000.

This is information coming from a reliable source. He goes on:

I wish you to have the kindness to acknowledge the receipt of this protest against the granting of a certificate so that I may advise the shareholders who are disputing their liability, and I would be pleased to go to Ottawa upon any appointment you may make for the further consideration of this matter.

That was written on October the 19th. The department hurried to reply to it four days later—they acknowledged the receipt of the letter. On the 19th of October, then, this writ had not been issued. On the 31st of October a letter was written by Mr. Boville, the Deputy Minister of Finance, to Mr. McCarthy, in which he said:

Referring to your letter of the 19th inst.——

The one I have just mentioned.

—addressed to Mr. Fielding, on the subject of the Farmers' Bank of Canada and the issue of a certificate to that bank to commence business under section 15 of the Bank Act, I notice recently a reference in the newspapers for a judgment given by Judge Anglin in a suit relating to this matter. In view of the decision rendered, I shall be obliged if you will let me know if you still desire the protest contained in your letter to be brought before the Treasury Board upon an application of the Farmers' Bank for a certificate to be considered.

Was a more remarkable letter ever written? A leading lawyer states facts which the minister and his deputy should have been delighted to receive, if they were facts, and which, if true, disentitled the Farmers' Bank to receive this certificate. This letter made it the duty, beyond all question, of the deputy minister to investigate. Because no one will suggest that when the Banking Act provides for a Treasury Board consisting of the Finance Minister and five of his colleagues, it intends that five wooden Indians with a rubber stamp can transact the business of the Treasury Board. There must have been a presumption somewhere that a little intelligence would be used. And when parliament requires certain conditions as prerequisite to a certificate being issued, surely it expected that the ordinary—I do not suggest extraordinary—amount of intelligence and industry would be displayed by the officials in carrying out that law. Yet, after this extraordinary statement, the only letter of inquiry is to ascertain if, the suit having been settled, this lawyer is prepared to withdraw the protest he had entered for these 10 or 11 gentlemen. But not a thought of the hundreds of shareholders and thousands of possible depositors, but only of the few individuals whose names happened to be mentioned in that writ. It may not be out of place to give a few of the principal

charges made, to show how serious this matter was. This is the endorsement on the writ:

This action is brought by the plaintiffs on their own behalf and on behalf of all other alleged shareholders of the Farmers' Bank of Canada who dispute the validity of alleged contracts to take share of the capital stock of the Bank, and who allege that they were induced to subscribe for shares through fraud and misrepresentation, and who may request to be joined as plaintiffs. And the plaintiffs' claim is: (1) for a declaration that the alleged contracts are void: (2) for the rescission of alleged contracts to take shares of the capital stock of the Farmers' Bank of Canada; (3) for an accounting for the money or promissory notes received—or alleged to have been received—in the name and on behalf of the provisional directors of the bank; (4) for an injunction; (5) for a receiver; and (6) for administration. And the following are the particulars of the plaintiffs' claim.

1. That the Farmers' Bank of Canada was incorporated by special Act of the parliament of Canada, passed on the 18th day of July, 1904.

2. The defendants, James Gallagher, John Watson, John Ferguson, Alexander Fraser and Alexander Shepherd Lown, were appointed by the said Act to be the provisional directors of the bank.

Then it recites how the bank was proceeded with, prospectuses issued and stock-books opened. And these are the charges of impropriety:

11. The plaintiffs and others subscribed to shares, and the plaintiffs allege: (1) that the provisional directors who professed to act for and in the name of the bank had no lawful power or authority to receive subscriptions for shares or to accept them; and (2) that the subscriptions for shares which were procured from the plaintiffs and others were procured through fraud and misrepresentation, and the plaintiffs allege, amongst others, the following particulars of fraud, namely:

1. That the agent in procuring the subscriptions for shares falsely represented that persons had subscribed for a larger number of shares than they had in fact subscribed for, and the following are examples of such false representation, namely: (a) that Robert Noble whose name is entered in the prospectus as one of those who had consented to be a director, had subscribed for shares to the amount of $10,000, whereas he had in fact only subscribed for shares to the amount of $3,000; (b) that John Sproat had subscribed for shares to the amount of $10,000, whereas he had in fact only intended to subscribe for shares to the amount of $1,000, and that he was induced to sign an application in the belief that it was filled up for $1,000 and that the general manager afterwards claimed that it was a subscription for $10,000, and the said John Sproat then repudiated the entire subscription; (d) that James Murray had subscribed for shares to the amount of $10,000, whereas he had in fact only subscribed for shares to the amount of $1,000.

(e) That Dr. Stewart was subscribing for shares to the amount of $10,000, whereas he was not in fact subscribing for any shares; and other false representations of a similar character were made by the solicitors and agents in reference to alleged subscriptions of other persons.

Then there is a charge with regard to Major Beattie, which was read before. Then there are a number of attractive inducements held out, and then it is alleged that actions and proceedings were taken, and so forth. Now surely there were charges enough to put any treasury board on its guard, charges explicitly made, and charges which went to court; and when we find that on the 19th of October the writ had not yet been issued, and that on the 31st, the Deputy Minister of Finance could write that the judgment had been given which, as a matter of fact was given on the 27th of October, and when we find all these allegations of fraud against the provisional directors and general manager, that when the writ was not issued on the 19th of October, such haste was made that the judgment was entered on the 27th of October, and the judgment itself recites as follows:

And it appearing that the said plaintiffs John Sproat, George Castle, William A. Dixon, William McLean, Finlay McCallum, Robert Hume, James Murray, George Denoon and John McLeod, have assigned and transferred their applications for the issue of shares of stock of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, and their right to shares in accordance with the said applications, to one William J. Lindsay, and that the claims of the said plaintiffs last above named, and also the obligations and liabilities of the said plaintiffs, have ceased——

2. It is ordered and adjudged that this action be and the same is hereby dismissed out of court without costs.

Now, Sir, if a deputation had come from Toronto with a brass band to serenade the Finance Minister, and had come with the express purpose of calling his attention to the fact that these charges of fraud had been made by Mr. McCarthy and had been substantiated, they could not have given a better evidence of the fact than this judgment which was referred to by the Deputy Minister of Finance in his letter of the 21st of October; and after these people had been settled with, and after these charges of fraud had been made, the minister simply inquired whether the individual whose clients had made these charges and who had been settled with, wanted to press this protest; but that the minister owed any duty to the shareholders or to the people of Canada, never even seemed to have entered his mind. Well, we find then that Mr. McCarthy received back his papers, and there was an interval of time, and then Mr. Travers sends in his application for a certificate and makes his declaration on the 27th of November. Now when the minister had seen the endorsement in this writ, and when there were 8

or 10 plaintiffs in that case whose names were before him, and when Mr. Travers on the 27th of November, this judgment having been entered on the 27th of October, makes his sworn declaration, that on which the minister gave, and could only give, the certificate, would it be believed that neither the minister, nor the Treasury Board, nor anybody in the department took enough interest in the proceedings to read the declaration of Mr. Travers to find out whether these men were still on the list given by him as shareholders on the 27th of November. If he had, he would have found their names still there, and then surely if he had so learned, he would have taken some steps to prosecute the man who had perjured himself in making that declaration. If the minister had only taken the trouble to read the papers put before him by Mr. McCarthy, the papers on which alone he granted the certificate, he would have found that the applicant was a perjurer, and he would surely have been justified in refusing to give to a perjurer a certificate to do business, and all this calamity, and all this loss and suffering which has been entailed on many people of this country, would have been saved; but all this exists to-day because the minister declined to take the trouble to read these papers, or if he did read them, declined to convey the information to the Treasury Board. On the 27th this declaration was made, and it would seem that Mr. Travers came post haste to Ottawa, and apparently a little deputation with him, and if we are to believe what was said by the hon. member for North Toronto, he was here on the 30th of November. Now it is a peculiar thing that the depositors' money had been paid into the Bank of Montreal about a month before. On the 23rd of October the money was paid into the Bank of Montreal, then suddenly on the 30th of November, when the minister was up to his eyes with his budget speech, Mr. Travers and his friends came down here, though it has been said that they had been here for two or three days already; at all events, on the 30th of November, when there was still plenty of time—the certificate did not require to issue until the 18th of January—on the 30th of November there was such urgency that this certificate should be issued, that that very day the minister, in his bustle, and hurry, and excitement, writes to Mr. Travers, and let us see what the minister wrote on the 30th of November to Mr. Travers:

Dear Sir,—I regret that owing to pressing engagements yesterday, arising out of the budget, I was unable to meet you to consider your application for the issue of a certificate to authorize the Farmers' Bank of Canada to commence business. I shall be glad to see you to-day, at my office, at any time before one o'clock, if you can call. Or I might be able to see you later, between 4 and 5, at the House of Commons, if that will be more convenient.

There is a phase of the matter which I should like to bring to your notice so that you may consider it at once.

'A phase of the matter,' only that and nothing more.

It has been represented to us that in some previous instances where an application was in all respects apparently regular, there was actually an evasion of the intention of the Bank Act in relation to the paid-up capital. We have been told that in some case the subscribers did not actually pay in cash, but gave notes to the provisional directors which were used to raise the money. On account of information of this kind, which has reached us in relation to a previous case, we deem it proper to scan very closely every application for a certificate which comes to us. I shall be glad to have an assurance that nothing of the kind has taken place in relation to the subscriptions for the Farmers' Bank, but that the amounts set forth in the application as having been paid up, have in every case been bona fide cash payments.

Now is it conceivable that, unless there is something which we do not know, which is not before the House, and which we would like to investigate, is it conceivable that after receiving such an extraordinary endorsement of a writ from Mr. McCarthy, that when Mr. Travers was applying for his certificate, when he had put in his declaration, the minister fails to read the declaration for fear he might find the list of shareholders which would show the declaration was false, he writes to Mr. Travers and he is so afraid of this financial magnate, that he actually fails to refer to any charges made against his bank, and in the most timid way intimates—what? He intimates that: My attention has been called to the fact that we have been fooled by these declarations before; this is not the first time we have been fooled, we are alive now, we are alert to-day, and we are determined that we will not be caught againt by a false declaration, we will check your declaration by asking you whether it is true or not. I wonder if an investigation would not be justifiable, even to find out the process of logic by which the minister thought he was going to get the truth of a statutory declaration by asking the man who made it whether it was true or not. I think the amendment might be altered so as to give the committee power to inquire into the simplicity of the Finance Minister, to inquire into the reasons of the Finance Minister for making this bargain with Mr. Travers. It is no wonder that we wonder at his capacity for making bargains. But that is not all. This letter was written to Mr. Travers asking him for an answer, and as the member for North Toronto pointed out, the Finance Minister did not even get what he asks for. He was

apparently assiduous in his care to ask a question that would be easy for Mr. Travers to answer, and Mr. Travers did not even answer that question. Now the minister ventures to intimate that in the case of the Farmers' Bank of Canada the provisional directors did not raise the money in the way mentioned by you. That is the kind of close, rigorous cross-examination and checking of the affidavit that the Finance Minister enters upon; he decides that the certificate must be given and so it was given. We have really nothing to do with the Finance Minister in this case except that he is chairman of the Treasury Board and except in so far as the correspondence shows that he acted. Our charge is not against the Finance Minister; we want to investigate what took place before the Treasury Board. What has been said by the Finance Minister?—It's not fair to say that the Treasury Board knew anything about the charge which was made.

An hon. MEMBER. He took the responsibility.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It is all very well for the Finance Minister to say that he took the responsibility. He might do that had the statute put it in his power, but the statute says that the Treasury Board shall do so and so. When the statute says the Treasury Board that does not mean the Finance Minister, and when it says the Finance Minister that does not mean the Treasury Board. So, we have first the Finance Minister deliberately shutting his eyes to all the information given him, then we have him writing Travers not saying a word to him about this case, but referring to some suppositious case in days gone by, we have been calling attention to the fact that he had been deceived by declarations heretofore, he asks a question which is not answered, and then runs off to the Treasury Board. He does not even know where he met them, he could not tell whether he met them in his office, or in the council chamber, or where it was, but in some way he met these worthy gentlemen and the Treasury Board agreed to issue this certificate. One would have thought that the Minister of Finance would have been anxious about that certificate. Not he. The very next day he found a letter from Sir Edward Clouston, president of the Bank of Montreal and head of the Bankers' Association, and Sir Edward Clouston puts his case very clearly. Surely a man in the position occupied by Sir Edward Clouston is entitled to a little consideration and respect when he makes a serious charge.

Mr. NORTHRUP.

Canadian Bankers' Association, incorporated 1900.

Montreal, November 30, 1906.

T. C. Boville, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

Farmers' Bank of Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—In connection with the application of the Farmers' Bank of Canada for the usual certificate from the Treasury Board, I have reason to believe that the money lodged, or to be lodged, at Ottawa as stock subscriptions, cannot be regarded as paid-up capital, and that a large proportion of the amount necessary to the obtaining of a certificate is a loan made upon the promise of its payment when returned by your department.

That surely is a specific enough charge.

Permit me to request that, if only for the protection of the public——

Like myself, he has a feeling for the unfortunate depositors.

—the Treasury Board will exercise its right to refuse to issue a certificate if it thinks best so to do, until a thorough investigation has been made into the circumstances stated herein.

When the Finance Minister received that letter, as my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) pointed out, what in the world was there to prevent him from stopping the payment of the $245,000 cheque and demanding back that certificate which had been obtained by fraud? If the general manager had refused to give it back, clearly there are courts of law in the land. He could not possibly be allowed to keep it under such circumstances, and, having obtained this certificate by fraud and perjury, it is not to be imagined that the courts were powerless to cancel the certificate. The Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board had ample knowledge from Sir Edward Clouston that the whole institution was a fraud, that they were not entitled to the certificate, and that therefore the certificate which the Treasury Board wilfully and knowingly gave was a certificate that was not justified by the law of the land. Now, the case would seem to be so reasonably clear so far that an investigation is a small matter. The fatuity with which the Minister of Finance seemed to have followed all the directions of this man Travers is most remarkable. It was not very long after that that the minister received a letter from a very honest young man. At page 29 of the Return we find the following letter addressed to the Deputy Finance Minister:

The Farmers' Bank of Canada,
Milton, April 7, 1907.

T. C. Boville, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Will you kindly give me your opinion as to the following: Our general man-

ager sends to the different branches lists of notes given in payment of our capital stock. These notes he makes the managers put through as discounts, crediting the amount to H.O. This is figured in the government return as paid-up capital and circulation issued to that amount. If I read the Bank Act correctly, section 76, he is asking us to do what is not right. As I do not wish to do anything contrary to the law I should be much obliged if you give me the ruling on it. With many apologies for troubling you.

G. VANKOUGHNET,
Manager.

That is written on April 17th and gives such a shock to the department that it is two weeks before they recover. On May 1, a reply is sent to Mr. Vankoughnet as follows:

Finance Department,
Ottawa, May 1, 1907,

G. Vankoughnet, Esq.,
68 Howard avenue, Toronto.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 17th ultimo.

I must apoligize for the delay in replying. Parliamentary business at this time in the session takes precedence over other duties.

While it is not deemed expedient to enter into correspondence at this stage, the matter referred to by you is of sufficient importance to warrant further inquiry. This will shortly be made. I should like to have a copy of any of the notes.

T. C. BOVILLE,
Deputy Minister of Finance.

Well, he gets his copy. That was written on May 1, and the manager, unlike the department, answered promptly on May 3:

Farmers' Bank of Canada,
Milton, May 3, 1907.

T. C. Boville, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I have received your letter of 1st instant and inclose as requested one of the notes which I referred to in my letter to you of 17th ult.; when we renewed these notes we dated them 2nd Jany., '07, or later, and made them payable at this office.

The amount under discount at this office 30th April was about $111,885.

G. VANKOUGHNET.

I looked all through the book carefully trying to find any further comments, but that note seems to have been a crusher. Apparently there is no further correspondence between Mr. Vankoughnet and Mr. Boville or the Minister of Finance. But we have the fact then that on the 3rd May that letter was written and received on the 4th May giving the minister this information. The letter of Mr. Vankoughnet told about notes being discounted at his office by the manager and the proceeds credited to the head office and he wanted to know whether this was in accordance with the law of the land. He stated that the amount under discount in his office was $111,885. In that one little office in Milton the Finance Minister knew that on the 4th May, 1907, there were $111,885 in discounts of note which had been given for the capital stock. Now, in the meantime not only had Mr. McCarthy questioned it, but Mr. Knight had been very busy. Some demands have been made and so the department is screwed up to the point of venturing to ask for another Return from their friend Travers, and they got it. We have it here on page 35 of this Return. There the minister is told that:

The portion of the $375,473 paid-up capital of the bank, as per Return of March 30, 1907, represented by promissory notes of the shareholders, held by the bank, amounts to $59,110.

That is the sworn declaration of the general manager. On the 10th May there was received by the Minister of Finance the sworn declaration of W. R. Travers that the total amount of these notes held by the bank was $59,000, while the minister had under his thumb the letter from Mr. Vankoughnet, the manager at Milton, saying: 'I have in my branch notes under discount to $111,885, my conscience smites me and I appeal to you as Minister of Finance to let me know if I am doing what is wrong.' How can this House account for the fact that away back in May, 1907, the Minister of Finance had it proved up to the hilt by documents in his own possession that Travers had perjured himself again? Where was the difficulty in bringing this bank to its senses? What possible use could there be in getting bank returns month after month from a man who already had committed, deliberate, wilful, ridiculous perjury? The Minister of Finance does not come before the House and say: I laid that before the Treasury Board, I was over-ridden, they would not listen to me, but he comes here and says: I take all the responsibility. Does he appreciate the responsibility to the widows and orphans of this country who have suffered because of the actions of two classes of men—those who have robbed the people and are now represented in the penitentiary, and those who have failed in their duty to enforce the law of the land—and who have refused to take a single step to save the shareholders and the depositors?

Surely if ever there was a case which would justify investigation it is this, and if ever there was a man who would hail with joy the opportunity of investigation it is the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance must not forget that if in the face of this extraordinary evidence showing the knowledge brought home to him again and again and again and refusal on his part to act, he calls his supporters in and votes down an amendment asking for investigation into the circumstances which

led to the issue of this charter, he may not be surprised if strong comments are made in the country and perhaps very great injustice done to himself. There may be a perfectly honest explanation of all this, and I do not say there is not, but I do say that if the Minister of Finance refuses to give men an opportunity to believe the simple, innocent, plain, convincing facts, he cannot be surprised if people draw their own conclusions which perhaps would not be gratifying or complimentary to him. Now, Sir, the last speaker (Mr. Miller) said that the Treasury Board had to give the certificate, and that the very best guarantee that all was well was the presence of the $250,000 deposit. Imagine a man, in the face of what has taken place saying that that is any guarantee. What are you to think of that for logic? Why should this House be compelled to waste time listening to a man who in the face of what has taken place in regard to the Farmers' Bank would deliberately tell this House in the year 1911 that the best guarantee that could be had was the presence of this $250,000. I think, Sir, that the Treasury Board would be bound to grant a certificate to the bank if after making all due inquiries they were satisfied the provisions of the Act had been complied with, but they made no inquiry in this case and they simply wrote a letter to the Justice Department in which they invited just the answer they got. Why they should have gone to the Justice Department at all I do not know; perhaps it is because they always do. An the question submitted to the Justice Department was a peculiar one. Again and again attention had been called to the fact that there was something rotten in the state of Denmark and instead of looking into the actual facts, on the 28th of November a letter was written to the Deputy Minister of Justice which reads:

E. L. Newcombe, K.C.,
Deputy Minister of Justice.

Dear Sir,—I beg to inclose herewith a file of papers, being an application from the Farmers' Bank of Canada for a certificate to commence business under sections 13-17 of the Bank Act. Kindly advise me if on the papers submitted such a certificate may immediately issue.

Here is the Department of Finance appealing to its own solicitor as plain as words can: For Heaven's sake can we give the certificate; say so if you can. And Mr. Newcombe who is an astute lawyer gave them back the letter they desired and it was to this effect:

Ottawa, Nov. 28, 1906.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 28th inst. and of the inclosed papers, being the application from the Farmers' Bank of Canada for a certificate to commence business under sections 13-17 of the Bank Act, and papers in support thereof.

You ask me to advise you if on the papers submitted such certificate may legally issue.

He is very careful to repeat their question; he takes no responsibility.

In reply, I beg to state that the statements in the statutory declaration of Mr. Walter R. Travers are sufficient, if they are accepted, to show compliance with the statutory provisions, and that the evidence thus afforded is such as the Treasury Board may lawfully accept under the Act, and thereupon issue to the bank a certificate under section 14 of the Act. Papers returned herewith.

E. L. NEWCOMBE,
Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. FOSTER. The opinion was given on the same day as the request for it.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Given the same day, November 28. If it were an ordinary case would not any one say that the client had appealed to his solicitor to get just the opinion that was wanted, and that the solicitor gave the opinion that suited them and still kept his own skirts clear because he is careful to say that the declarations of Travers were sufficient 'if they are accepted.' Now why did the Deputy Minister of Justice say to the Finance Minister: 'if you accept these statements.' And even if the Minister of Finance had not been suspicious before was not that sufficient to put him on his guard when a keen, shrewd lawyer like the Deputy Minister of Justice uses such an expression as that. But, the Minister of Finance is perfectly satisfied and at once hies himself forth to get a certificate for Mr. Travers. I do not propose to go into the question which has been discussed so ably by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) but I may say that there were a couple of subsequent suspicious incidents; one in connection with this transaction in New York city when it must have been perfectly evident to the Minister of Finance through the Finance Department that the Farmers' Bank had become a perfect swindle. I can quite understand that directly under the Banking Act there was nothing which allowed the government—inasmuch as there is not an official inspection—to step into the Farmers' Bank and take hold of the business merely because they found them hawking $150,000 deposit receipts around New York and unable to get a bidder, and when they found the manager going over to Syracuse with $150,000 in bills in his pocket to try and buy out an insolvent company. With these facts to their knowledge it is quite true they had no more power to step in under the Banking Act and take possession of the bank than they would have to step into the bank

of Montreal. But, they had all the power they needed, and under the circumstances all they had to do was to recognize they had blundered innocently or intentionally in issuing a certificate that never should have been issued. They have perjured declarations received from the general manager of the Farmers' Bank and it would not have taken long to obtain authority to close up the bank when the general manager was liable to be put behind the bars of Kingston penitentiary for a perjured declaration which was in possession of the government. In view of that perjured declaration they had the power to ask for a statement from the bank at any time, and they had learned enough to know that Travers could not possibly put in a true statement of the affairs of the bank without disclosing enough to close its doors. Surely the Minister of Finance will recognize that the longer such an institution was allowed to carry on business the worse it would be for the unfortunate victims throughout the country. Hundreds of people would have escaped if action were taken in May, 1907, only a few months after the banks' doors were opened, when the Minister of Finance had letters from a bank manager that he was compelled to have under discount $111,885 apparently notes given for stock unpaid, and the manager a few days afterwards swore the total amount of such notes was $58,000. Surely in view of this we have a right to ask why it is that this hypnotic influence was exercised by Travers over the Minister of Finance, and why should we not have an investigation to enable the House and the Finance Minister to understand how such an influence was acquired over him in order that he may avoid being subjected to any such unhappy and unhallowed influence in days to come.

Mr. T. W. CROTHERS (West Elgin). Although the facts available have been fully laid before the House by gentlemen on this side, yet, as many people who live in the constituency I have the honour to represent have been very heavy losers in connection with this bank, I desire to say a few words before the debate is closed. In view of the evidence we have heard to-day the action of the Treasury Board in issuing a certificate to this bank on November 30, 1906, establishes beyond any peradventure that we have not a complete record of the evidence before this House. The evidence we have cannot and does not explain the action of the Treasury Board. There is evidence either of record or of an oral character that has been witheld from this House, of that I have no manner of doubt whatever, and the people of this country have the right to know all the facts, in order to secure which a Royal Commission ought to be issued. The Treasury Board who are made the guardians of the public interest in such a matter as this, is composed of the Minister of Finance and five other members of the cabinet, and as we have been informed that this matter was considered when only three members of the Treasury Board was present it is perfectly clear that there not being a quorum or a majority of the members of the Treasury Board present the issuing of this certificate was illegal.

Nothing less than a majority of the six members of the board could have legally issued a certificate to this bank authorizing it to do business. We have been told that there were present on that occasion Sir Richard Cartwright, the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) and the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). Well, I do not believe that Sir Richard Cartwright had his attention called to the facts, or he would certainly not have consented to the issuing of this certificate. Parliament has provided that the Treasury Board should protect the public by seeing that the provisions of the Banking Act are complied with before a certificate is given to authorize a body of men to open branches in every city, town and village in the Dominion and secure from a confiding and innocent people millions of dollars. Why it seems to me that if the Minister of Finance had received no warning whatever, it would still have been his duty to have got some evidence corroborating that given by the manager of the bank. You will remember that the manager is not a portion of the body proper of a bank as is the president or vice-president. He is simply a general manager, an official, employed by the directors. His was the only evidence before the Finance Minister with regard to this matter. Now, it is only since a few years that any one was allowed to give evidence, who is interested in the matter under investigation, because it was considered that his personal interest would so affect his evidence as to make it unacceptable. It is only since a few years a man who is interested in the result is a competent witness in a court of justice. I find in the Dominion Lands Act a section providing that a patent shall not issue to a man for 160 acres of land in the remotest corner of British Columbia on his own uncorroborated affidavit. He is required to have his statement corroborated by two of his neighbours under oath. Section 126 of the Dominion Lands Act provides as follows:

Proof of residence or cultivation, required by the three last preceding sections of this Act, and of the erection of a habitable house, shall be made by the claimant by affidavit, and shall be corroborated by the evidence on oath of two disinterested witnesses resident in the vicinity of the land to which their

evidence relates, and shall be subject to acceptance by the Commissioner of Dominion Lands or the Dominion Lands Board; and such affidavit shall be sworn, and such evidence given, before the local agent, or his senior assistant, or before some other person named for that purpose by the minister.

So that this parliament has determined that it is not safe to issue a patent for a piece of land worth $500 on the uncorroborated testimony of the applicant, but requires the corroboration under oath of two disinterested people. These witnesses must appear before the agent of this government and give evidence under oath before this government will issue the patent on a piece of land worth $500. So that I say when a man comes before the Treasury Board asking for a certificate to enable him to open the door of his bank and issue notes and receive deposits dealing with millions of money placed in his care by people who believed that the solvency and standing of that bank is vouched for by this government, the Treasury Board should have evidence of some disinterested people, of some one other than the bank manager, before granting this certificate. People have been led to believe that the government looks after the honesty of the banks, and when they hear that this government has authorized a bank to do business in any part of this country, they have the idea that it is backed up by the government. The government, therefore, ought to see that those applying for a certificate have taken the steps provided by the Act in an honest and straightforward manner before giving them a certificate and authorizing them to open their doors.

But here we have a bank which had its charter over two and a half years before it was in a position to ask for a certificate. It had to get an extension of time, but even after the two and a half years it was unable to get the necessary amount paid in or make any show that it had got it. In reality it had not got it when the certificate was issued. That of itself should have been sufficient to put the Finance Minister on his guard, because he frankly told us he was not in favour of extending the time when these people made their last application. Still the time was extended, and I am unable to endorse the opinion expressed by the Finance Minister when he says the government has no responsibilities in the matter when a Bill of this kind is passed in the House. The people have the idea that the government is responsible for all legislation passed by this parliament and so it is. I submit that the government are unable to shirk that responsibility. We find the Prime Minister able to carry through any measure he desires, or defeat any measure to which he is opposed by simply holding up his finger; and if the Minister of Finance felt that a charter should not have been issued to this company, it was his duty to exert his whole influence to prevent its being granted. It was granted, however, and then came the application by Travers in the month of November, 1906, for a certificate. I need not go over what has been so clearly set forth by hon. members on this side. The Minister of Finance had in his possession a copy of the writ issued, or about to be issued by a reputable member of this House at that time and a distinguished lawyer in Toronto, alleging serious charges of fraud in connection with this transaction. Not merely one but eight or ten charges of fraud were before him. The minister told us this afternoon that he never read those charges, he knew that there were charges of fraud made against the institution, but he did not even read them. He consented to the issuing of this certificate enabling these men to deal with millions of public money, and he did this without having read the charges set forth in the writ.

Then the Minister of Finance gives as a reason for not considering these charges of fraud the fact that the solicitor acting for the plaintiffs told him that his clients had been satisfied and that, so far as he was personally concerned. he desired to withdraw any objections to the issuing of the certificate.

The correspondence shows that the Finance Minister at that time thought that that was the only thing which stood in the way. And here was a solicitor in Toronto, acting for eleven of the shareholders, objecting to the issuance of this certificate; and if he withdrew his objection, then all objections were withdrawn, and the Finance Minister had a perfect right to issue the certificate, utterly regardless, apparently, of the interests of the general public who might make deposits in this bank as soon as its doors were opened or might subscribe for its stock. This was not a private matter; it was a matter in which the whole public were interested. A man steals a horse; the Crown Attorney is notified; the man who lost the horse comes back two or three days afterwards and says: The man who stole the horse has paid me, and I have no further interest in the matter; and the Crown Attorney lets the matter drop. There is the case of the Finance Minister—as if the public were not interested in the fraud committed in this case, as if nobody were interested but the solicitor who had brought the action.

Well, there must be something back of this, something that we have not heard yet. I cannot imagine the Finance Minister writing the letter to Travers that he did write on the 30th of November unless there was something back of it. We have been told —I do not remember whether in this House

or outside of it—that the person who was chief whip in the Liberal party in this House at that time introduced Travers to the Finance Minister. It has been established that, shortly afterwards, that chief whip made a loan from this bank—stated by some to amount to $5,000, but, I believe, stated by himself at $3,000, and that loan was charged up to commissions. Something occurred we have not learned yet. The Finance Minister never would have acted as he did upon the facts we have and no more; there are other facts we have not got yet. The people of this country have a right to know the whole of these facts, and the only way for the people to secure the whole of the evidence is by the appointment of an honest and capable Royal Commission to investigate the whole case. There is nothing like publicity in these matters. Look at this letter of the 30th of November. You will remember that the Finance Minister, prior to that, had received from Mr. McCarthy this writ charging five or six—yes, eight or ten—different frauds in connection with the organization of this bank. And this is the letter the Finance Minister writes to Travers:

I regret that owing to pressing engagements yesterday, arising out of the Budget, I was unable to meet you to consider your application for the issue of a certificate to authorize the Farmers' Bank of Canada to commence business. I shall be glad to see you to-day, at my office, at any time before one o'clock if you can call. Or I might be able to see you later, between four and five, at the House of Commons, if that will be more convenient.

There is a phase of the matter which I should like to bring to your notice so that you may consider it at once. It has been represented to us that in some previous instances where an application was in all respects apparently regular, there was actually an evasion of the intention of the Bank Act in relation to the paid-up capital.

Notice the kid glove here. 'It has been represented to us that in some previous instances——' It was not 'represented to us in some previous instances'; it was 'represented to us' that, in this instance, you have been guilty of fraud and very serious fraud. Why does not the Minister of Finance say to Travers: You have been charged with fraud by a responsible member of the House of Commons. What have you to say about it? Here is the writ that has been issued against you; here are the several frauds that have been charged against you; what do you say to this one? What do you say to that one? What do you say to the other one? Mr. Speaker, there is no question about it, he had received Mr. McCarthy's letter and a copy of the writ in October, sometime about the 10th if I remember well. And this letter which I am quoting was written on the 30th of November.

It has been represented to us in some previous instances——

'Previous instances!' With all these charges before him, not in 'previous instances' but in this instance. Why did he deal so tenderly and carefully with the manager of the Farmers' Bank? Why is he withholding the facts that these charges have been made in connection with this very transaction?

—where an application was in all respects apparently regular, there was actually an evasion of the intention of the Bank Act in relation to the paid-up capital. We have been told that in some cases——

Some other cases, away up in the moon somewhere.

—the subscribers did not actually pay in cash, but gave notes to the provisional directors which were used to raise the money. On account of information of this kind, which has reached us in relation to a previous case——

How anxious he is to impress upon Mr. Travers' mind, apparently, that he had received no charge of fraud against him in this particular case, but some previous case, away back. Why was that?

—we deem it proper to scan very closely every application for a certificate which comes to us. I shall be glad to have an assurance that nothing of the kind has taken place in relation to the subscriptions for the Farmers' Bank, but that the amounts set forth in the application as having been paid up have in every case been bona fide cash payments.

And then, in order to have a record of Travers' answer, he has Mr. Travers write him a letter back the very same day:

In reply to your letter of the 30th of November, I have to say that in the case of the Farmers' Bank of Canada the provisional directors did not raise the money in the way mentioned by you. You will find the statement put in by me absolutely correct as to the amount of stock subscribed and the amount paid up.

I think the Minister of Finance told us this afternoon that he wrote that letter himself and left it in his office for Travers to sign——

Mr. FIELDING. There is not a shadow of foundation for that statement.

Mr. CROTHERS. I am mistaken, am I?

Mr. FIELDING. No, the hon. gentleman is not mistaken.

Mr. CROTHERS. I understood you to say that you had written this and left it in your office——

Mr. FIELDING. Written what?

Mr. CROTHERS. This letter—for Travers to sign.

Mr. FIELDING. I never made any such statement, nor did I say anything that would lead or give any intelligent person reason for imagining that I had said so.

Mr. CROTHERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Finance Minister for the compliment he has paid me; but I think I have a little intelligence, and I do not think he is a better judge of intelligence than a good many other people.

Mr. FIELDING. It is a very extraordinary statement for the hon. gentleman to make.

Mr. CROTHERS. Not an extraordinary statement at all, I submit; it is what I understood the hon. gentleman to say. He did say something about writing a letter—

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I said nothing about writing a letter for Mr. Travers to sign. I wrote a letter to Mr. Travers and signed it. I state that he is mistaken—I said nothing about the other letter.

Mr. CROTHERS. Didn't you say you discussed the substance of the letter——

Mr. FIELDING. I discussed the matter with Mr. Travers.

Mr. CROTHERS. The character of the letter you desired him to send?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I did not say anything of the sort. I said I had addressed him a letter and would await his reply.

Mr. CROTHERS. And you got this reply?

Mr. FIELDING. Very well.

Mr. CROTHERS. Now, we have a letter from Mr. Boville, of December 3, in which he says:

> For the purpose of record, Mr. Fielding wrote Mr. Travers a letter, of which I inclose a copy, asking for the assurance that the amounts set forth in the application as having been paid in were in every case bona fide cash payments. I inclose a copy of Mr. Travers' reply.

It seems from Mr. Boville's letter that the Finance Minister was very anxious to have something in writing from Travers to have it on record so that he could show it at some future time if necessary. He not only desired to have that on record, but he desired also, apparently, to have on record an opinion from the Department of Justice whether or not he could legally issue the certificate on the evidence that he had before him. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that any child of ten years would have known that it was competent for the Finance Minister, as a matter of law, to issue the certificate on the evidence he had before him: it was wholly a question of discretion as to whether he should be satisfied with the evidence. And I submit to you that, he having written that letter, I may question the magnitude of the Finance Minister's intelligence just as sincerely as he questioned mine.

Now, with all these warnings, does he ask anybody else for any corroborative evidence? None whatever,—simply calls in Mr. Travers and accepts his uncorroborated statement with reference to matters involving millions of dollars. Did you ever hear of a Crown attorney or a judge before whom a charge was made against a man of stealing or of having committed a fraud sending for the man and saying: I have been told that a man about your size—I have no reference to you now, but in some other case a man stole a horse under certain circumstances, and John Brown lost a horse the other night, and I would like to know what you have to say about it? And the man replies: I did not steal the horse. And the judge says: Very well, let us have that in writing so that we may have it on record. That would be just as sensible as the very intelligent action of the Minister of Finance.

The Minister of Finance, the Treasury Board, do not seem to have realized their position at all—do not seem to have realized the responsibility resting on them to protect the public, as suggested by the president of the Bankers' Association. There is some reason for the issue of this certificate which has not yet been made known. If the Minister of Finance had acted as a man of ordinary intelligence under the circumstances—I am speaking guardedly, Mr. Speaker—I submit that where a man comes before the Minister of Finance asking for power to open the bank, asking to be placed in a position where he can fleece the public of millions of dollars, where the Minister of Finance has been told that this man has already committed many frauds, I say a man of ordinary common sense and intelligence, acting in the interests of the people, would have insisted upon evidence other than that of the man who is making the application himself. I must give the Finance Minister credit for the fact, as he states it, that he did not receive the letter from the president of the Bankers' Association until the day after this certificate was issued. I have no doubt that the Treasury Board, authorized to issue a certificate, had the inherent power to cancel that certificate, if they were satisfied afterwards that it was unwarrantedly issued. We have no evidence that the Minister of Finance took the slightest notice of the warnings that he received from the president of the Bankers' Association the day after.

Mr. LENNOX. Did he take the advice of the Department of Justice then?

Mr. CROTHERS. I am not aware whether he did or not. It is not on record, and we have nothing here to-day except

that which is on record, and there is a great deal that is not on record. Now, I have no hesitation in making the charge, I believe the people of this country will make the charge, that the losses that the depositors and shareholders of the Farmers' Bank have sustained are morally owing to the culpable negligence, the criminal negligence, of the Treasury Board. They made a mistake, to say the least of it; certainly they failed to exercise that common sense and that intelligence that any man would who had in his heart the best interests of the people of this country. And having got further evidence, he would have refused to authorize these people to open their doors and be in a position to bleed the public to the extent of millions of dollars. I believe, therefore, it is the duty of parliament to do something for these people. I do not know, I am not prepared to say, that they would have a legal claim against the Crown, because the Crown is supposed to do no wrong, by a monstrous fiction. But these people, having suffered this immense loss by reason of the negligence of the Treasury Board of this government, this government is morally responsible for the losses they have sustained, having taken the course they did.

The Finance Minister says that Mr. Travers came to them as a man that they did not know anything against. Well, that was simply a negative quality, we do not generally trust a man in large transactions of whom we know nothing. This man was charged with a dozen frauds of a very serious character, which may possibly involve millions of dollars. We do not know the man at all, and we accept the word of this man in the face of these charges, and send him out authorized to rob the people of this country as he has done. Now, Sir, I submit that the people of this country, especially those who are interested in the Farmers' Bank, especially the depositors and shareholders, desire to know all the facts in connection with this matter. They are perfectly satisfied that we have not got all the facts this afternoon. The conduct of the government cannot be explained on the facts we have, but their conduct may be explained on other facts. Who introduced this man to the Finance Minister? We have it stated that the chief whip of the Liberal party at that time did so; I think that is not denied.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not recollect whether it was or not. But why should not anybody introduce him? There was an article to that effect in a Toronto paper, it may be quite correct. I do not know.

Mr. CROTHERS. We would like to know, the public would like to know, they have a right to know, all the facts in connection with this matter, what it was that influenced the Treasury Board to issue a certificate under these very suspicious circumstances without making any inquiry whatever to corroborate the statement made by the gentleman who is making the application. As I said a few moments ago, the issue of the certificate I believe to have been illegal. There was no quorum of the Treasury Board qualified to issue a certicate. Of the capital stock of $500,000, $250,000 not having been paid in cash by the subscribers, they were not legally qualified to do business. There is a case which I think establishes that fact, the case of Cass against the Ottawa Agricultural Insurance Company and others, reported in volume 22, Grant's Chancery Reports, where it is held that where a company was required by statute, to raise $50,000 before beginning business to be paid in by those who have subscribed to the stock, and where they borrowed a large portion of that money to make up the $50,000, they were not legally authorized to do business. That is the case here. Those who subscribed for this stock did not put up the $250,000. One can understand why the statute requires subscribers to pay the cash. A later section of the Act provides for double liability in case of insolvency; it therefore becomes important that the shareholders should be men of substance, and hence it is required that they should put up the cash, not simply to give their promissory notes. The most superficial investigation on the part of the Finance Minister would have disclosed that the subscribers had not put up the $250,000, and therefore they were not entitled to the certificate. If the Finance Minister had taken the reasonable course, and had found they had been guilty of fraud in the inception of this institution he probably would have said to them: I shall have nothing more to do with you. It has been shown that you are capable of an attempt to defraud the public, and so far as I am concerned you will never be authorized to open a bank anywhere in the Dominion of Canada.

I take much pleasure in supporting this resolution. I believe the people require a thorough investigation, and I submit that this House should not surrender its right to investigate a matter of this kind because it is in the police court of Toronto or in the hands of a curator there. It is the duty of this parliament to investigate a matter where the officials of this parliament, the Treasury Board which is composed of six members of the cabinet, have shown themselves guilty of negligence in not taking a reasonable course to satisfy themselves that there was no fraud in the matter. If they had taken that course no certificate would have been issued, and thousands of people who have suffered seriously would have been spared. I, therefore, submit that a Royal Commission should issue that we may get all the facts, no matter who is hit or who is hurt.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not intend to occupy much time, because the subject which is engaging the attention of the House has been very thoroughly debated. This is one of the most disastrous bank failures that has ever occurred in Canada. Looking at the statement of the curator one sees that the liabilities of the bank amount to nearly $2,000,000, and looking at his statement of the assets there will be apparently a shortage of $1,250,000 to $1,500,000. The capital stock is gone, and it is doubtful whether the ordinary creditors will receive anything at all, and in any case they are not likely to receive more than a small percentage of their claims. The failure has occasioned widespread distress not only throughout the province of Ontario, but elsewhere in this country, and in the United States. I have received a good many letters on the subject; one of them is so cogent in its terms and so well written, that I will take the liberty of reading it to this House, because it expresses in respect of one locality what has occurred in many localities in the province of Ontario, and elsewhere in this country. This is a lady writing from Lakeside post office in Ontario. She writes in this way:

I write to you on behalf of the 'Farmers' Bank.' I wrote some time ago to Mr. Laurier, also to Mr. Fielding on this subject, and both sent short but courteous replies. I read all the parliamentary discussions this year, and when the time comes for the Banking Act to be ventilated in parliament, come to the rescue and plead the cause of the poor widows and people either paying for, or renting farms, who have lost their whole savings in this bank. Some are in want who are advanced in years, while others cannot meet their payments this spring. If you were to visit Embro and heard the tales of distress, your heart, I am sure, would be touched with sympathy. Our butcher lost $2,000 in it at Lakeside, which he took out of the Imperial in Ingersoll for convenience. His sons have both been through operations this last year, and here this man is without a dollar, and his oldest son and son-in-law are on rented places lately set up and cannot meet their payments, and this, sir, is repeated wherever Travers set his trap.

Then she goes on to speak of criminal proceedings at Toronto, commenting upon them and wanting to know why they are not more effective. She proceeds as follows:

I am proud of my country, but I am ashamed of the way this affair is conducted. Now, sir, if you know any other of the members who know better than you how people are suffering, do please get them to advocate the rights of the people and pay them their hard earned money. Those who stole should be made to refund, and what the Keeley mine does not supply, should be raised by the government, and paid by May at the farthest. You know very well that the people have no way of agitating reforms of any kind but through their public men, both in church and state, and I feel that this has been a clear case of robbery, and is a case of truth and justice, to be rectified by the government, and also things should be put on such a basis that such rascalities could never occur again. You know the government helped the sufferers by the Martinique disaster, and it is quite right, but how much more should our own people, who are industrious and law abiding, be helped, who put their money in the 'Farmers' Bank' believing it to be chartered properly. How soon we should be arrested and fined heavily if we made wine and sold it without paying license to the government. A pedlar cannot travel a one-horse wagon without paying license, and why should bankers be allowed so much liberty which has often driven sufferers to the lunatic asylum or worse than all to suicide. I do hope you will do your best in this matter, and oblige thousands.

That gives an idea of the way this matter is regarded throughout the country, of the suffering which has been brought upon the people, and the question is: How has all this result been brought about? The bank obviously should not have been permitted to commence business. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance himself has admitted that. There can be no doubt at all, as my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has pointed out, that if he had taken the ordinary business precaution of calling for the minute books of this bank, as one would suppose that any man in his senses would have done, he would have seen that the Bank Act was being violated, he would not have permitted the bank to commence business. Let us see what the real conditions were when the bank commenced business. I am not speaking of my own knowledge; I am taking it from the curator's report, at pages 6 and 7, of the Return which has been brought down. The directors had collected about $211,000 from subscribers in cash. In contravention of the law of this country, a fact that was shown by their own minute books, which were not brought here as they should have been, they paid out improperly for commissions and expenses $41,000; so that they had in actual cash not $250,000, but $170,000. They handed over that $170,000 and turned over subscribers' notes to W. R. Travers, who borrowed on these notes $80,000, which amount, with the $170,000, made up the $250,000 which he deposited with the Receiver General. Travers then handed back the $80,000 which he had borrowed, and thus the bank's capital, after the deduction of the $80,000, did not amount to the sum required by law. Further than that, the actual amount of capital, $211,000 which had been collected by the directors, was further diminished to the extent of $41,000 which it had been improperly paid out. How was it possible under such conditions that the Treasury Board permitted

this bank to commence business? Had the Treasury Board any notice that these unlawful acts were being perpetrated? They had the most direct and positive notice, I affirm, in the presence of the Minister of Finance, and I will prove that the notice of the frauds was never from first to last withdrawn.

Mention has been made of the oral notice given to the Minister of Finance by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), I can only say with regard to that, without the slightest disrespect to the Minister of Finance, without any desire to impugn his sincerity, that where you have two men, one of whom deposes to a positive and direct recollection of a particular incident, and the other of whom says he has no recollection of that incident and does not believe that it ever took place, according to well recognized rules which prevail in courts of justice, assuming that both of these men are sincere in their statements, credit must be given to the man who has a positive and direct recollection and credit will not be given to the man who simply says that he has no recollection.

Mr. FIELDING. I think that my hon. friend hardly states the case fairly. I did not state that I had no recollection; what I did state was that I had had conversations with the hon. member for Halton, but that the nature of these conversations was not as he had stated it to be. I did not say that I had no recollection.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). All I have to say to the Minister of Finance is that if he will grant this Royal Commission another hon. member of this House will be produced and will depose on oath, as he has informed me, that he gave the same kind of notice.

Mr. FIELDING. Why cannot the hon. member say so here?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Because he is not in this country, or in this House at the present time, but he told me before he left the country that he gave the Minister of Finance exactly the same kind of notice which my hon. friend from Halton gave to the minister.

Mr. FIELDING. Will my hon. friend give the name?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will give the name; Mr. E. B. Osler was the man who so informed me.

Mr. FIELDING. I am quite satisfied that Mr. Osler will not confirm that statement. I think my hon. friend has misunderstood Mr. Osler, and I am quite sure that Mr. Osler will hardly make the statement in the terms that my hon. friend has stated it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am perfectly aware that it is possible to misunderstand a gentleman who makes a communication. I do not think I misunderstood Mr. Osler with regard to the matter because the communication was made not in my presence alone, but in the presence of other gentlemen who understood Mr. Osler in that regard in exactly the same way as I understood him. There are gentlemen sitting in this House within the sound of my voice who heard Mr. Osler make that statement when I heard him make it before he went away.

Mr. FOSTER. Give us your commission and we will produce the man.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Further than that I have heard of other reputable men also who, before this certificate was issued, gave the Finance Minister the same kind of warning. There are also rumours throughout the country—I do not know whether they are correct or not—that this matter so impressed itself upon certain officials in his department that they made a rather strong protest against the certificate being granted under the circumstances in which it was granted.

Mr. FIELDING. I can assure my hon. friend that that is unfounded.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, I accept the minister's statement at once. I only mention it because it came to me in a way that seemed to give some appearance of credibility. But, we need not debate these things. There was the letter of Mr. Leighton McCarthy, there was the writ, and the endorsement upon the writ itself which, in the plainest and most unmistakable terms, conveyed a warning to the Minister of Finance in this regard. Perhaps sufficient emphasis has not been laid upon one particular paragraph of Mr. McCarthy's letter of the 19th of October, 1906, three days before the writ was issued. He stated the writ would shortly be issued, and three days afterwards on the 22nd of October, it was issued, and in his letter he says:

I have received information that the alleged subscribers for shares paid a large sum of money in cash and have signed notes for other large sums of money, and that the persons professing to act in the name of the bank have transferred notes and received the proceeds, and that a deposit either has been made or will be made of the cash received and the proceeds of these notes, or sufficient amount to make up $250,000.

The intimation conveyed by that to any one who is familiar with the provisions of the Bank Act is simply that these men were conspiring together to contravene and to evade the provisions of the Act which the Minister of Finance was bound to see observed. From first to last Mr. Leighton McCarthy, in the correspondence at least, has never withdrawn the statement made by him in that letter of the 19th of October,

1906. True, he did in a subsequent letter state that his clients had been settled with, but he never in any letter withdrew these statements of fact which he made to the Minister of Finance. The statements in the writ itself are so startling and convey so plain a notice to the Minister of Finance that one would think there could not be the slightest doubt in his mind as to what his plain duty would be. The first charge of fraud is this:

1. That the provisional directors who professed to act for and in the name of the bank had no lawful power or authority to receive subscriptions for shares or to accept them; and (2) that the subscriptions for shares which were procured from the plaintiffs and others were procured through fraud and misrepresentation, and the plaintiffs allege, amongst others, the following particulars of fraud, namely:

1. That the agent in procuring the subscriptions for shares falsely represented that persons had subscribed for a larger number of shares than they had in fact subscribed for, and the following are examples of such false representations.

Then he gives eight or ten cases where men had applied for small sums and had been put down for sums ten times as great, and where men who had subscribed nothing at all are put down on the stock list as actual subscribers. In all the instances so set forth in this writ, as I understand it, the names of these men are on the stock list which the Minister of Finance accepted on the sworn declaration of Travers, although comparison of the writ with the list would have given the plainest possible indication to the Minister of Finance not only of fraud in the first instance, but fraud persisted in up to and at the very time when this certificate was being asked for from the government:

That Major Thomas Beattie, represented by the prospectus to have consented to act as a director, had not subscribed for any shares, and refused to be a director, and refused to allow his name to be used in any way in connection with the bank; and the plaintiffs allege that the names of other persons were represented by the prospectus to have consented to act as directors who had not subscribed for any shares or given any authority for any such publication.

Was it not open to the Minister of Finance to write a letter to Major Beattie and ask him whether that statement was true or false? Was it not competent also for the Minister of Finance to have taken the precaution which Major Beattie took to have looked up the record of Mr. Travers a little and to ascertain whether this matter was not worthy of further investigation by him. There is a further direct charge of fraud which ought to have attracted the attention of the Minister of Finance in an especial manner:

And the plaintiffs further allege that the agents and solicitors who were procuring subscriptions for shares had not lawful power or authority to solicit or accept applications for shares or subscriptions for shares.

And the plaintiffs allege that the agents and solicitors professing to act under the name and authority of the provisional directors have procured a large number of subscriptions for shares, and have received the sum of one hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars more or less on account thereof, and have also procured promissory notes to be signed by persons who were subscribing for shares, payable to the provisional directors of the bank, and the persons acting in the name and under the professed authority of the act of incorporation and amendments thereto, are endeavouring to discount or procure a loan by the transfer of the said notes.

And the plaintiffs further allege that the persons professing to act as aforesaid under the alleged authority of the provisional directors have unlawfully deducted large sums of money for alleged services and commissions and other purposes out of the money received by them.

The plaintiffs allege that the shares and the money and the promissory notes procured from them have been procured through fraud, deceit and misrepresentation.

Finally in the concluding part of the endorsement prayer is made for:

An injunction to restrain the bank, and the provisional directors and the general manager, and their officers, servants or agents, from the publication of a notice to call a meeting of the alleged subscribers of the shares of the capital stock of the bank, and from making application to the Treasury Board for a certificate under sections 14 and 15 of the Bank Act.

The defendants in that suit under the terms of the settlement in court admitted in effect every one of the charges of fraud I have just now read.

I am not going into particulars of Sir Edward Clouston's warning just at this moment, but to be brief let me sum the whole situation in this way. The minister had the following warnings—in the first place he had the warning of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). Again I repeat that, attributing equal sincerity to each, the testimony of one who has a distinct recollection of a particular incident which impressed itself upon his memory, is always to be accepted against that of the other party who merely affirms that according to his recollection the incident did not occur. In the second place he had the warnings of other similar witnesses who can be produced if inquiry is granted. In the third place he had the warnings of Mr. Leighton McCarthy in the three letters referred to. In the fourth place he had the warnings contained in the writ of summons, and the endorsement. I want to point out to the minister and to the House that the charges

in that writ were of a two-fold nature, namely, those which concerned the plaintiff alone and those which concerned the public interest, and the duties of the Finance Minister. Among the latter were the charges that moneys had been illegally paid out by the provisional directors in contravention of the Bank Act, thus impairing the bank's capital. Even if the plaintiffs were settled with, was not that a consideration which should have been before the mind of the Minister of Finance, and which should have impelled him to call for the minute books, and for every scrap of evidence which would bear upon the conduct of the persons which had been promoting the organization of this bank. Another charge made by Mr. McCarthy, and which never has been withdrawn was: That notes of subscribers had been and were being discounted by the provisional directors in order to evade the Bank Act, and to deceive the government, and there was a further charge that fraudulent representations were being made by this man to obtain the money necessary to secure the certificate of the Treasury Board. And, although Mr. McCarthy withdrew his clients' objection to the granting of the certificate by the Treasury Board he never withdrew his statements and representations which disclosed a fraudulent attempt to evade and contravene the Bank Act. Although the suit was settled the allegations of fraud set forth in the writ were never withdrawn, but were rather confirmed by the judgment of Mr. Justice Anglin. The written warning of the Canadian Bankers' Association confirmed all previous warnings, and the Treasury Board should have instantly ordered the return of the certificate and failing compliance the government should have peremptorily ordered the issue of a Royal Commission to investigate the alleged frauds. The Treasury Board had a plain and clear duty before it. We have been asked what could the Minister of Finance do? In the first place he could have ordered the production of the minute books, he should have ordered an investigation, he should have ordered further corroborative evidence, he should not have granted that certificate after warnings which had been conveyed to him unless he was absolutely and positively assured by the evidence as to which there could be no doubt whatever that everything in connection with the Farmers' Bank had been properly done in accordance with the law, and that no fraud was intended upon the government of this country or upon the public. That is what he should have done. But, he says he was helpless when the direct and positive warning of Sir Edward Clouston came to him. I say he was far from helpless.

What should he have done? He should have sent a telegram after Travers. It is said that he sent a messenger after him, and that Travers refused to give up the certificate. That may be mere rumour; there may be nothing in it; and I do not vouch for it. But the minister should have sent a telegram after Travers ordering him to return that certificate immediately and telling him that if he failed to comply, the government would the next day issue a Royal Commission to inquire into all the circumstances attending the organization of that bank and its application to the Treasury Board for a certificate. That is what the minister could have done, but that is what he did not do; and as the direct result of his inaction and neglect, the farmers of Canada, the workingmen of this country, have suffered losses to which they should not have been subjected; the Bank Act of Canada, as to its efficiency and its operation, has received a blow such as it never received before. From one end of this country to the other people are in doubt to-day as to our banking system, seeing that under the operation of that system, under the safeguards which ought to be observed by the Finance Minister and his department, these frauds have been perpetrated. The minister had Travers' affidavit, it is true, but he had the warnings of reputable men that that affidavit did not set forth the true statement of facts. What was the course he took? He took the solemn and serious course of asking Travers in private conversation whether or not his affidavit was true or false, and he received of course the answer that the affidavit was true. He then solemnly determined that that conversation should be made a matter of record and sat down and wrote a letter to Travers and Travers wrote a letter to him, and then he handed over the certificate. Is it any wonder that the other side of the House has lapsed into silence over this transaction? I do not wonder that they no longer have the courage or hardihood to stand up and say a word in defence of the position of the government. I do not wonder that the Prime Minister left this chamber in disgust and only returned a few moments ago. I wonder whether we shall hear from him; but if we do I sincerely trust that he will give some attention to some of the serious matters which have been urged against the administration of an important department of his government in this connection.

Then, as my hon. friend from Hastings has observed, within two or three months after this bank had begun business, the Minister of Finance learned out of the mouths of officers of the bank, by direct statements under their own hand, that these notes which had been discounted for the purpose of raising part of the capital paid over to the Receiver General, were still being held at different

branches of the bank. At one branch $109,000 of this paper was even then being held and that was only two months after this bank had begun business. That was confirmation, if any was necessary, of the warnings the minister had been given. It was confirmation of the warnings given by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), by Mr. Leighton McCarthy, by Mr. Osler and other persons, by the writ of summons and the endorsements thereon, and last but not least it was confirmation of the direct and positive warning given by the president of the Canadian Bankers' Association. What was the object and purpose of that association when its president conveyed to the minister the positive statement that a fraud was being practised on the government in order that a greater fraud might be practised on the people, if not to induce the government to take some course to protect the public. Yet the minister remained inactive and matters were allowed to drift. This is absolutely an indefensible case, and it will be to the discredit of the government if it should refuse the inquiry demanded by my hon. friend from Halton.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). In approaching the discussion of this question, I think it is advisable in the first instance to examine what are the objects stated by the motion of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). The motion reads:

That this House is of the opinion that a Royal Commission should forthwith issue to inquire into and investigate the incorporation and organization of the Farmers' Bank of Canada and the granting of the certificate by the Treasury Board permitting the said bank to issue notes and commence business, and all circumstances connected therewith, and generally to inquire into and investigate the operation and efficiency of the Bank Act in relation to the affairs and transactions of the said bank.

In this motion three things are asked. It asks that a commission should be appointed to investigate the incorporation of this bank, its organization and then the granting of the certificate by the Treasury Board permitting it to issue notes and begin business. The discussion which has already taken place has already eliminated from this motion two of the objects sought to be accomplished by it. The first thing to be examined was the incorporation of the bank; but if I understood the speech of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), that part of the motion has been abandoned because he said that in reality there was nothing to investigate as regards the incorporation of the bank.

Mr. FOSTER. If my right hon. friend will allow me, I was combatting the argument made by the Minister of Finance. He divided the motion into three sections, namely, the incorporation of the bank, the granting of the certificate and the operation of the bank. I agreed with him, that as far as the incorporation by the commission and this House was concerned, all were responsible. My hon. friend from Halton said that by incorporation he meant all the preliminaries up to and including the granting of the certificate. I was simply replying to the Minister of Finance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think that this is really a distinction without a difference. Will my hon. friend tell me now, in the face of the discussion we have had, what would be the object of an investigation into the incorporation of the bank? What would such an investigation lead to? The same thing applies to the organization of the bank. The real crux of the matter is the third part of the motion, the granting of the certificate by the Treasury Board. All the discussion has really been upon this part of the motion and nothing else. Nothing serious has been said about the incorporation or organization, but the whole complaint has been that the Treasury Board advised by the Minister of Finance, made a mistake in granting the certificate. Therefore we can eliminate the other two parts and address ourselves to this alone, namely, what are the facts connected with the delivery of the certificate? My hon. friend from Halton made his motion with an object, and that object was to show that the certificate had been issued erroneously, that it should not have been issued at all, that the Department of Finance and the Treasury Board had been deceived and all this led to the conclusion that the government or parliament or the country should assume the losses incurred by the shareholders. I think I have stated the case fairly when I put it in this way. We are asked to investigate the granting of the certificate in order that such investigation might lead parliament to come to the rescue of those who lost their money in this institution. If such be the case, let us examine the reasons given why parliament should take this extraordinary step. The reason given is that the Department of Finance was deceived. All the speeches made, even the speech of my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Borden, Halifax), have been to this effect, that the Department of Finance and the Minister of Finance, as leader of the Treasury Board, issued a certificate which should not have been issued, that the government had been deceived, and that those who lost by the bank should not bear their losses but they should be borne by the country.

Deceived in what manner? That is the question we have to investigate. That the

Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board have been deceived was admitted long ago. But let us go further. My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) tells us that this is only a preliminary step leading to another whereby parliament should be induced to come to the rescue of the men who put their money in the hands of Mr. Travers and the other directors of the bank. In what manner have the department and the Treasury Board been deceived, and what had the deception to do with the ultimate loss incurred by the shareholders? The deceit consisted in Mr. Travers, manager of the bank, reporting under oath that the bank had received in cash $250,000, half the amount required to be subscribed under the statutes. There is no longer any question about the deceit. When Mr. Travers declared that the shareholders had put into the treasury of the bank $250,000, that was deceit to the extent of about $80,000. That is admitted. Afterwards the bank failed. The question arises: Was that deception the cause of the failure of the bank? Can any one say—I put the question to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax)—that this deception was the cause of the failure of the bank and the loss of the shareholders' money? I believe it has been stated and not denied that ultimately the whole of this money was paid into the treasury of the bank. There was a deception at the time, but afterwards the whole $250,000 required for the bank to commence business was actually paid in by the shareholders. If the bank afterwards failed and the shareholders lost their money, it was not because of the deception practised upon the Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I be permitted a question? The Prime Minister has put a very relevant question as to whether or not this fraud had anything to do with the subsequent loss. I would ask him: Does he consider that the Department of Finance was doing its duty, that the government was doing its duty, when it permitted the man who, according to the statement of the President of the Canadian Bankers' Association, had perpetrated a fraud by means of perjury upon the department to remain at large and to continue his operations among the various communities of this country, and no investigation instituted? Had that nothing to do with the loss?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman's question has no relevancy to the subject now before us.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why not?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let me read the motion under discussion:

That this House is of the opinion that a Royal Commission should forthwith issue to inquire into and investigate the incorporation and organization of the Farmers' Bank of Canada and the granting of the certificate by the Treasury Board permitting the said bank to issue notes and commence business.

The motion is not to examine what took place after the bank had been organized as now suggested, but to examine these circumstances under which the certificate was granted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If I understood the motion correctly, it asks for an investigation into the operation and efficiency of the Banking Act in respect of the affairs and transactions of the bank.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let us read the motion:

That this House is of opinion that a Royal Commission should forthwith issue to inquire into and investigate the incorporation and organization of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, and the granting of a certificate by the Treasury Board permitting the said bank to issue notes and commence business, and all circumstances connected therewith and generally to inquire into and investigate the operation and efficiency of the Bank Act in relation to the affairs and transactions of the said bank.

The fact that the provisions of the Bank Act may be violated is not an argument in favour of the view taken by my hon. friend. We are asked to investigate three things—the incorporation, the organization and the granting of the certificate. As to the granting of the certificate, anything that transpired afterwards, when the bank was in operation, is not relevant to the question.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the Prime Minister allow me a question? If the Treasury Board had not given the bank permission to do business, could this loss have occurred?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is very easily answered—certainly not. Had the certificate of the Treasury Board not been granted, the bank could not have begun business; and there would have been no default and no loss. But the object my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) had in this motion is, after this investigation is granted, the treasury of Canada should come to the rescue of the shareholders. My answer to my hon. friend is there is no logic or relevancy in his question. If the shareholders have lost, the man who was their agent deceived the Treasury Board as well as the shareholders, and the Treasury Board is no more responsible for the laches of the agent of the shareholders than

are the shareholders themselves. I think that is common sense. The government has been deceived by the agent of the shareholders, by the man whom they selected, and in whom they put their confidence. So, I ask my hon. friend himself: Does he think that, under such circumstances, it lies in the mouth of the shareholder to tell the government: You should relieve us from the effect of the laches of our own agent?

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. gentleman is speaking to me, my answer is that in the first place the motion does not say anything of the kind, and, in the second place, in the interest of the people, there should be a full investigation so that a disaster like this could not happen again.

Mr. GOODEVE. May I ask a question? As I understand it, the object of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) is, only if the investigation proves that the issue of the certificate was due to the neglect of the Finance Department, to hold the government responsible for protecting the people.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I say that is the object of this motion, as it was plainly stated by my hon. friend from Halton, who spoke, I think, in very clear language. He made it plain that his object was to come to the rescue of the shareholders. He wanted to show that this investigation was only a preliminary step which would ultimately induce parliament to recoup these people for the losses they have suffered. My answer is, simply, if the shareholders have lost, it is because the agent of the shareholders deceived the government as well as the shareholders. And I think it is not a sound principle that anybody should be recouped for a loss made by his own agent.

Mr. HENDERSON. I dislike to interrupt the Prime Minister, but would he permit me a word?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think you will recollect, Mr. Speaker, that in what I said I divided the question into two parts. I distinctly said that if the loss was all brought about by reason of the action of the men whom the shareholders had put into office, then, they should suffer alone. I was clear on that, I think. But I said that if, on the other hand, the loss was brought about by reason of the action of this government or of the Treasury Board which was part of the government, then I thought this country was big enough, rich enough and generous enough to maintain its own honour and defend these people. That is what I said.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am quite willing to discuss the question in the light my friend has placed it, that this country is broad enough, rich enough, to correct an error of the government, if an error has been committed. Undoubtedly the government has been deceived in this matter, but by whom? The government has been deceived by the agent of the very men whom my hon. friend now wants to recoup. The government has been deceived by Mr. Travers, if by anybody, and Mr. Travers was the agent of the shareholders who had appointed him to his office. Under the circumstances, I think that the suggestion of my hon. friend that the government should come to the rescue of the men who appointed the very man who deceived the government, is a proposition which no one could on reflection be prepared to admit. Now, it has been stated that there is a further question to investigate, the broader question of the sufficiency of the Bank Act. That is a good proposition, and it may be that an investigation might serve a good purpose. But I am not prepared to say at the present time that a case has been made out against the Bank Act; I do not say that later on something may be disclosed of that nature. But I have to observe that at the present time the matter is being investigated by the courts, and that there is not sufficient evidence yet disclosed by the courts to show that it is necessary to go further with this investigation. My last word is that at this moment no case has been made out why the motion should be granted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the Prime Minister how he can argue that Mr. Travers was the agent of the depositors.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say the depositors. I said the shareholders.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the depositors are the people who are suffering.

On motion of Mr. Edwards, debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 12.07 a.m. Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 16, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS APPOINTMENTS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That the recommendations of the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons, laid on the Table of the House on 21st February last, by virtue of the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908, with reference to—1.

The appointment of Mr. Arthur S. Glasier as assistant clerk of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization;

2. The promotion of Mr. Jules Castonguay, assistant in the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery; and

3. The addition of the names of H. Pinard, and George Gibson, house carpenters, to the organization of the staff of the House of Commons, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

WATER SUPPLY IN PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, as the House is deeply interested in the question of the water supply furnished in these buildings, I think it well to read a report from the biologist of the Department of Agriculture, so that it may be placed on 'Hansard' and hon. gentlemen will have information of which I have no doubt they will be very glad:

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT—BIOLOGICAL LABORATORY.

Ottawa, March 11, 1911.

2322—2323—2324.

Dr. J. G. Rutherford, C.M.G.,
Veterinary Director General,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I have the honour to report as follows on samples of water taken at the parliament buildings on the 8th instant:

2322—Sample taken from drinking water supply in Senate. A non-pathogenic sporulating organism present in very small numbers. No evidence of sewage bacteria.

2323—Sample taken from drinking water supply on the floor of the House of Commons. A non-pathogenic sporulating organism present in very small numbers. No evidence of sewage bacteria.

2324—Sample taken from lavatory on main floor of the House of Commons. Sewage bacteria present.

From the above it is apparent that the raw city water is unsafe for human drinking purposes, while that supplied from the sterilizing machines is a perfectly safe drinking water.

I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) CHAS. H. HIGGINS,
Pathologist.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

AGRICULTURE IMPORTS INTO CANADA.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. What have been the yearly imports, quantity and value, for the past six years into Canada from, respectively, Australia, New Zealand, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, Argentine Republic and the United States, of wheat, oats, horses, cattle, sheep, lambs, mutton, beef, eggs, butter, cheese fowl, vegetables and fruit?

2. What have been the average prices of butter and of eggs in London, England, for the past five years in comparison with the prices, respectively, in eastern provinces, in Montreal, in Toronto, in Minneapolis, in Chicago, in Detroit, in Buffalo, in Boston and in New York?

Mr. PATERSON. As far as the customs is concerned I have the answer which the hon. member may have. With reference to the second question the Minister of Agriculture tells me it would take a very long time to prepare and he would like it to stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I think the United States government very quickly got out a comparative list of the prices, and I cannot see why this should stand as a notice of motion. This information is very necessary for the discussion on the question of reciprocity.

Mr. PATERSON. There is no objection whatever to giving it, but I was just intimating to the hon. gentleman that he must not expect it immediately and it would be better given in the shape of a return.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). It would be better to expedite it for the information of hon. members.

Mr. FISHER. I have already given instructions to the department to set a man at work to prepare it, but I was informed that it will take at least a week to get it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I would ask to have included in the return the import duties on these goods going into these countries from Canada.

Mr. FISHER. I think we can get that information.

NEW POSTAGE STAMPS.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew):

1. Is the government aware that the governments of Australia and South Africa have offered substantial prizes for the best designs for new postage stamps, emblematic of the present reign, for those portions of the empire?

2. What steps is this government taking to secure a set of postage stamps for Canada which will be characteristic of the country and of artistic merit?

3. Is it the intention of the government to offer prizes for the best designs in order to encourage Canadian artists? If not, who will prepare the designs?

4. Will an opportunity be afforded to the members of the House to inspect whatever designs may be submitted to the Post Office Department, before the selection is finally made?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We are not aware in the Post Office Department of what is being done in this matter by the governments of Australia and South Africa. What we have done is this. We have written to our High Commissioner in London, Lord Strath

cona, and he is in communication with the home government in order to arrange for a postage stamp in Canada similar to the one which will be issued at the time of coronation for the United Kingdom. We have not yet received the design, but as soon as received, I shall have no objection to laying it on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS HUMBER RIVER, TORONTO.

* Mr. WALLACE:

1. Is the government aware that a serious obstruction to navigation exists on the Humber river, caused by the middle pier of a bridge being built by the Grand Trunk railway over the river?
2. If so, has the government done anything to remedy it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No doubt this question relates to the application which has been made by the Grand Trunk railway for the approval of the plan of a bridge which they propose to build across the river Humber in order to take the place of the railway bridge now there. The object of building the bridge, is, it appears, to meet an order made by the Board of Railway Commissioners requiring the company to make a change of grade so that the proposed bridge will be higher than the existing one. Objections have been made to the plan by certain owners of property on the Humber and also by the city of Toronto. All the parties have been given an opportunity to be heard. The matter is now being considered by me, and in the course of a few days I expect to decide what recommendation I shall make to the Governor in Council on the subject.

ACCOUNTS OUTSTANDING.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe):

1. What were the total amounts of the accounts outstanding and unpaid, but since paid, in each department at the end of the last financial year?
2. Were these amounts taken into the accounts in preparing the annual financial statement?

Mr. FIELDING. Stands as a notice of motion for return.

CANADIAN EXPORTS OF HAY—REMISSION OF UNITED STATES DUTIES.

Mr. MONK:

1. When will the commission called upon to decide the amounts to be reimbursed Canadian exporters of hay, from 1866 to 1882, customs dues collected by the United States customs officials, be named under the terms of the recent convention between Great Britain and the United States?
2. What is causing the delay in the nomination of said commission?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. These claims are included in those with regard to which the governments of Great Britain and the United States have agreed on a convention, and will be taken up as soon as the convention sits.

SESSIONAL CLERKS.

* Mr. MONK:

1. At what rate per day are sessional clerks paid, and is the rate uniform for all such clerks?
2. Was the per diem rate of pay for sessional clerks increased last year? If so, by what authority?
3. To what class of such clerks does the increase apply?
4. Do the clerks whose salaries were so increased work more or during longer hours than the others?
5. Why was the salary thus increased for some only?
6. Have the clerks whose salaries have not been increased petitioned for an increase?
7. If so, was the petition rejected as far as they are concerned?
8. Is it not a fact that a number of the sessional clerks whose salaries have not been thus advanced possess technical qualifications not held by those whose pay was increased?
9. What is the reason for this apparently unjust discrimination?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. There are two divisions of sessional clerks, viz.: 'Post office clerks' and 'sessional clerks'. The rate of pay is uniform for sessional clerks and is also uniform for post office clerks. The rate of pay for post office clerks is $5 per diem and of sessional clerks $4 per diem.

2 and 3. The per diem rate of pay for post office clerks was increased last session by authority of the Board of Commissioners of Internal Economy of the House of Commons. The rate of pay for sessional clerks was not increased.

4. The work of the post office clerks is of an entirely different nature to that of the sessional clerks. As to whether post office clerks work longer hours than sessional clerks it may be stated that in some cases they do and in others they probably do not.

5. Answered in the reply to question No. 1.

6. The sessional clerks have petitioned for an increase of pay.

7. The petition has not been rejected, but is under consideration of the Board of Internal Economy.

8. Some of the sessional clerks are stenographers and typewriters, some are typewriters only and some are neither typewriters nor stenographers. The work required of post office clerks does not require them to possess the qualification of typewriters or stenographers.

9. There is no desire to unfairly discriminate among these officials. The matter of adjusting their pay according to the nature of their work is under consideration.

IMPORTS OF LEAF TOBACCO.

*Mr. MONK:

1. What was the total amount of leaf tobacco imported from the United States for each of the last three years?

2. What is the value of manufactured tobacco of all sorts imported from the United States during each of the last three years for which reports have been compiled?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The quantity of 'Tobacco, unmanufactured for excise purposes, under conditions of Inland Revenue Act,' imported into Canada from the United States during the last three fiscal years was as follows:

	Pounds.
1908	15,544,752
1909	14,761,094
1910	14,242,809

2. The value of manufactured tobacco imported into Canada from the United States during the last three fiscal years was as follows:

	1908. Value.	1909. Value.	1910. Value.
Cigarettes	$ 2,896	$ 1,530	$ 3,462
Cigars	20,321	20,969	30,852
Tobacco, cut	110,549	40,692	38,217
Snuff	29,903	25,462	4,600
Tobacco, all other manufactures of	57,793	55,577	60,737

INTERNATIONAL PRISON CONGRESS.

*Mr. MONK:

1. Did the government send a representative to the meeting of the last International Prison Congress held at Washington, U.S.A., last year?

2. Was the government invited to participate in said meeting?

3. If so invited, why was not the government represented at said meeting?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. See answer to No. 1.

JOHN JARDINE.

Mr. BARNARD:

Referring to questions and answers re Mr. John Jardine set out in columns 3926 and 4762 of the revised 'Hansard,' was the department aware at the time or times of making the payment or payments therein referred to, that payment was being made for work done in excess of his instructions? If not, when did the government first become aware of the fact?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

The department at Ottawa was not aware at the time of making payment that the work done by Mr. Jardine, and for which the resident architect sent in duly certified accounts, exceeded what had been authorized by him, as the resident architect had been instructed to consult Dr. Montizambert as to what works he considered most important and would advise to be done from the appropriation of $28,000 which was available.

SAND SUPPLIED TO KINGSTON PENITENTIARY.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. How much money has been paid by this government in each year from 1896 to and including 1910, to R. H. Fair, for sand supplied to Kingston penitentiary?

2. Were tenders called in each year for sand supplied.

3. Has the government paid the said R. H. Fair for supplying sand for any other public buildings or works at or near Kingston in the years 1896 to 1910? If so, how much?

4. Has the said R. H. Fair received any money from the government for any other supplies or services? If so, for what, in what years and how much?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH:

1.

1896-7	$ 100 00
1897-8	300 00
1898-9	232 03
1899-1900	434 55
1900-1	52 75
1901-2	76 05
1902-3	9 90
1903-4	410 25
1904-5	343 50
1905-6	122 67
1906-7	87 99
1907-8	189 06
1908-9	49 86
1909-10	398 90
1910-11	577 67
	$3,385 18

2. No.

4. For potatoes:

1898-99	$ 41 65
1900-01	69 49
1902-3	52 13
1905-06	29 47
1907-8	7 66
	$ 200 40

CHEESE WEIGHING AT MONTREAL.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Has the government during the past year received any complaints from cheese boards or individuals in regard to the weights and quality of cheese as allowed by buyers in Montreal?

2. Has there ever been an official referee at Montreal appointed by the government? If so, what was his name, when appointed and at what salary?

3. What were the duties of said official referee?

4. Is there an official referee at Montreal at present? If not, when were his services dispensed with, and why?

Mr. FISHER:

1. The Department of Trade and Commerce has received complaints from cheese boards and individuals, in regard to the weights and quality of the cheese as allowed by buyers in Montreal during the past year, and the Department of Agriculture received at various times three requests for the services of an official referee owing to disputes between buyers and sellers as to the quality of cheese.

2. The following officers of the Department of Agriculture have acted as official referee of butter and cheese at Montreal: J. A. Ruddick, July, 1900, salary $1,800 per year; A. W. Woodard, May, 1901, to March 31, 1906, salary $1,200 to $1,700 per year; Geo. H. Barr, May to November, 1907, salary, $1,800 per year; Jos. Burgess, May to November, 1908, salary $1,100 per year; J. F. Tilley, May to November, 1909, salary $100 per month. The position was not filled during the seasons of 1906 and 1910.

3. The duties of the official referee consisted of making examinations of butter and cheese on request of both buyer and seller when there was a dispute as to quality.

4. There is no official referee at Montreal at present. There was so little demand for his services in 1909 that there seemed to be no justification for continuing the office.

PRIVILEGE—MR. NORTHRUP.

Mr. NORTHRUP. If in rising a second time, as a matter of privilege, to take exception to some remarks made by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), my observations shall be very brief. I trust the House will understand that it is because I recognize the rule limiting the rights of members at such a time as this to a statement of the words actually used. If an hon. member attempts to go any further, he is very apt to be called to order. The particular paragraph to which I take exception is in the speech of the hon. member for North Cape Breton delivered in this House the night before last. I will read the paragraph to which I do take exception. He says at page 5389:

> I quote here an opinion which will be found in 'Hansard,' page 408, 29th November, 1910. It is the opinion of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) given while speaking in the debate on the address. He is taking the address paragraph by paragraph, and he takes this paragraph:
>
> An arrangement may be made which will admit many of the products of the United States in on satisfactory terms.

Then follows some interruption, Mr. Bradbury raising a point of order, and the Deputy Speaker ruling upon it. I will omit that and go on with the remarks of the hon. member for North Cape Breton.

Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. Chairman, if any hon. friend will insist upon it, all I have to say is that this statement was made on the 29th November last when the hon. member for East Hastings expressed himself strongley in favour of reciprocity. He assured us that he would hold up both hands in favour of such an arrangement. I would ask my hon. friend from East Hastings if he will put up one hand in favour of it if it comes to a vote now. In case anybody may think I am not quoting him properly I have taken the page and day when he spoke, so that anybody will see what the hon. gentleman said.

Then followed a reference to some remarks made by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm), and the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) proceeded:

> Now, Mr. Chairman, I have quoted a great many opinions but I have quoted none with greater satisfaction and greater faith than the two last opinions, because, judging from what has been going on around me here for the last three weeks, the fiery eloquence of the hon. member for East Hastings denouncing and condemning this agreement in all the moods and tenses, I certainly could not think that he had ever expressed a view in favour of the proposal.

Then he continues:

> Then, having discovered this oasis in the desert, I find there are a great many other saints in Caesar's house and that from other quarters we are getting support for this agreement.

Turning to the remarks to which the hon. gentleman refers, what do I find? The hon. gentleman professed to quote some remarks made by me in this House, and he himself says: In order to avoid any possibility of mistake I have taken the page and date when he spoke. On turning up page 408, which is the page given by the hon. gentleman, I find that the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) was discussing the Canadian navy. So, we see with what care the hon. gentleman gave his reference.

Mr. McKENZIE. I shall be pleased to hand the hon. gentleman 'Hansard' if there is any doubt about it.

Mr. NORTHRUP. May I ask the hon. gentleman——

Mr. McKENZIE. I may have made a mistake in the page.

Mr. NORTHRUP. May I ask the hon. gentleman does he deny that he made the statement that I am reading from page 5389, March 14, 1911, when he says:

> I quote here an opinion which will be found in 'Hansard,' page 408.

Mr. McKENZIE. I may say that I might have made a mistake in the page, but I have the extract in my hand that I clipped out of 'Hansard' and I will be pleased to give it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. NORTHRUP. If there is a mistake in the page, so far so good. The only reason I referred to the fact at all was to justify the apology and excuse that I intend to offer for the hon. gentleman before I conclude. It seems impossible for him to quote anything correctly, even the page at which I had spoken. The gravamen of the charge is this paragraph of my remarks:

An arrangement may be made which will admit many of the products of the United States in on satisfactory terms.

Will the House be surprised to learn that I did not say anything of the kind, and that there is nothing at all approaching it in any part of the speech made by me on that day, the 29th November?

Mr. McKENZIE. Read what you did say.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I will read it and read it correctly. The paragraph to which the hon. gentleman refers and in which the hon. gentleman for East Hastings is said to have 'expressed himself strongly in favour of reciprocity', is a paragraph taken not from my speech but from the speech from the Throne. But the House must be reasonable, for certainly the paragraph as quoted by the hon. gentleman bore so slight a resemblance to the speech from the Throne which I quoted that it is no wonder that he thought it was mine. let me give you what the hon. gentleman gives as the paragraph and let me give you what the speech from the Throne gives as the paragraph. The hon. gentleman quoted:

An arrangement may be made which will admit many of the products of the United States in on satisfactory terms.

That is the remark which I was supposed to have made. What I did quote from the speech from the Throne was this:

An arrangement may be made which will admit many of the products of the Dominion into the United States on satisfactory terms.

If there is no difference between Canadian produce going into the United States and American produce coming into the Dominion of Canada, then I am bound to admit that the hon. gentleman quoted me fairly and properly, but if there is any difference, or if the hon. gentleman can conceive or imagine or suppose or dream of any difference, between American products coming into Canada and Canadian products going into the United States, then I think I have surely ground for objection to being reported to have said exactly the opposite of what I did say when I quoted from the speech from the Throne. Then the hon. gentleman also rejoices within himself in the expectation that I would hold up both hands in favour of this arrangement. What did I say? Referring to the correct pages in 'Hansard', November 29, pages 392 and 393, I find that my remarks were along the line that I was finding fault—I merely mention this that what follows may be understood—with the government because there was no mention of reciprocity in the speech from the Throne. I called attention to the fact that while there was ample reference to the admission of our goods into the American market, there was no mention of American goods into our market. That is the point I was making. Then I made the quotation which has been garbled.

An arrangement may be made which will admit many of the products of the Dominion into the United States on satisfactory terms.

And said:

Why, of course, we would all hold up both hands for that. But does any one suppose for a moment that our American friends, the shrewdest, keenest, business men in the world, came to Canada merely to discuss measures by which the products of Canada would be admitted into the United States on satisfactory terms to Canada? Did it ever enter the minds of the right hon. gentleman or his colleagues that perhaps the Americans might like some of their goods to enter Canada on satisfactory terms to them? And, when we are called on to discuss such a question as this surely we have the right to ask that when the question is reciprocity, if it is reciprocity, we should be told so. Everybody will hold up both hands for any arrangement to enable us to send our goods on satisfactory terms to us in the United States, but whether or not we shall agree to let their goods in here is another story.

I think the quotation which I have given is pretty closely what was really said by me on the 29th November. As to the second statement quoted from the hon. gentleman's speech at page 5389, I am not perhaps to blame for not replying to it, because it is so far beyond my humble intellect, so far beyond the grasp or conception of an ordinary mind that I can merely leave it to hon. members to fathom if they can. The hon. gentleman said:

Then, having discovered this oasis in the desert, I find there are a great many other saints in Caesar's house and that from other quarters we are getting support for this agreement.

I do not contradict that, Mr. Speaker. I do not assent to it; but I frankly admit that had the hon. member for North Cape Breton been an Irishman I might have had some suspicion as to the explanation of it, but coming from a Scotchman I can only say, Sir, that I am hopelessly at a loss.

Mr. McKENZIE. As a matter of privilege—if there is any privilege left after the tremendous drain made upon it by the hon. member for East Hastings from day

to day,—I suppose I might claim some little of what privilege remains. The hon. member makes a great deal of noise about very little.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE. He makes a great deal of fuss, and he quotes scripture with great effect.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE. He says that the great offence I committed the other day was to unite his name with that of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. NORTHRUP. No such statement will be found on my part.

Mr. McKENZIE. It will be found on 'Hansard' that he said he would not get on his feet were it not that I united his name with that of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Yes, in the charge you made.

Mr. McKENZIE. Then, he went on to quote scripture. But there is one quotation from scripture which, had he used, he would have shut my mouth completely, and that is the reference to yoking an ox with an ass. Had he cited that as a reason why I should not unite his name with that of the leader of the opposition I would have nothing more to say. I did not get very much information or satisfaction out of the hon. gentleman's repeated speeches. If they are a question of privilege all right, but it is another matter altogether if they are merely made to keep my hon. friend in the limelight, and give him an opportunity to make little fiery speeches which I think is all the privilege he wants. There is another apt illustration that I might put on record in connection with the hon. member for Hastings. A Scotchman had a certain quadruped which he wanted to catch, and he chased it into a house in which there was only one window, and that a pane of glass 9 by 10. When he got the pig into the house he thought: Well, I've got you now, but the pig was not to be trapped, and he jumped through the 9 by 10 window. The Scotchman was perplexed, but he looked after the pig and said: Well, I lost you, but I've got your measure; it's 9 by 10. Well, I have got the measure of the hon. member for Hastings, but it would be tremendous extravagance to say he is 9 by 10 for I believe mathematically speaking he is nearer to 3 by 2. I care nothing for what the hon. gentleman says, and that is all the privilege I require.

Mr. McKENZIE.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE FARMERS' BANK.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Fielding that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the amendment of Mr. Henderson thereto.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that there was a branch of the Farmers' Bank established in my county in the village of Sharbot Lake; That there were 76 shares of stock held by residents of the county of Frontenac, and that with the double liability caused to these shareholders a loss of $15,-200. That, added to the money placed on deposit in that one branch entailed a loss to certain residents of the county of Frontenac of some $60,000, which although a relatively small sum in comparison with the loss sustained in other parts of the province is nevertheless a serious blow to that part of the county as it was distributed almost entirely over two rather poor townships. But, the sadness of the whole picture is only equalled by the splendid courage exhibited by many aged men and women in bravely facing the loss of all they possessed and of being brought down to penury and want. I desire, Sir, to express in the strongest possible terms my appreciation of the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), asking for a Royal Commission, and in doing so I am but endorsing the expression of opinion of all the people in my county who have sustained loss through the failure of this bank. I support this resolution, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that if a commission should be appointed certain evidence would be brought to light which would lead to the recovery of some of the money which has been lost, and thus to a certain extent recoup those who have suffered. I also support the resolution in the hope that this Royal Commission may obtain some information which may enable it to give to the Minister of Finance and to the House some definite information which will lead to the improvement of the Bank Act, and in consequence prevent similar loss in the future. Before discussing the Farmers' Bank in particular, I desire to make a few general observations in regard to the working of the Bank Act and to certain losses which have been sustained by bank failures from time to time in Canada. From 1880 to 1906 there were 48 chartered banks established in Canada, and of that number 12 or 25 per cent failed, and others only saved themselves from failure by amalgamation. In the neighourbood of 30 per cent of all the

banks which have been established since 1880 have failed and one half of these failures have occurred since 1896 during the time the present Finance Minister has held office. Surely, Sir, it is a sorry commentary on our banking system and on this government, that the percentage of failures of chartered banks in the Dominion of Canada has been greater since this administration came to power in 1896, and under the care of the present Minister of Finance, than in any other country in the world. Mr. H. C. McLeod, former general manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia, commenting on this deplorable state of affairs, used these words:

Most, if not all the above mentioned failures were fraudulent, and it is now plainly evident that a few hours examination by a skilled banker would have disclosed an insolvent condition in any one of these banks years before it collapsed.

This criticism was made some years ago and had the Minister of Finance acted upon the suggestion of this eminent financier, Mr. McLeod, endorsed, as it was, by many others from one end of the country to the other, I firmly believe that the people who are to-day suffering from the failure of the Farmers' Bank would not have sustained loss. The monthly bank statement for the month of December last shows the note circulation of all our banks in Canada to be $87,694,840. To what extent I may ask is that note circulation protected? The deposit with the government known as the Bank Note Redemption Fund, is only a fraction of the note circulation, and that is no use in saving a bank from failure in a time of stringency, because it is not available until the bank has closed its doors and gone into liquidation. The amount of it is so extremely small that it is practically of no use. So far as the Rest or Reserve Fund is concerned, the Farmers' Bank does not appear to have had any. The double liability of shareholders is represented as a very great guarantee of safety to depositors, but not only in regard to the failure of the Farmers' Bank, but in regard to the failures of the various banks which have taken place in this country for years past, the double liability of shareholders is absolutely no security whatever. That has been demonstrated time and again. The assets of the bank are the only guarantee that depositors have, and these assets, unfortunately, are often worthless or of such a kind that it is impossible to realize on them in time of need. What guarantee, I would like to ask, is afforded by the double liability of the stock of the bank when most of that stock is held by the bank itself? Take the case of the Banque Ville Marie, which failed in 1899, and was finally wound up in 1905; the total claims of depositors and noteholders were $1,364,000, and only $96,000 was collected from the shareholders on account of the double liability. Why? Because about $200,000 worth of the stock was held by the bank itself, having been bought up to support the price of the stock in the open market. And the greater part of the $300,000 of stock remaining was held by people from whom the double liability could not be realized—or, at least, was not collected. The paid up capital of this bank was $500,000, and although the Act restricts the amount of the note circulation to its paid-up capital, yet at the time it failed and for some time previously the note circulation was in excess of the paid-up capital. This is managed by the parties making false returns to the government, which, apparently, makes no effort to verify the bank returns made to it. This has occurred time and again. Another point in the failure of the bank just referred to is that the sum of $33,000 went to defray the expenses of liquidation and law costs, a very exorbitant sum, especially when you consider that the creditors, including depositors, received only 30 cents on the dollar.

Another evidence of the looseness of the Fielding Banking Act is furnished by the failure of the Bank of Yarmouth in 1905. This failure, occurring about the time this Farmers' Bank was seeking to get incorporated and before its certificate was granted, should have caused the Finance Minister to exercise caution. In regard to the Bank of Yarmouth, the main, if not the only cause of failure, was found in the large loans and advances to one mercantile house with unhonoured drafts for $249,550 at the time of suspension, and a total indebtedness to the bank amounting to within a very few dollars of half a million. Take the case of the Ontario Bank, which closed its doors in October, 1906. I may say that was about the time when the hon. Finance Minister was receiving warnings in regard to the Farmers' Bank. The 'Monetary Times,' speaking of the failure of the Ontario Bank, said:

This is the story of as miserable a fiasco as contemporary Canadian history affords.

Before the failure was made known to the shareholders, the Bank of Montreal made a private agreement whereby it acquired the business of the Ontario Bank for $150,000. By this deal it bought a business with over $12,000,000 of deposits, of which $3,000,000 were without interest, and a capacity for note circulation of $1,500,000. What was the cause of failure in that case? It bears a very close resemblance to the cause of failure in the Farmers' Bank—speculation by the manager, which began in 1901, but was covered up by such terms in the returns made to the government as 'current loans,' 'other securities,' &c., which the Finance Minister accepts, apparently, without question and without the slightest investigation

or inquiry as to their character. No less than $1,784,403 was lost through the speculation of the manager of the bank, and $230,091 by the bank purchasing its own stock in the open market, a practice which, as I have shown, makes the double liability a fallacy, a delusion and a snare. There are hundreds of men in Ontario who believe that, in the interests of the shareholders and of the people in general, there should be a Royal Commission to inquire thoroughly into all these bank failures that have taken place during recent years. The incapacity of the Finance Minister to deal with large financial problems effectively has become painfully evident to hundreds who have lost their all, and the hon. gentleman's indifference has aroused throughout the country the greatest indignation.

It looks to me as if, in the winding-up proceedings of these broken banks, the ordinary shareholder gets unmercifully fleeced, while the solvent banks get whatever assets are worth having. But what can one expect? The Fielding Banking Act is framed to meet the wishes of the Bankers' Association, and grants powers to that association which should be possessed only by the government. Take, for instance, section 117 of the Bank Act. That section authorizes the Bankers' Association, if a bank suspends payment in specie or Dominion notes of any of its liabilities as they accrue, forthwith to appoint a curator to supervise the affairs of such bank, and at any time to remove the curator and appoint another person in his stead. Thus, the affairs of the defunct bank are placed entirely in the hands of its competitors—surely a very illogical proceeding. The effect is that these banks purchase whatever assets are worth having at their own price. The Bankers' Association also have the naming of counsel, who makes the application at court for the winding-up order, and they appoint the liquidator as well as the curator. In the case of the Sovereign Bank, the public knew nothing of the condition of the bank until the morning after it was swallowed up by some of the larger banks. The directors entered into an agreement with thirteen banks, which declared the Sovereign Bank, with $20,000,000 of assets and over 80 branches, insolvent, transferred all that was of value to those thirteen banks, allowed them six months to look over the spoils and throw out anything which carried with it the appearance of liability, leaving the helpless shareholders to bear the brunt of the burden. At a meeting of the shareholders of the Sovereign Bank, a motion was submitted asking for a government investigation, but the president refused to put the motion, and said that he held proxies for the stock controlled by J. P. Morgan & Company of New York, and, if necesary, would exercise his voting power under these proxies to prevent an investigation.

Mr. EDWARDS.

In addition to the indifference of the Finance Minister to the whole disgraceful affair, I may mention that after a delay of almost a year and a half, a warrant was issued for the arrest of Lieut.-Col. D. M. Stewart, the former general manager of the Sovereign Bank, the charge against him being that he had made false returns to the government, and about the same time the militia orders from Ottawa announced that 'leave of absence, with permission to travel abroad, had been granted to Lieut.-Col. D. M. Stewart of the 13th Scottish Light Dragoons.' In the case of the Sovereign Bank there is good reason for suspecting that some of the banks, instead of assisting, actually helped to strangle that bank. At all events, there is little doubt that the Sovereign Bank was in a far more solvent condition at the time of the disclosure of its affairs than several other banks. Taking the percentage, which the reserve of legal tender bears to the liabilities, which I believe is the usual test of a bank's stability, it appears that on December 31, 1907, a few days before the Sovereign Bank was declared insolvent, it was able to liquidate in legal tender 4·1 per cent of its liabilities, and was in a better and more solvent condition than five other banks at the time. Their respective percentages were 1·5, 1·3, 1·2, 2·3 and 3·2. At that time the average percentage of reserve to liabilities in all the Canadian banks was 10·1, the highest of any was 19·1. Compare this with the fact that the Bank of England maintained reserves of fifty per cent, and the Bank of France and the Imperial Bank of Germany from fifty to seventy-five per cent.

Now I contend that these facts have a very important and direct bearing upon the matter we are considering, namely, whether we will grant a Royal Commission in this case. I am giving these facts for the purpose of showing that to my mind there is reason for a very thorough investigation into the whole banking system of this country. I have received from my own county many requests, I have in my possession a letter from a county judge in the province of Ontario, urging that a commission such as the one now asked for be appointed, and that its scope be extended over the failure of the Sovereign and the Ontario banks as well as the Farmers' Bank. It is worth noting that throughout this country vast sums of money are being expended by banking institutions in erecting magnificent buildings; and if you look at the returns furnished monthly to the Finance Minister by the several banks, you will be struck by the very low valuation placed upon these buildings. Another thing which attracts my attention is that the salaries of bank managers in Canada are from two to four times higher than those

paid to the highest officers in the Bank of England or the Imperial Bank of Germany.

Another respect wherein I think this government is culpable and neglectful of the public interest, is in regard to the deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank. Now the Post Office Savings Banks are merely a means whereby the people transfer their funds to the regular banks, the post office acting as a medium, that is all. The money paid by the people in the Post Office Savings Banks is transferred to the regular banks, the post office sending deposit slips to Ottawa. The people are paid three per cent interest on their deposits by the post office, and that rate is paid back to the Post Office Department by the several banks to which the money is transferred, that is all it amounts to. Putting the money in the Post Office Savings Bank merely gives the depositor a guarantee by this government that his money will be safe, that is the only advantage the people have in placing their money in the Post Office Savings Banks instead of in the regular banks, because it goes to the regular banks anyway. Now the Bankers' Association control the Finance Minister in that respect, just as they do apparently in many others. The people receive three per cent from the banks for the money deposited, and when they want to borrow money they have to pay anywhere from six to ten per cent on loans. The Bankers' Association will not agree that the rate of interest in the Post Office Savings Bank should be increased, because they know full well that if the rate was increased they would have to increase the rate they pay to the public; so I say that they are able to control the Finance Minister in that regard, and to keep the rate of interest in the Post Office Savings Bank the same as it is in the regular banks. Now on the 31st of last December, all the banks in Canada showed a paid-up capital of $99,676,093; the deposits of the people in those banks amounted to $280,910,695, those were deposits payable on demand. The deposits payable after notice, or on a fixed date, amounted to $544,220,710. There is a total of $825,131,405 of the people's money deposited in the various banks of this country, the paid-up capital of which is only $99,676,093. In other words, under the system to-day, the money, the credit of the people, is being used by the banking institutions of this country at the rate of three per cent, and these banking institutions show their gratitude to the people by charging them anywhere from six to ten per cent on short loans, if they can get the money at all. That is the condition of affairs, and it is one that is unfair, not only that, but it is being permitted by the government at the present time, and has been permitted for years. The government pay three per cent to the people, while this very government goes to England, or to other money markets of the world, and borrows money on which it pays four per cent or even a higher rate, while there are over $800,000,000 of the people's money only drawing three per cent. Now I contend that these figures show that the people of this country, whose money is running these banks, have a right to come to this parliament and ask for a Royal Commission to investigate the failure of the Farmers' Bank, or of any other bank. They have a perfect right to ask that some of the money of this country should be expended in granting that Royal Commission, and even they might go further, and ask this government to give them some compensation for the losses they have sustained.

Now I wish to refer more particularly to the failure of the Farmers' Bank, and in doing so permit me to refer briefly to some remarks made by the right hon. the Prime Minister last night. The right hon. gentleman spoke to this resolution very briefly, not only did he speak briefly but he did not speak to the point. He attempted to read into the resolution what was not there at all, and he forgot to read what was in the resolution, for instance, he tried to leave the impression that the resolution contained something in the direction of compensating those who had lost by the failure of the bank. Now there was nothing whatever of that kind in the resolution, from first to last. But, Sir, I think although that was not contained in the resolution and although the right hon. gentleman spent a good deal of his time in trying to leave the impression that that was the sum and substance of the resolution before the House, I would say, speaking for myself, that I do think there are very strong and cogent reasons why this government should compensate, in a measure at least, the people who have sustained losses through the failure of the Farmers' Bank. This parliament has voted without dissent substantial sums of money for the relief of sufferers by flood in Paris and by earthquake in San Francisco and in Italy. These people suffered through no fault of their own and through no fault of this government, and parliament gladly gave them a measure of relief. The sufferers through the failure of the Farmers' Bank also suffered from no fault of their own, but from the negligence and the fault of this government, and therefore, the argument in favour of granting relief to them is overwhelming as I think has been amply proven in the discussion that has taken place.

The right hon. gentleman, after failing in his juggling feat with the motion before the Chair, advanced as his sole and only plea why a Royal Commission should

not issue in this matter that the Finance Minister had been deceived, and that we should, therefore, not hold the government responsible. He says that Travers was the agent of the shareholders, and that we should not reimburse these shareholders whose agent Travers was, but he failed entirely to answer the point raised by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), when he referred to the depositors who certainly were not to blame whatever blame may attach to the shareholders.

What are the facts in regard to the Farmers' Bank? The Farmers' Bank was incorporated in the year 1905. The matter came before the Banking and Commerce Committee in the regular way. An attempt was made by the Minister of Finance to have the members of the Banking and Commerce Committee share with him the responsibility for the incorporation of the Farmers' Bank. I do not think that was justified, because while the matter came before the Banking and Commerce Committee it is well known that many of the details, such as the examination of credentials, are not placed before that committee, but are supposed to be looked after by the Finance Department. The minister failed utterly in his attempt to drag the members of the Banking and Commerce Committee into the pool created by his own neglect, and lax administration. The Finance Minister has been deceived by Mr. Travers, the Prime Minister says. It is an old saying that there are none so blind as those who will not see, and in reference to the Farmers' Bank it does appear that the Finance Minister deliberately refused to either hear or see; from the time he took office in 1896 until to-day his pathway is strewn with the wreckage of banks, yet he has never taken warning from one of those banks. I do not know what warnings will be necessary to make him realize his responsibility, he may wait until some bricks fall out of a breaking bank and hit him on the head before he realizes how weak his whole Bank Act is. The statement of a man like Mr. McLeod, former manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia, appears to have made no impression on him whatever. One of the ablest and oldest and most highly respected members of this House, the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) went to the Finance Minister and gave him repeated warnings in regard to the Farmers' Bank, and yet the Prime Minister says the Finance Minister was deceived. I would like to ask why the Prime Minister objects to the issuing of a Royal Commission? Can those who have suffered by the failure of the Farmers' Bank lose anything by the appointment of a commission, can matters be made any worse for them? Will anybody say there is no possibility that it might bring forth some facts which would lead to the recovery of part of the money? Why then object to the appointment of this Royal Commission? What is the premier afraid of? No doubt if there was a Royal Commission the Finance Minister would be placed in the box and would have to give evidence. Is the Prime Minister afraid of that? Is that the reason why they do not wish a Royal Commission? There is no doubt also that if a Royal Commission was appointed, Mr. Calvert, former chief Liberal whip, would have to go into the box. Is it for the sake of Mr. Calvert that the Prime Minister and his Finance Minister object to the appointment of a Royal Commission?

Mr. BOYCE. Would not other hon. gentlemen opposite have to go into the box?

Mr. EDWARDS. I cannot say, but it seems to me very probable that the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stratton) would have to testify before such a commission. Is it because of this that the leader of the government, and the Finance Minister object to a Royal Commission? They have not given any good reason why a Royal Commission should not issue, and it does look very suspicious indeed. If they have nothing to conceal, if they have no party favourites to defend and protect, why should not a Royal Commission be appointed to investigate this matter without loss of time? It looks to me as if the objection to the Royal Commission was not on the grounds of economy—think of this government practising economy along any line—but purely on the ground of party political expediency. The Prime Minister says his Finance Minister was deceived. But, suppose he was—though in the face of facts that were placed before him previous to that certificate being issued I do not see how he could be deceived—but, if he were deceived all the more reason there is why a Royal Commision should be appointed which will get at the methods by which men like Travers can come along and deceive a man like the Minister of Finance, so that we may be able to guard against that sort of thing in the future. On the 8th of October, 1906, Mr. Leighton McCarthy wrote the Minister of Finance giving notice that a number of subscribers would dispute the bona fide character of the subscriptions, and that was followed by another letter from the same gentleman on the 19th of October inclosing a special endorsement of writ from the High Court of Justice and giving the names of plaintiffs and defendants. These letters and documents allege fraud, deception, and misrepresentation in getting subscriptions; they gave numerous examples and all of this information was in the hands of the Minister of Finance before the certificate was granted. The Prime Minister tells us, however, that his Minister of Finance was

deceived, but the allegations made in these letters of Mr. McCarthy and in the documents sent were acknowledged by Travers when he paid back the money and gave up the notes to these subscribers, which he did rather than face the court. I repeat that all of these facts were before the Minister of Finance prior to the certificate being granted. It was the duty of the Minister of Finance to guard the people's interest and to see that section 13 of the Bank Act was complied with. Did he do so? No, on the contrary he knew it had been violated and that Travers and the provisional directors had no right to call the meeting of the subscribers which they did call under that section. Was the Minister of Finance deceived in that? I think he knew, and he must have known that the meeting was called illegally, and it looks to me that he was indifferent rather than that he was deceived. The names of men who had been released by the High Court of Justice as subscribers to the Farmers' Bank and whose money and notes had been returned to them by the order of that court were falsely retained on the list as subscribers for shares, and how can the Minister of Finance say he was ignorant of that fact. And yet, the Prime Minister puts forward as his only reason for opposing the appointment of a Royal Commission, that his Minister of Finance was deceived. Will the Minister of Finance say that the $250,000 was properly raised by the taking of notes from the subscribers and the discounting of the same. Why, the Minister of Finance himself says in a letter to Travers dated November 30:

> We have been told that in some cases the subscribers did not actually pay in cash but gave notes to the provisional directors which were used to raise money.

On the very same day Sir Edward Clouston, president of the Canadian Bankers' Association wrote a letter to the Minister of Finance counselling delay in the issuing of the certificate and urging thorough investigation for the protection of the public. And yet, with all these facts before him, the Minister of Finance issued a cirtificate without which the Farmers' Bank could not have gone on and without which these losses would have been impossible. And yet we are told by the Prime Minister that the government is in no way responsible, because the Minister of Finance was deceived. Now, Sir, this brings us up to the granting of the certificate, and I say it is a most remarkable thing that the Finance Minister in the face of these repeated warnings; in the face of this indisputable evidence that Travers was crooked, granted this certificate. But, I would take the matter just a step further; I would like to know if the responsibility of the government ends with the granting of the certificate. Has the government no further duty to perform? has it no further obligation to protect the people? Let them read sections 112 and 113 of the Bank Act. Section 112 says:

> Monthly returns shall be made by the bank to the minister in the forms set forth in the schedule to this Act.

Section 113 reads:

> The minister may also call for special returns from any bank whenever in his judgment they are necessary to afford a full and complete knowledge of its conditions.

So that after the certificate was granted the Minister of Finance had the right not only to a monthly return, but he had the right at any time to ask for a special return that he might be apprised of the condition of the bank in any respect. Did the Minister of Finance find nothing in the correspondence which passed between him and the state superintendent of insurance for New York over a year ago, to warrant him in asking for a special return in order that he might have full and complete knowledge of the condition of the Farmers' Bank. Let me read what is said by an American paper of date, January 17, 1910, commenting on this matter:

> An amazing and almost incredible story, which should make every Canadian blush for shame is on file here in the public records of the Department of Insurance of New York State. It relates how, in the face of repeated warnings and urgent entreaties, based on undisputed facts, the Finance Department of Canada refused summarily to investigate the Farmers' Bank a year ago when it was beginning to totter on the brink of inevitable disaster.

There we have the whole thing in a nutshell so far as the minister's responsibility is concerned after the certificate was granted, I repeat that his responsibility as Minister of Finance did not end with the granting of the certificate, but that it was up to him in the face of the correspondence which passed between him and the New York state superintendent of insurance to hold the most rigid and careful examination into the condition of the Farmers' Bank. Had he done his duty in that respect the people of this province would have been saved the heavy losses they have sustained. Now, Sir, what members do we find on the government side of the House opposing this resolution asking for a Royal Commission? We have in opposition the Minister of Finance, and that is of course very natural I suppose, and we have the opposition of the Prime Minister, who thinks it is necessary to protect and shield his followers, which I suppose is very natural also. In addition to that, up to the present time we have had the opposition of

the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) to the granting of this Royal Commission. That hon. gentleman interested himself very energetically and enthusiastically some time last year, in raising that beautiful fund which was presented to the Minister of Finance, the $120,000 present. I believe it is said that the hon. member for South Grey contributed slightly to that fund. At all events I think I am correct in saying that the hon. gentleman told us himself in this House that he was one of those who solicited subscriptions. Well, that was last year; he occupies the position of chairman of the Banking and Commerce Committee this year.

Now, Sir, the Farmers' Bank in all its transactions from beginning to end is a very sorry spectacle. It seems to me that it was conceived in fraud and iniquity, and that there was a deliberate attempt from the very beginning of the organization of this bank to rob the people of the province. From the day that the Finance Minister, regardless of the repeated warnings which he had received, granted the certificate, down to the time that the bank failed a short time ago, every bit of history of the transaction is marked with fraud and deceit. The Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister have failed in their duty to the people and I regret that they are disposed at the present time to add to the burden of their sins, already one would think, greater than ordinary mortals could bear, by refusing this very reasonable request of my hon. friend from Halton that a Royal Commission be issued to inquire into the Farmers' Bank. For my part, I am very strongly in accord with the resolution. I think I would not be doing my duty to the people of my constituency who have suffered serious loss from the failure of this bank did I not urge upon the House the appointment of a Royal Commission. After hearing the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister oppose the resolution we who come from constituencies where people have sustained heavy losses by the failure of this bank have nothing much to expect in the way of the granting of the request of this resolution. Very well, the responsibility will be put on this government and I can assure the hon. Minister of Finance that the people of my county, when they are aware, and they are pretty well aware now, of his inefficiency as a Minister of Finance, of his inability to cope with the financial situation, of his failure to regard repeated warnings given to him and which, if he had regarded them, would have saved them from the loss which they have sustained, will not have very much confidence in his ability to go to Washington and negotiate a treaty for the benefit of this country.

Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford). Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal in the remarks of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) in introducing this resolution, with which I personally am entirely in accord. It is a great pity in the financial interests of the country and also in the interests of the people who have been so severely punished that a fraud of this kind should have peen perpetrated on the public. I also have a large number of people in the riding that I haye the honour of representing in this House who have been very severely punished, and I know that we have in two townships in North Oxford lost $105,000 in deposits. It would not require a person to have very much sympathy in his nature to sympathize with these people. I heard the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) last evening read a letter from some one at Lakeside in my constituency, the lady who wrote the letter, I suppose, being either the wife of one of my constituents or a widow in that constituency. I have been approached by people who lost money deposited in that bank to ask the government to see that they were reimbursed for their losses. I have also been approached by people to ask the government to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate, although I may say not exactly the kind of Royal Commission that is proposed by the resolution. I heard the resolution read yesterday, but I am slow to gather in what is read in that way, and until to-day I did not know what was in that resolution. If I may be allowed I would like to read it just to hear myself read it:

> This House is of opinion that a Royal Commission should forthwith issue to inquire into and investigate the incorporation and organization of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, and the granting of a certificate by the Treasury Board permitting said bank to issue notes and transact business, and all the circumstances connected therewith——

That is into the issuing of the certificate:

> —and generally to inquire into and investigate the operation and efficiency of the Bank Act in relation to the affairs and transactions of said bank.

There is nothing asking the government to appoint a commission to inquire into the working of the Farmers' Bank after it was instituted or into the present condition of the Farmers' Bank that was. What I would think would be much more necessary would be to inquire into the present condition and find out if there were any means of recovering some of the money that the depositors and shareholders of the Farmers' Bank were beaten out of. As far as the issuing of the certificate is concerned, I cannot agree with the hon. member

for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) when he says that the shareholders were looking to the Finance Minister to protect them in not issuing the certificate. I venture to say that there was not one in twenty of these subscribers who knew that when the charter was issued the bank did not come into existence. I venture to say that until this discussion came on in the newspapers with reference to the certificate there were very few subscribers of the Farmers' Bank who knew that a certificate had to be issued after the charter was obtained. I believe that most of them thought that the instant the charter was obtained it authorized the bank to go on and do business. Therefore, I do not believe that there was deception in so far as the subscribers were concerned. Perhaps a good many people who bought stock in the Farmers' Bank now do not really understand what the discussion is as between the certificate and the charter. The fact is that these stocks are sold by very enterprising gentlemen as a rule, men who have very smooth tongues, and you will see in this Return which has been brought down by the government that the prospectus points to the profits that might be obtained by buying stock in this bank, comparing it with the older banks that have been in existence for a long time. That, I know, is done. I am not selling stock for any corporation. I frequently have propositions brought to my attention and I have many times been asked to sell stock for various institutions, but up to the present I have refused for the very simple reason that I never know whether the corporation will be a success or not. I do occasionally buy some stock, if I can borrow money enough to do it, and I have generally been deceived myself, although I do not know that I know so very much less than the ordinary individual shareholder in my section of the country.

Coming down to the question whether the Finance Minister was guilty of any negligence or not, I am quite sure that none of my hon. friends opposite will say that they charge him with anything else. I do not think that any one of them will say that the Finance Minister had any wrong intention when he allowed that certificate to be given to the Farmers' Bank; but looking at this matter in a proper light, the question is: Was the Finance Minister negligent in his duty? We must all admit that the Finance Minister is not more responsble for the Bank Act than any other hon. member in this House. We are all equally responsible The hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Edwards), has continually referred to it as the Finance Minister's Bank Act, but that Act was in force practically as it is now before Mr. Fielding became Finance Minister, so that he is no more responsible for it than any other hon. member of this House. In executing that Act, he acts in an administrative position. He has to administer the Act as he finds it, and I claim that he did so administer it. Under clause 15, after all other requirements have been complied with, the promoters have to deposit $250,000 with the Receiver General and $5,000 for currency. The hon. minister (Mr. Fielding) did see that that $250,000 was deposited. It is quite true that Mr. Leighton McCarthy notified him not to issue a certificate until some irregularities were removed, but in another letter Mr. McCarthy withdrew that notification. He said most distinctly that he withdrew the charges he had made, and his opposition to the issue of the certificate. He withdrew entirely his opposition, in so far as his clients were concerned. I do say that I can sympathize with my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), who may have given a hint to the Finance Minister that everything was not right, but did not want to put himself in writing. He did not want to commit himself to writing for the simple reason that none of us want to assume the position we would have to assume by putting ourselves in writing if we were not absolutely sure of the facts. I quite believe that if we were aware that a fraud was about to be committed on the government or anybody else, we would be only too willing to give notice to the parties interested. But my hon. friend from Halton was naturally very careful not to put himself on record in writing. He was very careful not to tell the Finance Minister in writing that he thought a fraud was about to be committed. The Finance Minister was in exactly the same position. He dared not move until he was absolutely sure because he might do a good deal more harm than he possibly could do good. When Mr. McCarthy withdrew his objections, the minister had nothing before him to show that there was anything wrong. He had the affidavit required by clause 15, and after Mr. McCarthy had withdrawn his opposition there was certainly nothing to warrant the minister in concluding that Travers was not telling the truth when he told him that the subscriptions were regular and that everything was regular. If my hon. friend from Halton did not want to put himself in writing, I can quite understand that the Minister of Finance would not dare to prevent the issuing of that certificate. If he had, there would have been a cry to high heaven that he was standing in with the moneyed interests and the banking association and consequently had refused to give the farmers a charter and see how they could run a bank for themselves.

The Finance Minister was not authorized by anything shown here to refuse that

certificate. The next day after the certificate had been issued, when Mr. Clouston, President of the Banking Association, told him he did not think everything was right and that the moneys had not been all obtained for that certificate, properly Mr. Clouston was very careful in the letter he wrote not to be very definite in his statements. He did not say that there was something wrong, but that he heard something was wrong, and asked the Minister to delay issuing the certificate. But there was nothing in the Act to authorize the Minister of Finance to stop that certificate. Had he done so, he and the government would have been open to prosecution.

Mr. BOYCE. Would the hon. gentleman say that the certificate having been issued, and the attention of the Minister of Finance or the Treasury Board having been drawn to the fact the following day that that certificate had been obtained by fraud, the government were powerless to prevent a continuance of that fraud on the public?

Mr. NESBITT. There is nothing in the Bank Act to show what the government should do in such a case. There is no power or instructions in it to meet such a case. Mr. Clouston said in his letter that he had heard that there were rumours and asked that they be investigated. There was no charge.

Mr. BOYCE. Mr. Clouston said, as President of the Canadian Bankers' Association, to the Finance Minister that he had reason to believe, and that is very different from having heard.

Mr. NESBITT. What is the difference? The words are not the same but the meaning in each case is identical. It needs a peculiar mind to construe them differently. What I say is this, that if there be anything wrong in this matter it is the Bank Act, and the Minister of Finance did not make that Act any more than any of the rest of us, and if that Act is wrong, then it is high time we should amend it, and I understand there is going to be a new Bank Act. Now, I hope that all these hon. gentlemen who deem themselves so wise during this debate will be at the Banking and Commerce Committee and show an interest there in the amending of the Banking Act, and try to put through a Bank Act that will guard against these evils. I quite agree with the hon. member who said yesterday that there should be corroborative or collateral evidence in addition to the affidavit before the issuance of the certificate authorizing a bank to commence operations. But I do not agree with the suggestion of sending for the minute book of the people who are incorporating. I know that the present Bank Act does not authorize this. I believe it has never been done, and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) says that it has never been done in his time.

Now, as to reimbursing these depositors, where would this end? Some hon. gentleman says that we have voted moneys to the sufferers by great calamities in this and in other countries. That is quite true, but I think that that is entirely different from voting moneys to repay these depositors, much as I sympathize with them. These calamities that are referred to are the act of God. But these people who put money into this bank—I am not speaking harshly of them; there are a number of them in my own section—had access to a bank of which they were sure all the time, the Post Office Savings Bank; and they could have got just as good interest in it as they got in the Farmers' Bank. Right in the same place where the Farmers' Bank had an office, there was the Post Office Savings Bank ready to receive the people's money. Therefore, this loss is not in the same class as loss in a calamity which, as I have said, is the act of God.

One thing was said last night that surprised me a good deal, and that was what my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) said with regard to a former member of this House. I did not think the hon. gentleman would be so—well, so unfair. It was an insinuation that Mr. Calvert, formerly whip on this side of the House, had introduced this man Travers to the Finance Minister for financial reasons—nothing more and nothing less. Now, Mr. Calvert denies over his own signature in the newspapers that he had any possible interest in giving this introduction. He said that when he was whip, former mayor Urquhart of Toronto wrote him a letter introducing this man Travers to him—he had never seen the man before, and did not know him—and asking him to introduce Travers to the Finance Minister. Mr. Calvert received hundreds of letters of that kind from various people all through the country. He did introduce this man to the Minister of Finance. He afterwards borrowed from the Farmers' Bank $3,000—like any other man who would borrow; and he repaid it, like any other borrower. Should I think my hon. friend from West Elgin himself will see that it is not a fair thing to throw suspicion on a transaction of that kind. There was no need for suspicion; Mr. Calvert did what he had a perfect right to do. Every member of this House is asked to introduce people he knows little about to ministers of the Crown. If these people turn out wrong, to a certainty it is not our fault.

So far as this resolution is concerned, I

think the whole fault whatever it may be, lies with the Bank Act. If this idea of reimbursing the depositors were carried out, some of my people would benefit by it, and I should be glad to see it done if the doing of it could be justified. But we could not make an exception of these people; we should have to go back to the people interested in the Banque de St. Jean, the Banque Ville Marie and others. We could not very well do that. And there are many other things for which, on the same ground, we should have to reimburse people—for there are so many companies chartered by the government that afterwards beat the people. It is too bad that it is so, but I presume that it will always be so. Nobody sympathizes with these losers more than I do, but I do not see why we should be asked to take money out of the public treasury to reimburse them. They deposited their money in the Farmers' Bank with their eyes wide open, when they had, as I have said, other places where they could have deposited it with absolute safety, guaranteed by the government itself. The Bank Act, I think, should be amended in many ways; but I am not going to discuss that this afternoon; this is not the time for such a discussion. I shall have much pleasure, if I am living and the Bank Act comes before the Committee on Banking and Commerce, in taking part in the discussion there. I have my own views as to how the Act should be amended—very strong views— and I agree that we should protect the people to the very best of our ability in these charters that we issue. This applies not only to bank charters, but to all others. We should be more careful in all the charters we issue here. For my part, I hope it will not be many years before the Dominion Companies' Act will be amended. Many improvements could be made in that law for the better protection of the public. But, after all, you cannot wholly protect the public. We are not a paternal government, and the public will always, no doubt, be buying stock in something in which it will be beaten. As to this particular bank which is under discussion, I quite agree with the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) that it was intended from the first to beat everybody; I do not believe that it had any other idea. I would like to see these people severely punished. If the courts, which are now investigating this case, do not investigate it thoroughly and punish adequately everybody who should be punished in connection with the matter. I hope the government will appoint a Royal Commission and follow up the case. But I do not think this is the time—while the courts are investigating—to ask the government to appoint a Royal Commission. And I still say, with all due deference to the opinions of others, that nothing has been said during this debate that would lead any person to believe that the Finance Minister did not do his duty fully as laid down by the Bank Act. Especially will this be seen to be the case when you consider that it would have been just as dangerous—perhaps more so—for him to make an error by refusing a certificate to people who should have it as to err in granting a certificate. The Minister of Finance speaking yesterday afternoon, quite fairly called attention to the fact that these people who made this application were then creditable men. We are all gifted with wonderful hindsight as compared with our foresight. We all know now that this was a fraud. We all know that this man Travers was a fraud. For my part, before the bank started I had never heard of him, and I venture to say that the Finance Minister had never heard of him either, until Travers was introduced to him. Some people have commented upon what a nice letter the Finance Minister wrote to this man on the day when he issued this certificate.

Now hon. gentlemen know that there is no point in that sneer against the Finance Minister. That was only an ordinary polite letter such as we get every day, and if hon. gentlemen opposite dont get that class of letters every day from business men, I do, and I hope that is the class of letters they write to business men. Why should they sneer at the Finance Minister, because he wrote an ordinary polite letter to a man that, so far as he knew, was honest, and who wanted to deal with the government in an absolutely honest manner? Now I want to put myself on record as saying that I would like to see this matter investigated thoroughly, and so far as I have been able to observe, it is being thoroughly investigated in Toronto. I see that yesterday two or three other men have been committed, I hope they will have a fair trial, and if they have been guilty of any fraud, that they will be punished. I believe there are men who have borrowed money from the Farmers' Bank who will be uncovered by the liquidators, and if they are able, they will be forced to pay the money back. I look to see the liquidation of the Farmers' Bank turn out better than many now expect, because I believe that some of those to whom the Farmers' Bank had lent money in a reckless manner, will be forced to return it. If that is not done, I hope the government will appoint a commission that will compel them to do so, and that will see that everybody who has been guilty of fraud in connection with the Farmers' Bank will be punished. But I do not see the need of inquiring into the Bank Act as applicable to the failure of the Farmers' Bank at present

when we are to take up the revision of the Bank Act itself in a few days, and if there is anything lacking in the Bank Act that will be the time to make it right. When that time comes, I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will show just as much interest in preparing a thoroughly efficient and proper Bank Act, as they are now in asking for a Royal Commission.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). My excuse for taking up a short time of the House in discussing this question, is that in my own county, at a small place called Chiltenham, the people have lost already, or will lose, $36,600. I was much interested in listening to the remarks of my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). He stated that those who organized this bank were guilty of fraud, but he is unwilling to vote for a resolution that will bring about a searching examination to find out who is responsible. My hon. friend suggests that possibly a revision of the Bank Act might reach the case. For myself, I cannot understand how any revision of the Bank Act is going to assist to bring those who are guilty to justice, or recover any of the money which has been lost by many persons in the province of Ontario by reason of the failure of the Farmers' Bank. I crave the indulgence of the House to read a petition that was presented from my own county, bearing the signature of 70 men who are sufferers from this failure, men who had invested their money either in stock of the bank, or placed it on deposit. This petition is only one among many others that have been presented to the right hon. the First Minister and the Finance Minister in relation to this difficulty:

To the honourable the House of Commons in parliament assembled:

The petition of shareholders and of creditors of the Farmers' Bank of Canada humbly sheweth:—

1. The bank was incorporated by an Act of the parliament of Canada, chapter 77, of Edward VII.

2. The Act was amended by subsequent Acts.

3. The bank was organized in the year 1906.

4. A large proportion of the shareholders are farmers.

5. The government return for October, 1910, reports the total assets of the bank at $2,670,195, and the total liabilities at $2,051,081, leaving a surplus of $619,114.

6. The bank suspended on the 19th day of December, 1910, and Geoffrey T. Clarkeson, accountant, has been appointed curator, and has taken possession of the head office and branch offices of the bank, and of the books, assets and securities at the offices.

7. The curator has with the assistance of a retired bank manager and some of the officers of the bank, made a partial examination and investigation into the assets and liabilities of the bank, and your petitioners are informed and believe that the curator will report to the shareholders and creditors that a large proportion of the capital and deposits has been lost by the officials of the bank in their own speculative and unlawful transactions, and amongst others:

(1) In the purchase, equipment and development of a mining prospect.

(2) In loans on unlawful and insufficient securities.

(3) In personal loans to borrowers who have no means or ability to repay them.

8. The deposits are stated to be more than $1,500,000 and the paid-up capital stock about $580,000.

9. Your petitioners are informed and believe that the shareholders will be called upon to pay the double liability on their shares, and that all the available and collectable assets, inclusive of the double liability, will not realize a sufficient sum of money to pay more than an approximate rate of twenty-five cents on the dollar to the general creditors after payment of preferential claims.

10. Your petitioners have been trusting to the published government returns of the assets and liabilities of the bank and the difference between the published returns and the actual state of the accounts of the bank, appear to show a loss of the money of the shareholders and depositors within a period of four years of approximately the sum of $1,500,000.

11. The grief, the sorrow, the physical and mental suffering brought on the families of shareholders and creditors cannot be told in a petition.

12. Your petitioners refer to the examination under oath of the inspector of the bank in open court at Lindsay, and to the report which will soon be prepared by the curator.

13. And it is evident that in too many instances the families of shareholders and creditors will be compelled to meet great distress and suffering.

14. And your petitioners respectfully submit——

I want to direct attention particularly to this.

And your petitioners respectfully submit to the parliament of Canada that it is material and necessary in the public interest to have a thorough and exhaustive examination of the government returns which have been made by the officers of the bank and of all the affairs, accounts and transactions involving the use of the money of the bank.

Now in closing, I want to direct this latter paragraph to the attention of my hon. friend from North Oxford, because in his county there are some people who are losing money.

15. And your petitioners respectfully pray that a Royal Commission shall at once be issued with full powers to examine into the affairs of the bank from the time of its incorporation until its suspension, and of all the accounts, dealings and transactions with the money, securities, assets and liabilities of the bank, and your petitioners will ever pray.

This is signed by P. O. Macdonald, T. H. Elliott, F. P. Hames, in all by 70 persons, who have suffered by the wrong-

doing of some persons. For myself I cannot agree with my hon. friend from North Oxford when he says that the responsibility for this difficulty does not rest upon the government; in my opinion all the responsibility rests on the government of the day. There is responsibility somewhere. The Prime Minister has stated that it does not rest with the Banking and Commerce Committee or with the House in passing the incorporation Bill, the one important point is the minister's responsibility for granting the certificate that allowed the bank's doors to be opened for the people to deposit their money. Let me suggest that if the Banking and Commerce Committee of this House when this bank was seeking incorporation for the first time, and subsequently when it came for extension of time had been made aware of such a letter as was written by Mr. McCarthy, then a member of this House, not a member on either side of the House would have granted the extension or granted the bank incorporation at all. Therefore, whatever responsibility may attach to the members of the Banking and Commerce Committee, and of this House there is surely a special responsibility resting on my right hon. friend as Prime Minister, upon the Treasury Board and particularly upon my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. Leaving out the question of incorporation and extension what does the Finance Minister say about it in his speech of yesterday:

> The first stage in this matter of the issue of the certificate is to be found in a communication from Mr. Leighton McCarthy, who says he is instructed by some shareholders, his clients, to object to the issue of the certificate, and he states in a subsequent letter that he complains that in come cases where large sums of money have been paid, notes have also been given. Now, at that time the application for a certificate had not yet been received, and, therefore, there was no such application.

Then when this all-important time arrived in the bank's history, the first matter that came to the attention of the Finance Minister was a letter from Mr. McCarthy which was as follows:

> Home Life Building, Victoria St.,
> Toronto, Oct. 8, 1906.
>
> Counsel, Wallace Nesbitt, K.C.
>
> Honourable W. S. Fielding
> Minister of Finance,
> Ottawa.
>
> My Dear Mr. Fielding,—I have been consulted on behalf of a number of subscribers to the shares of the Farmers' Bank, and from the instructions I have received, a number of the subscribers will dispute the bona fide character of the subscriptions. I have not time to-night to give a full statement of the grounds of this request to you, but I beg to assure you that grave conditions have arisen which will require careful consideration before the Treasury Board would grant any certificate for the organization of this bank.
>
> I, therefore, ask you to be good enough to stay any action which might be taken until I have had an opportunity of discussing this with you. If it is not asking you to hold it too long, I would prefer not having to go to Ottawa this week, but will go any day next week which would suit your convenience. Of course, if there is no immediate prospect of your granting such a certificate, my seeing you at an early date will not be necessary.
>
> LEIGHTON McCARTHY.

The Finance Minister states that everything has been presented to the House and practically everything has been discussed. The House has no knowledge whatever of the personal interview and of what took place between Mr. McCarthy and the Finance Minister.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think I had any such interview. I do not recollect any at all events. I do not think Mr. McCarthy came to me on the subject.

Mr. BLAIN. That is one of the difficulties. We have a letter from Mr. McCarthy stating that he would come to Ottawa.

Mr. FIELDING. Later on it appears that he did not come. I am pretty sure I am correct in saying that Mr. McCarthy did not see me about it.

Mr. BLAIN. I accept that statement. My hon. friend had notice from Mr. McCarthy that there was something wrong. My hon. friend knew at that time that a large number of people in almost every part of the province of Ontario had subscribed for stock, had paid a portion of their money and given notes for some of the balance. Not only was my hon. friend aware of that, but he said in the House that when this matter was up for an extension in the Banking and Commerce Committee he was a little suspicious of the affair himself. Suspicious of what? Suspicious that these men who were associated in the early history of this bank were not the men to whom to entrust the people's money and public honour of this country?

Mr. FIELDING. No, that was not it.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend denies that, but he goes on in his speech and is very careful to give a character to Mr. Travers. May I say to my hon. friend, with all deference to the high position he occupies, that the public have dealt to some extent with Mr. Travers, and they want to deal with my hon. friend the Finance Minister now, because my hon. friend the Finance Minister had more to do with the granting of this certificate than any other man in Canada. One word from the Finance Minister at a critical stage in the history of this bank, not after the bank had been

organized and the people had put their money into it, but when he either took this letter of Mr. McCarthy's before the Treasury Board or did not, would have settled this question and not a man in Canada would have lost a dollar through this bank. May I ask the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister whether or not, when this matter was discussed in the Treasury Board, Mr. McCarthy's letter was read to the board?

Mr. FIELDING. I could not tell my hon. friend. Mr. McCarthy's letter having been withdrawn, was no longer an issue. The Treasury Board record must speak for itself, but as to what actually occurred between the members of the Treasury Board at that time I would not from memory attempt to speak.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend in answering Mr. McCarthy said:

I wired you to-day that no application had been made by the promoters for the Treasury Board certificate, and suggested that you send forward at once any representations which you may wish to make, to which we shall give all due consideration.

Mr. FIELDING. Then they were withdrawn?

Mr. BLAIN. May I say that my hon. friend the Finance Minister was not speaking in that letter particularly as Finance Minister; he was writing over his signature representing the Treasury Board, and he told Mr. McCarthy over his own signature that whatever representations he had to make would be placed before the Treasury Board when they met to deal with this certificate. My hon. friend's memory is a little short now.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, my hon. friend is not able to state whether or not that letter was read to the board.

Mr. FIELDING. The letter having been withdrawn, Mr. McCarthy having withdrawn his objections, I think it is quite possible the letter was not read, but I cannot speak from memory on a matter of several years ago.

Mr. BLAIN. If it was not read the greater the responsibility on the head of the Finance Minister because he took upon himself to receive communications from a gentleman who was objecting to the granting of the certificate, he corresponded not as Mr. Fielding, but as Finance Minister of this country, and a member of the Treasury Board, took upon himself to accept communications, to answer communications, to receive further communications and telegrams, and then because some of these had been withdrawn, he took upon himself to not submit any of them to the Treasury Board.

My hon. friend's record in connection with the establishment of banks is not so good, as was pointed out by my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) in his speech during this afternoon.

The responsibility, therefore, must rest with the Minister of Finance. Whatever the policy of the government may have been in the past in respect to granting these certificates to banks; whether they did it at the close of a council meeting or not, whether they did it in a formal or informal way, whatever the past history of my hon. friend as a member of the Treasury Board, he had sufficient warning in this case; he had suspicions of his own when the bank was asking extension of time, he had suspicions when Mr. McCarthy, a member of this House and a political supporter of his own party wrote him a warning letter; he had sufficient information in his possession, as a trustee of the public interest, to call the board formally together and go into the whole matter in detail. There is no question about that. The Finance Minister had been warned time and again. My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) prior to the granting of the certificate had more than one conversation with him as the Minister of Finance admits. What were these conversations about? Would there be any necessity for them if everything was all right. And yet, we had the Minister of Finance saying yesterday to my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson): You need not be alarmed, Mr. Henderson, you have notified the government, your responsibility ceases. And the member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) struggled to point out that the same responsibility rests with the member for Halton in the premises as rests with the Minister of Finance. Surely when he reads his remarks in 'Hansard' to-morrow he will not subscribe to such a doctrine. What is the Finance Minister for, anyway, and why is he selected for the second position in the cabinet if it is not that he should specially protect the interests of the public in such a matter. What nonsense it is to argue that he has no greater responsibility in such a proceeding than has an ordinary member of the House. And, when the Prime Minister spoke he was careful to discuss everything but the request of those who are suffering, that a Royal Commission should be appointed, and that, Sir, is the crux of the whole question that is before the House, before the courts, and before the people of Canada. I am not going to discuss just now the question of recouping out of the public treasury these sufferers, but I will read the resolution of my hon. friend, (Mr. Henderson):

This House is of the opinion that a Royal Commission should forthwith issue to inquire into and investigate the incorporation and organization of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, and the granting of a certificate by the Treasury Board permitting the said bank to issue notes and commence business, and all circumstances connected therewith, and generally to inquire into and investigate the operation and efficiency of the Bank Act in relation to the affairs and transactions of the said bank.

I think I would be safe in saying that my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson? would not have gone too far if he had moved a resolution condemning the government, the Minister of Finance, and the Treasury Board for failing to discharge their whole duty in respect to the granting of the certificate to the Farmers' Bank. But, the resolution is so mild in form, that in view of the statement of the Prime Minister, and of the Minister of Finance that there has been no wrongdoing on the part of the government I should have thought that they would cheerfully accept such a resolution asking for a Royal Commission. If the Minister of Finance is not guilty as he declares, who can suffer. Certainly the government will not suffer from an elucidation of the facts if they have done nothing wrong. Surrounded as this whole question is with suspicion, why is it that the Prime Minister and particularly the Finance Minister do not hail this resolution with sighs of relief and declare that they will reveal everything in connection with the transaction. But, the Minister of Finance stands up and declares to his followers that there shall be no Royal Commission and asks support. In the different sections of the province of Ontario there are homesteads disappearing from the possession of their original owners and there are men who hitherto have lived in comfort forced to take up the pick and shovel to earn a livelihood for the remainder of their years, and all on account of the ruin brought on them by this unfortunate collapse of the Farmers' Bank. And yet the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance tell these unfortunate people that they are to have no recourse, that justice is not to be rendered them, that there is not to be an inquiry into how this bank came into being and as to the fraud it perpetrated; and they call on their majority in this House to vote down a resolution which might give these poor people some relief. Yesterday we had the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). the responsible representative of a great city in this Dominion, stating in his place in the House that if a commission is granted he would bring forward other evidence that cannot be presented without the appointment of such a commission. The Minister of Finance knows full well that there is evidence to be found that will not come out in the investigation which is taking place in the city of Toronto, and which only can be made public through a Royal Commission. I do not wish to detain the House longer, and in conclusion I will say to the Prime Minister and to his Finance Minister that there is no class of the community, whether they be losers by the Farmer's Bank or not who will feel that the government has done its duty if they refuse to accept this moderate resolution proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson). It is not a resolution condemning the government before they are tried; it merely asks for a full and complete investigation by an impartial tribunal so that the people will know where the money came from, and where the money has gone.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN (South Huron). Mr. Speaker, I desire to say only a very few words on this subject, and I do not intend to waste the time of the House discussing the sophistries, insinuations and suspicions indulged in by my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) who has just preceded me. In listening to the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as to those of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, the thought has occurred to me that if the foresight of these gentlemen were only half as good as their hindsight they would be very wise indeed, but unfortunately for us all, that is not our condition. If it were we would be saved from many difficulties, many disasters and many pitfalls. I do very sincerely and truly sympathize with my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) who has moved this resolution. There are stockholders and depositors in this bank in my own constituency. The bank had, I think, three agencies in the constituency and there are deposits to the amount of about $100,000 or over. But, I am sorry I cannot congratulate my hon. friend on the manner in which he has introduced this resolution or the time that he has chosen to do it. Neither, Mr. Speaker, can I congratulate hon. gentlemen opposite on their attempt to make political capital out of this unfortunate affair. I have very carefully and attentively listened to the discussion of this subject, I have very carefully perused all the evidence that has been submitted to this House, I think that possibly I am, in a measure, as capable of judging the evidence as some of my hon. friends who have spoken on the opposite side, and I am free to say that for the life of me I cannot discover that my hon. friend the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) or the Finance Department have been blamable in any sense whatever. In so far as my judgment enables me to interpret these documents they have only done what they should have done in connection with the matter. It is quite true, Sir, that the department was deceived by Mr. Travers, but they are not the only parties

who have been deceived by Mr. Travers. Mr. Travers deceived his shareholders, he deceived his provisional directors, he deceived his permanent board of directors, and he deceived the late president of that board. I am also free to say that, from my examination of the evidence which has been taken before the courts in Toronto, I am firmly of the belief that, bad as Mr. Travers is, he has simply been the tool of another archconspirator and rogue, who, I am sorry to say, has not been captured, and I am led to believe that the authorities possibly have not made as great exertions to capture him as they might have made.

If, under these exceptional circumstances, the government can see fit, or think it advisable, to recommend that the depositors in this bank should in some measure be reimbursed, and if this can be done without setting a dangerous precedent, I would be very glad. I have not so much sympathy with the stockholders of the bank. The stockholders went into it knowing what they were doing, at least they should have known what they were doing. They went into it as a business enterprise, and if it had succeeded as a business enterprise they would have profited. But, as it has not succeeded as a business enterprise, of course, like investors in any other similar business, they have lost. But, it is very different with the depositors. The depositors placed their money in this institution for safe-keeping, believing at the time that they were protected in so doing by the laws of the land, and, under the circumstances, as I said before, if the government should see fit, or if they should consider themselves in a position to grant some measure of aid to these unfortunate people without setting a precedent which might be considered dangerous, then I think that the country will certainly support them in so doing.

Let us come down to the real issue that is before the House and to the substance of the motion moved by the hon. member for Halton. That motion has been read two or three times already this afternoon, but for the sake of my argument, I want to read a portion of it again. The resolution says:

> That this House is of opinion that a Royal Commission should forthwith issue to inquire into and investigate the incorporation and organization of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, and the granting of a certificate by the Treasury Board permitting said bank to issue notes and transact business, and all circumstances connected therewith——

I maintain that there is no necessity for a commission for any such purpose. I maintain that all the evidence which any commission could possibly secure has already been obtained and has already been placed before this House by the Department of Finance. Not only that, but the resolution casts a doubt upon the honesty and fidelity of the Minister of Finance and the Department of Finance, and I certainly cannot vote for such a motion as that, because I have full confidence that the minister, the department and the Treasury Board would not do a dishonest or dishonourable act to favour any person. The second part of the resolution is:

> —and generally to inquire into and investigate the operation and efficiency of the Bank Act in relation to the affairs and transactions of the said bank.

Why should we carry a resolution of that kind at the present time? That question is not before the House. That question will be presented to the House before very long, and when it does come before the House is the proper time to decide as to whether or not such a commission is required. But, Sir, I contend that the affairs of this banking institution are at the present time being investigated by the courts of this province. If that investigation is thorough and complete and if it answers all the purposes, then certainly there is no necessity for a Royal Commission such as is being proposed. It has been said that under a commission the Minister of Finance, and several other gentlemen who were named could be brought up and put into the box; but under the investigation now being prosecuted, the Finance Minister and every other man can be brought forward and made to give his evidence. This again shows the futility of the proposition before the House. I have no hesitation in saying that in the event of its being ascertained that the present investigation is not full, that justice is not being done, that those supposed to be criminals are being shielded and that an additional investigation is necessary, the government would be lacking in their duty to the people and themselves if they did not grant such an investigation. But the time for deciding that has not yet come. When it does, if it should come, the government can take action. For these reasons I have no hesitation in saying that I shall give my vote against the motion of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson).

Mr. C. J. THORNTON (Durham). With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to occupy a short time on this question, and I shall be very brief, because I have some sympathy for yourself, Sir, and the House who have to listen to this long discussion. The matter is, however, of so much importance to those of us especially who represent agricultural constituencies that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not give my views with regard to it. It has been my lot to have been brought very closely in contact with some of those who have suffered through this dis-

astrous bank failure. It makes one's heart ache to see how much suffering has been caused by it. I have in my mind the case of a young woman whose husband was killed on the railway, and she was left with three young children. She gathered up what she could of what was left after his death and deposited $1,000 in this Farmers' Bank. To-day that is all gone and this poor woman with three children is left without any means of subsistence. I know the case of a man between 60 and 70 years of age, whose working days are over, who deposited his all in this bank, and now that it is gone he does not know where his means of living is to come from. I could multiply these instances by the score, and it makes one's heart bleed to realize how much suffering this fraudulent disaster has caused. It is wise, therefore, that we should look carefully and calmly into the facts of the case. How was this bank instituted? An appeal was made to a class of men who have very little experience in business and who are the natural prey of financial sharks. I refer to the farmers. Being a farmer myself, I know how to sympathize with them, and I know how they may be the easy victims of frauds such as this. An appeal was made to them. At the head of that prospectus are the names of responsible, successful business men. Why were these names inserted? They were used to decoy honest men into investing their money in that institution. If you examine that prospectus, you will find it looks as though it had been framed purposely to deceive the public. It says:

The Farmers' Bank of Canada is being formed to give the increased banking facilities required by the natural expanse of business coincident to rapid development in Canada——

Immediately following, it says:

—particularly the agricultural industry to whose interests, whilst conducting a general banking business, it will aim to give special consideration.

There you have a special appeal to the farmers on behalf of a banking institution which took the name of the Farmers' Bank, and which declared that it would give special attention and consideration to the interests of the farmers. Then the prospectus goes on to say:

No other safe business has been as profitable as banking and no other profitable business has been as safe as banking.

In order to further decoy the farmers it gives a table showing what profits have been made in banking in Canada, and it tells us that the Dominion Bank, the par value of which was $100 the share, are selling to-day at the price of $280 per share, and paying a dividend of 10 per cent. All that was declared purposely to lead the farmers to invest their savings in this bank. Then the prospectus goes on to give a list of the American banking institutions and quotes the Chemical National Bank of New York, the par value of whose shares was $100, and whose present price was $4,850 per share. These tables were of course quoted to deceive the farmers, and other innocent people who put their money into this institution. Then it goes on further to say:

That it was a safe investment and an investment increasing in value and an investment easily realizable.

These were all intended to deceive the people and induce them into subscribing to the stock. Further on the prospectus says:

This is an opportunity that seldom occurs and once the stock of the bank got into the hands of a few men, they hold it and it is almost impossible to buy bank stocks.

Further on in the latter part of the prospectus, this is set forth:

That the gentlemen who have consented to act as directors have succeeded in their own business and are admittedly men in whom the public have the highest confidence.

There was everything in that prospectus to lead the farmers to invest their money in that institution and they did so with the utmost confidence in its solvency. There is another thing. It was generally believed throughout the country that the deposit made with the government when a bank is started is an additional security to the shareholders and depositors. It was not generally known that that deposit was immediately given back with the exception of $5,000. In fact everything about this matter seemed to be for the purpose of deceiving the people. You notice that, before the bank began business, before the certificate was issued authorizing it to do business, a strong protest was made against the certificate being granted by the Treasury Board. The very fact that that protest was made in the wrong way in which it was made, together with the facts which that protest recited, were enough to have made any person in authority and connected with the granting of this certificate suspicious. That protest never was withdrawn. While there was a money settlement with the men whose interests were concerned in that protest, that act on the part of the promoters of that bank stood there against them, and should have been, in the eyes of the Finance Minister and the Treasury Board, something to cause them to hesitate before granting the certificate. That protest against the issuing of the certificate was settled, so far as the money part of it was

concerned. But there is another matter to which I would direct the attention of the Minister of Finance and the House. The Bank Act provides that a bank shall not do business until the certificate of the Treasury Board is issued. We are told that, after this protest, had been entered by Mr. Leighton McCarthy against the issue of this certificate, an interview took place between the Finance Minister and Mr. Travers and that Mr. Travers gave the minister assurance that everything was straight in connection with the raising of the money for the deposit that was necessary before the certificate could issue. In his reply to the Finance Minister, Mr. Travers said:

In reply to your letter of the 30th of November, I have to say that in the case of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, the provisional directors did not raise the money in the way mentioned by you. You will find the statement put in by me absolutely correct as to the amount of stock subscribed and the amount paid up.

This was in direct contradiction of the allegation made by Mr. Leighton McCarthy. At pages 6 and 7 of this return we find the application which was made for this certificate of the Treasury Board. We have been told that the application was made by the Farmers' Bank of Canada. But I think there was an evasion of the law and something misleading in the application made by Mr. Travers. As a layman, I may not understand these matters, but I think that the very fact that the application for the certificate was put in by Mr. Travers in the way it was should have made the Treasury Board suspicious that things were not right. As I read the Bank Act, it does not say that the manager of a bank can get the certificate and start the bank. It does provide, as I understand it, that the president and directors of the bank can get the certificate and start the bank—assuming, of course, that they have complied with the conditions under the law. In this case, was an application made by the president? No. Nor was it made by the directors. This application reads as follows:

Toronto, Nov. 27, 1906.

Deputy Minister of Finance,
Parliament Buildings,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour herewith to forward declaration of the general manager of the Farmers' Bank of Canada setting forth facts relating to the incorporation and organization of the said bank, and also giving the names of the directors——

And so on. And he goes on to say, at the end of this letter:

I apply for the certificate of the Treasury Board permitting the said bank to commence the business of banking.

W. R. TRAVERS,
General Manager.

Mr. THORNTON.

Mr. Travers himself applied for the certificate and was given that certificate. Now, I do not read the Bank Act as saying that the certificate is to be granted to the manager himself on his personal application. As I read the law, there should be an application on the part of the bank, signed at least by some of the bank officials who have authority. But in this case the application was made by a person said to be the general manager, but who, even as such, had no authority to ask for nor receive the certificate.

Another point that seems to me of great importance is the correspondence that took place between the Deputy Minister of Finance and the Deputy Minister of Justice with respect to Mr. Travers' application. I read at page 25 of this return the letter of the deputy Minister of Finance in which he says:

Dear Sir,—I beg to inclose herewith a file of papers being an application from the Farmers' Bank of Canada for a certificate to commence business under sections 13-17 of the Bank Act.

Kindly advise me if, on the papers submitted, such a certificate may legally issue.

Now there is something in this reply of the deputy minister that should have caused the Treasury Board suspicion. Now I will the Deputy Minister of Finance in which Deputy Minister of Justice.

In reply, I beg to state that the statements in the statutory declaration of Mr. Walter R. Travers are sufficient, if they are accepted——

Now he does not say they are sufficient, he does not say that they should be accepted, he does not pass any judgment upon their sufficiency, but he says 'if they are accepted,' that is, by the Treasury Board. Surely there is here an implication that they should not be accepted. There is in these few words of that letter, matter which should have caused the Treasury Board to pause, there was something which should have raised a suspicion in their minds that all was not right. Now there is another point I wish to bring out, and that is the fact that no certificate could issue without a meeting of the Treasury Board, and without the consent of the majority of the Treasury Board. Not only that, but there is the promise of the Finance Minister to Mr. Leighton McCarthy that his objection to the granting of a certificate would be laid before the Treasury Board when they considered the application for a certificate. That was of all things the most important to lay before the Treasury Board, that objection of Mr. Leighton McCarthy was the most important thing of all. Now will the Finance Minister say that that objection was laid before the Treasury Board? Did the Treasury Board consider that charge against these men who were trying to get

this certificate? Did they ask if those things were true? Were they laid before the Treasury Board? Why, Mr. Speaker, we have the fact that the Treasury Board met on the 30th November, but the papers, all the documents which had been submitted to the board in connection with Mr. McCarthy's protest, were returned to Mr. McCarthy on the 7th of November, and the board did not meet until the 30th of November. Then when the papers had been returned to Mr. McCarthy, how could these matters have been laid before the board? It looks very suspicious to say the least of it.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock, I was directing attention to the conduct of the Treasury Board at the time the certificate was granted. We have Mr. McCarthy's letter and the minister's answer requesting particulars of the charges against these men who were asking a certificate for the Farmers' Bank, and the minister promised that the matter would be considered by the Treasury Board. All particulars were furnished, the charges were made against the promoters of the bank and yet the Treasury Board met on November 30, but the papers and particulars which had been furnished at the request of the minister had been returned to Mr. McCarthy on November 7. Evidently these men got the certificate without the objections having been considered by the Treasury Board. It is peculiar that the Treasury Board met on November 30 and that on that day there was correspondence between the Minister of Finance and Mr. Travers, and that on that day Mr. Travers received his certificate for the bank to start business. It looks as if everything had been hurried on that day. There was no occasion for hurry, an extension had been granted, good until January 18, so there were still about six weeks before the charter would expire. Who was hurrying the Treasury Board and the Finance Minister? The question arises, was Mr. Calvert or the president of the Trust and Guarantee Company hurrying matters on, and if so for what reason? Was there something in it for these men? These questions naturally arise, and the people out in the country are asking them.

There is something very distressing in the failure of the Farmers' Bank. Members from constituencies which were very much affected, receive many letters about it. I receive letters every few days appealing to me and asking if the government and the right hon. First Minister will not do something to relieve those who have been robbed of their all, for there are many whose whole substance has been taken from them by this, and wanting to know if there is not some relief to be granted by the government. If the government had been as careful of the people's interest as they should be, then immediately this failure occurred, they would have done something to relieve the situation and to show the people that they wanted to get after these designing men who robbed the shareholders and depositors. I know the plea is put up that there is no law to touch these men, that the government had no power to interfere. Is that so? Has it come to this? I am perfectly well aware they say there was a law and that the law was being enforced in Toronto, but we know how comparatively helpless that is; we know how the majority of these men have escaped the hands of justice and how the great offender in the case received what everybody says is too light a sentence, only six years for the crime he had perpetrated. The impression is abroad that he should have had 26 years. It looks as if there was something lax in the law when a man guilty of such a crime should receive a sentence of only six years, and is to-day living comparatively a gentleman giving evidence in Toronto. It looks as if the government ought to have done something more to get after those fellows. If there is no law to get after them should there not be? Are designing men to be allowed to rob innocent men, women and children of their hard-earned savings? If so, God help Canada and help her legislators, her lawmakers to make laws that will get after such men quickly.

There were warnings without number in connection with this bank failure. We had first of all numerous personal appeals made not only to the Finance Minister, but to other members of the government. These were more than gossip, they were practically definite charges made against the promoters of this bank, for the way in which they were trying to get the bank started. Then there was the direct charge made by Mr. Leighton McCarthy, coming from shareholders who had been, to say the least, fooled, who were being robbed and misrepresented in connection with the floating of this bank, and on the very day that the Treasury Board issued that certificate we have Mr. Clouston, in the name of the Canadian Bankers' Association, protesting strongly against that certificate being issued. Then within four months of the bank starting business we have this protest from the manager of the Milton branch of the bank, saying there was crookedness in connection with the management at head office, and we had later on another appeal from the Canadian Bankers' Association, through its secretary, saying there was something crooked in connection with the doings of

this bank. All these warnings about the misdoings of the management should have shown it was time to do something. Had steps been taken by the department in some way to arrest these men in their work of robbing these innocent people, something could have been done. I do not wish to take time to recite the particulars of that insurance matter in New York state. You will remember that when the Minister of Finance was appealed to, his one answer was that contained in a letter dated January 12, 1910, to Wm. H. Hotchkiss, Superintendent of Insurance, Albany, New York:

> There being no government bank inspection in Canada I do not see how we can at present take the action that you desire. Probably the bank on application from you would explain the whole matter.
>
> (Signed) W. S. FIELDING.

Now, if there is not government bank inspection in Canada which would prevent these abuses, whose fault is it? Ought there not to be some way by which banks can be controlled, and some way in which bank managers can be prevented from fleecing the people. Let me refer briefly to the question of bank inspection. At different times the subject has been discussed in this House, but no action has up to the present time been taken. It is said, that in the last thirty years the people of Canada have lost no less than $45,000,000 in connection with bank failures, and I am inclined to think that is rather an underestimate. In thirty years there have been 29 bank failures in Canada, and in view of such deplorable figures it seems to be extraordinary that a system of government bank inspection has not been inaugurated before this. Three years ago this question was brought forcibly to the attention of the House by Mr. Pringle, then member for Stormont, and in the course of his remarks he laid great stress on government inspection of banks. Mr. Pringle stated that at the date on which he was speaking there were $600,000,000 deposited in Canadian banks, and to-day the deposits amount to over $800,000,000. I am well aware that there is a difference of opinion as to government bank inspection, and I can readily see how that may be the case. But some of the best bank managers that Canada has ever had are very strongly in favour of government bank inspection. Mr. H. S. McLeod, late manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia is strongly in favour of government inspection or of an independent audit or both, and he urged this matter on the government as far back as the year 1900, and at different times since then. In a letter to the Toronto 'Globe' on the 26th November, 1906, Mr. McLeod wrote:

> In Canada there were in existence in 1880, forty-one banks. Since then seven have been incorporated and have commenced business, making a total of forty-eight banks. Of this total, twelve have failed and some others have saved themselves by amalgamation. The failures are, therefore, 25 per cent in twenty-six years, the last ten of which were years of unexampled prosperity with steadily rising deposits—conditions under which even insolvent banks seldom close their doors.

Now, here is a very important part of Mr. McLeod's statement:

> Most if not all of the above mentioned failures were fraudulent, and it is now plainly evident that a few hours examination by a skilled banker would have disclosed an insolvent condition in any one of the banks years before it collapsed.

There cannot be any doubt as Mr. McLeod says that had there been efficient government bank inspection in Canada during the last 3 or 4 years this disastrous failure of the Farmers' Bank and the dreadful consequences that ensued could not have happened, because, as Mr. McLeod says, a few hours' examination by a skilled banker would have disclosed the insolvent condition of that bank Mr. McLeod says further:

> In each of the two most recent disasters a correct diagnosis could have been made ten or more years ago.

Had there been efficient bank inspection the Farmers' Bank could not have run six months without its insolvency being detected, and over one million dollars would have been saved to the innocent shareholders and depositors. Three years ago when Mr. Pringle brought this matter to the attention of the House, one of the most surprising things in that debate was the answer which the Minister of Finance then gave on the floor of the House. Speaking on the 2nd of March, 1908, he said (volume 3, 'Hansard' 1908, page 1499):

> Perhaps the most important question he (Mr. Pringle) discussed was that of government inspection. I confess without pretending to give a final judgment that my inclination is strongly against the views he has presented on that subject.
>
> I am disinclined to favour government inspection for several reasons:
>
> 1. In the first place I think it is unnecessary. There is no condition of affairs in Canada that calls for it.

Now, if there is no condition of affairs in Canada that calls for bank inspection I would be curious to know how rotten the condition of things must be to satisfy the Minister of Finance that government bank inspection is necessary. It is most distressing to contemplate that the state of affairs existing in this country in respect to banking must be worse than it is to-day before they call for efficient government inspection in the eyes of the Minister of Finance. It seems to me that the

want of proper government inspection is where the Bank Act is weak, and where the Minister of Finance is at fault in not providing it. I believe there should have been efficient government bank inspection in Canada years ago. In the United States where there is a system of government inspection of national banks, a system which is not nearly as perfect as it should be, and which, indeed, is very imperfect, there has only been in the last 25 years 5 per cent of failures as against 25 per cent in Canada. It would seem to me, the Minister of Finance notwithstanding, that these figures show that government inspection is a good thing. I believe, Sir, that the time has come when something should be done by the government in the line indicated in the motion of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), I believe that the only way to get at the facts in connection with this deplorable business is to appoint a Royal Commission to make full and independent inquiry.

It has been acknowledged on all hands, and acknowledged by some hon. gentlemen on the government side of the House, that there is no other way to get at the facts except by a commission. I thought the duty of the government, and indeed most people in this country thought the duty of the government was, just as soon as this failure occurred, to have issued a Royal Commission to investigate the whole matter. They should have done it immediately after the failure. They could and should have done so. Three months or thereabouts have elapsed since the failure and nothing whatever has been done. We have been waiting for the powers that be in Toronto to move in this matter. It is a well known fact that in information they have gained there is of such a limited character that it does not throw a great deal of light on it. A Royal Commission is the only means by which the information can be obtained. The matter is of so much importance and the consequences of this failure are felt so widely throughout Canada that I cannot see why or how the government can refuse to grant this request of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). Those who have lost their all do not hesitate to blame the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). I know the feeling of the country, and it is that if the government and the members of the government, if the right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Finance want to square themselves with the people they will not hesitate for one moment to grant this request of my hon. friend from Halton. There is no doubt that had ordinary care been exercised when this certificate was granted, these so-called bankers would never have been authorized to do business. It is regrettable from every view point that this failure should have taken place and I trust that the proposal of my hon. friend will be acceded to. Not only that, but I hope that there will be in the new Bank Act provision for an efficient and thorough system of government inspection. I think that the government should show its willingness to try to do something at least to save as much as it can to the innocent sufferers from this miserable wreck.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). Mr. Speaker, I represent a constituency in which there were practically two branches of this institution which was licensed by this government and allowed, with the full knowledge and consent of the government, to perpetrate frauds upon the people of the country. Many of my constituents have lost their all. At the village of Phillipsville there was one branch of this bank established. Across the line dividing the constituency of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) and my own constituency there was a branch located, but a great share of the business was done with the farmers in my own constituency. Many of them are stockholders and depositors, I had hoped to see the Minister of Railways and Canals in his place joining with me in advocating that the government should approve of the motion of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) and I hope that when the division comes he will vote with me in the interest of many of his constituents who have suffered, as mine have, from the fact that this rotten institution was granted a certificate by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). With the full knowledge that a fraud was being perpetrated upon him and upon the government, they granted this certificate, the minister having at the time the proof of this fraud in his hands. If he did not have it in his hands he got the information the next day. The certificate was issued on the 30th November, and next day he received a letter from the Bankers' Association telling him that the thing was not right. Why did he not obtain a warrant for the arrest of Travers for perjury? He had the declaration sworn to by Travers in which Travers had given false information, he had the proof in his own hands that it was false—why did he not act and save the people of this country from the loss of thousands and thousands of dollars? A branch of this bank was opened in Athens, adjoining my constituency. Travers came there, selected one of the most respectable farmer's sons in the constituency as manager because he knew that he had influence in that section of the country with the surrounding farmers. Travers said to him: I want you to go among the farmers and offer them 4 per cent on their deposits. The rule of the Bankers' Association only permits 3 per

cent, but you will have to cover the matter up in your books so that it will not show. Early last fall, after this branch had been doing business for some time, the accountant was short in his cash, and he and the manager were both arrested. The manager was sentenced to three years in the penitentiary for falsifying his books. He is in the penitentiary now and Travers, who got him into this trouble, will be down with him, I presume, in a few days. There is a petition being circulated and signed in the constituency of the Minister of Railways and Canals and in the town in which the young man is well known asking the Minister of Justice to liberate him from the penitentiary. I hope the Minister of Railways and Canals will see that his colleague the Minister of Justice does justice to this young man and has him released, because what he did he did at the request of the manager, Mr. Travers, in order that the bank might pay one per cent more than the other banks are paying.

The Minister of Finance issued that certificate contrary to law. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) said that we have a Bank Act. What is the good of having a Bank Act or of making a Bank Act if the government will not enforce it? We have a Bank Act now and if the Minister of Finance had done his duty and enforced the Bank Act this certificate never would have been granted. What is the use of talking—are not the government morally if not legally responsible for every dollar that has been allowed to be taken from the people of this country by this rotten institution which they brought into existence? Now, they refuse to give a Royal Commission to investigate the facts. Why do they refuse a Royal Commission? Is it not patent on the face of it that some of their friends would be exposed if a Royal Commission were granted? The only excuse they can have for not granting the request of my hon. friend from Halton is that some of their friends will be exposed and they would rather that the whole country should suffer than that some of their friends should be exposed in the matter.

I will support the motion of my hon. friend from Halton, in the first place, for the reason that I think we should have a Royal Commission. That commission should investigate all the circumstances and facts surrounding this bank, and the fact that it was allowed to do business by this government. The Prime Minister, the Finance Minister, the Minister of Customs, have often repeated in my hearing in this House that they belonged to a business government. The Prime Minister brags that his is a business government. The people of Canada have elected this parliament, the members of the government are the trustees of the people, they are in the same position towards the people as is a board of directors towards any incorporated company. If any board of directors had acted for their company as the members of this government have acted for the people, the stockholders would soon turn them out, and I think that the people of this country, if for no other reason than the incapacity and laxity of the government in allowing this fraudulent institution to be foisted on them, will say to these ministers: You have not discharged your duty faithfully, and we are now going to elect a new board of directors at the first opportunity. I, therefore, support the motion of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) calling for an investigation. If we should have that investigation and find that the government made a mistake, that they were careless in their administration, that they were regardless of the interests they were bound to protect, then they are morally responsible for the losses sustained by the depositors in this bank. It will then be the duty of the people of this country, through their representatives in this parliament, to declare that this country is big enough and able enough to stand the losses which the people's trustees have brought upon so many innocent people. The facts stated by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) cannot be disputed; and on those facts being proved, as they cannot fail to be, by a Royal Commission, it will be the duty of this parliament to pass legislation liberating the stockholders from their double liability. They will suffer enough by losing what they have paid in already and should not, under the circumstances, be compelled to pay this double liability. These are my views. It is the duty of the Finance Minister to withdraw his opposition to this motion and allow a Royal Commission to be appointed so that we may find out who are the guilty parties. The hon. minister says that he was not to blame, that he had nothing against the promoters of this bank after Mr. Leighton McCarthy had withdrawn his charges. But he had in his hand a letter from the Bankers' Association telling him that there were irregularities, that things were not correct, and he should immediately have had Travers arrested, and that would have put a stop to the bank doing any further business. But when he did not have Travers arrested then, he should, four months later, when he was informed by one of the banks that this thing was not right, that these notes were being discounted, have had Travers arrested then for making false returns. He did not, however, do this because no doubt he was afraid of exposing some of his friends. Should the commission be granted which my hon. friend calls for, we shall have all these transactions, which are now hidden, brought to light, and the parties re-

sponsible brought to punishment, but otherwise we shall be helpless.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Like many of those who have addressed the House, I have a branch of this unfortunate bank established in the town of Arkona in the county I represent. In that branch there were deposits to the extent of $43,000 besides a large number of stockholders. In common with other members of this House I deeply regret the unfortunate condition of affairs which has come about in connection with this institution, and the whole matter is a live question among the people of my constituency and one worthy surely of the consideration of the government. We have had the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) telling us that the Finance Minister had no evidence against the promoters of this bank, after Mr. Leighton McCarthy had withdrawn his charges. Well, I am satisfied that if my hon. friend had investigated a little further he would have found that the Bankers' Association sent a letter to the Finance Minister calling his attention to the fact that there had been irregularities and urging on him the necessity of an investigation before granting the certificate. My hon. friend said also that the people in the country should have put their money into the savings bank. I am satisfied, however, that those of us who are in touch with the banking system throughout the country realize how absurd it would be to ask the people to send their money to a savings bank instead of depositing it in a bank in their own immediate vicinity, and I sincerely hope that when the time comes to discuss a new Bank Act, provision will be made for government inspection, not only of the branches of banks, but also of the central organization, because that is where the trickery and rascality was carried on in the Farmers' Bank. It was in the central office of that bank that Travers conducted his operations, and had that institution received a thorough government inspection, there is no doubt we would not have had the unfortunate collapse we are now discussing.

The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) said he would approve of the appointment of a commission if the court does not do its duty. But my hon. friend knows, and the Minister of Finance knows full well, that it is practically impossible for the police court of Ontario to carry on any serious investigation. The Minister of Finance knows that when Mr. Laidlaw placed his case before the Prime Minister in his apartments in the House of Commons, he distinctly and emphatically declared that there was not one dollar with which to carry on an investigation after the preferred claims had been paid by the liquidators. He also urged upon the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister on that occasion the necessity of making a thorough investigation into the doings of the different men who had transactions with that bank, and he assured the right hon. gentleman and his colleague that if such an investigation were ordered it would certainly bring to the bank a large amount of money for the benefit of its stockholders and depositors, because many men would be brought to justice who otherwise would go scot free.

The people of this country have always looked upon bank stocks as one of the safest kinds of investments and have always regarded their bank deposits as perfectly secure; and anything we can do in this parliament to strengthen that confidence, which is now so severely shaken, will certainly be a move in the right direction. I trust, therefore, that the Minister of Finance will see that before this session closes, the people who do business with our banks will have sufficient protection in that regard.

My hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McLean) said that Travers was only a tool of others, and that the depositors believed they were protected by the laws of the land. Depositors in my riding, who had placed $43,000 on deposit in this Farmers' Bank in the town of Arkona, believed up to a short time ago that their money was absolutely protected by government inspection and control, and they are to-day surprised to find that they are likely to lose every dollar, because it is emphatically stated that the only asset the bank has, after the preferred claims have been paid, is the Keeley mine. And it has been shown by the men interested in the Keeley mine that the amount of money that is owing to the Farmers' Bank at the present time is very small, and that the creditors of the Farmers' Bank need expect to get very little out of that mine.

What harm, may I ask the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) and the first minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would there be in granting a commission to investigate this whole affair? And will it not be a source of satisfaction to those who have deposited such a large sum of money in this bank, and to the stockholders as well, to know, that this matter has been thoroughly investigated, and that the men who are guilty of any rascally conduct in connection with the incorporation or operation of this bank have been brought to justice? There is no reason why they should not be exposed. Do the government deny this investigation because they are afraid that the reputations of some men might be spoiled? I am satisfied that if the government consult the wishes of the people who are interested in this affair, and of the financial institutions of the Dominion they will con-

duct the investigation that my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) has asked for. If you do not grant that investigation, depend upon it, the people will come to the conclusion that something is radically wrong, and that the government is shielding somebody. The thorough investigation of this question will assist us in framing a law under which, we may hope, the repetition of any such transactions as these will be impossible in this Dominion. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) said, in regard to this certificate, that it was granted in good faith, and that in granting it the Minister of Finance believed that he was doing right. On the facts before us, we cannot come to any conclusion but that the Finance Minister was deceived by Mr. Travers and the other men who brought this matter to his attention. And not only he, but the people who bought the stock or deposited their money in this bank also were deceived. But, remember, the only men who are to suffer loss in this matter are the depositors and shareholders of the bank; the government, apparently, are not going to lose any money. Nor are they ready to spend a reasonable amount of money so that the men who were instrumental in wrecking this institution could be brought to justice. The liquidators, as I have said, have no money to carry on an investigation, nor have they power to incur indebtedness to raise money for such a purpose. And why should we saddle such an expense upon the poor people who have been so seriously injured already? I only wish that I felt free to speak of a number of those in my own district; but I will refer only to one case. I have in mind an old couple, each about 80 years of age, who were induced to put down their names for ten shares in this bank. I think they had only half enough to pay for these shares; and to-day we find that, under the double liability, they are compelled to sacrifice their home. And these are not by any means the only ones who are made to suffer by the rascally work that has been carried on by Mr. Travers, and by the action—might I say?—of the Finance Minister in granting this certificate. For, when Mr. McCarthy, time and again, called his attention to the fact that these men were trying to get this certificate under false pretenses, and that they were perjuring themselves to that end, it was his duty and the duty of the Treasury Board to make a thorough investigation into the whole question. This Royal Commission should be granted. Since 1905, 11 banks have quit the field of active business; five have been absorbed by other banks; one is now in process of liquidation; and five have failed. The Farmers' Bank is the only case in which the depositors have had a great amount of funds tied up. In other cases, the depositors have generally received within a small percentage of their money; but in this case it looks as if practically every dollar the depositors have placed in this bank throughout the Dominion will be a direct loss to them. The people have been led to believe that deposits especially were safe in the banking institutions of our country. I do not wish to take up more time, as there are many others to follow? My object is merely to emphasize the statement made by the hon. member for Halton, and to say that I intend to support the resolution. My reasons are these: That Mr. Travers was not entitled to a certificate, because the sum of $500,000 had not been bona fide subscribed, and $250,000 had not been bona fide paid thereon. That the Minister of Finance had notice that the provisions of the Bank Act had not been complied with, and he did not make the thorough investigation he should have made into the facts connected with the issue of the certificate. That the president of the Bankers' Association urged upon the Minister of Finance the necessity of investigating this question; and this and the numerous private interviews that were held with the hon. member for Halton and others in regard to this important matter were surely worthy of consideration. That the minister had conclusive evidence, by the admission of Mr. Travers, that he had committed perjury even before the certificate was issued. For these reasons, I heartily support the resolution of the hon. member for Halton.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina). I shall speak but a very few minutes. I have not the same excuse for speaking as other members have had, because the Farmers' Bank and its promoters did not operate in the province of Saskatchewan and I am very glad they did not. I agree of course with the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that the shareholders of this bank, and also the depositors, are deserving of the greatest amount of sympathy on the part of all the people of Canada. So far as the shareholders are concerned, I must say that I cannot sympathize with them so much as I do with the depositors. The shareholders went into the concern and subscribed their stock, presumably, after making proper inquiries. They went into the matter as a business proposition, as an investment, with the intention of making money legitimately. But so far as the depositors are concerned, they deserve the sympathy of every member of this House. I do not agree, however, with those members who have supported the resolution that the government should recompense either the shareholders or the depositors. It seems to me that it would be a dangerous precedent to follow in res-

pect to any banking or financial institution transacting business in Canada, if, in case of failure of that institution, the government should compensate the shareholders, or, in the case of a bank, the depositors. Now the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), it seems to me, was most unfair in an expression he used this afternoon. He referred to the Bank Act as 'the Fielding Bank Act.' Now the Bank Act is no more the Fielding Bank Act, than it is the Act of any other member of parliament who occupied a seat in this House at the time of the revision of that Act. Then I want to refer to what was said last night by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers). Referring to the issue of the certificate by the Treasury Board, that hon. member said:

The Treasury Board who are made the guardians of the public interest in such a matter as this, is composed of the Minister of Finance and five other members of the cabinet, and as we have been informed that this matter was considered when only three members of the Treasury Board were present, it is perfectly clear that there not being a quorum or a majority of the members of the Treasury Board present, the issuing of this certificate was illegal.

I would like to ask the hon. member for West Elgin where he got his authority for stating that three members of the Treasury Board are not perfectly justified in transacting any business that comes before them, and were not justified in this case in issuing a certificate to the Farmers' Bank on being satisfied that the promoters had complied with the Act. I am informed that it has always been the custom of the Treasury Board to transact business with only three members of the board present.

Now with respect to the incorporation of the bank, which is included in the resolution as a matter for investigation by the proposed Royal Commission, the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) last night, I think, well expressed the views of the House when he said there was no question that parliament was responsible for the incorporation of that bank. If I had any criticism to offer with respect to the incorporation of the Farmers' Bank it would be this that it was inadvisable to allow any bank to be incorporated under that name. The word 'farmer' no doubt induced a number of people to subscribe stock to the institution who would not otherwise have done so, and to deposit their money in that bank who would not have done so if the bank had not been called the Farmers' Bank. With respect to the issue of the certificate, there is no question that the responsibility attaches to the Finance Department, and therefore to the government. The whole question, however, is as to whether the Finance Department took the proper steps to make inquiry to see that the Bank Act had been fully complied with. To answer that question all we need to do is to refer to section 15 of the Bank Act, which says:

No certificate should be given by the Treasury Board until it has been shown to the satisfaction of the Board, by affidavit or otherwise, that all the requirements of this Act and of the special Act of incorporation of the bank, as to payment required to be made to the minister, the election of directors, deposit for security for note issue, or other preliminaries, have been complied with and that the sum so paid is then held by the minister.

Now the words 'affidavit or otherwise' imply that there may be some other way of obtaining a certificate except by affidavit. In this case the affidavit was supplied which on examination, proved to be in exact compliance with section 15, and also covers the points set forth in section 13 of the Bank Act to which the member for Frontenac referred. Now that affidavit was referred by the Finance Department to the Justice Department, and a good deal of criticism has been made with respect to the answer of the Deputy Minister of Justice to the request for an opinion as to whether the Bank Act had been complied with. On November 28, 1906, a letter was sent by the Deputy Minister of Finance to the Deputy Minister of Justice, inclosing a file of papers and I presume from the wording of the letter that the papers included all the papers on file in the department with respect to this matter. In the reply of Mr. E. L. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, dated on the 28th of November, he says:

In reply, I beg to state that the statements in the statutory declaration of Mr. Walter R. Travers are sufficient if they are accepted to show compliance with the statutory provisions.

All that the Deputy Minister of Justice intended to say was, the Bank Act has been complied with, and if these statements are true you are justified in issuing the certificate. He put upon the Department of Finance the responsibility of seeing whether these statements were true. Now let us see what precautions the Department of Finance took before issuing this certificate to the Farmers' Bank. Take the letter written by the Deputy Minister of Finance on the 24th of October, 1906, to the general manager of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, in which he says:

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23rd instant, inclosing receipt and draft of the Bank of Montreal, Toronto, for the sum of $250,000 deposited by your bank in compliance with section 13 of the Bank Act. I may say in this connection that opposition has been filed in this department to the granting of a certificate to your bank under section 14 of the Bank Act.

Here the Deputy Minister of Finance informs the general manager that opposition has been raised to the issue of the certificate. A little later on, there is another letter from the Deputy Minister of Finance, November 21 in which he writes to the manager of the Farmers' Bank and says:

Referring to your letter of the 23rd October, making a deposit under section 13 of the Bank Act of the sum of $250,000, I have no doubt that you will be applying very shortly for a certificate under section 14 to commence business. In the papers to be submitted to the Board in support of the application there is a list of bona fide subscribers of capital stock of the bank showing subscriptions to the extent of $500,000. Would you be so good as to have added to this list, for submission to the Board, a statement showing the actual amount of cash paid up by each subscriber.

Now there, I contend, was a certain amount of precaution taken by the Finance Department in asking to be supplied with a list of subscribers, the amount of stock subscribed by each, and the amount of cash paid up. There is no question that precaution was taken there. Now the supporters of this resolution have endeavoured to make a great deal out of the protest put in against the issuing of the certificate, by Mr. Leighton McCarthy, on behalf of certain subscribers to the bank.

Mr. LALOR. Was there any effort on the part of the Treasury Board to find out the bona fides of these subscription lists?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). There was absolutely no evidence before the Department of Finance to show that every one of these shareholders was not absolutely bona fide and that every dollar of that subscription was not satisfactory.

Mr. LALOR. Did not Mr. McCarthy's letter cast doubt on it?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). My hon. friend knows that Mr. McCarthy's letter was subsequently withdrawn. The supporters of this resolution have endeavoured to make a great deal of the fact that a writ was issued and a copy of the writ or the special endorsement was on the files of the Department of Finance. Every lawyer in the House knows that there is always a great deal of material put on a special endorsement of a writ, put in a statement of claim, to which no one pays any attention until some proof is submitted. What is an endorsement on a writ? Absolutely nothing as far as the case against the Department of Finance is concerned. The argument of hon. gentlemen opposite rests entirely, so far as this return shows on that specially endorsed writ filed with the department which was absolutely and unequivocally withdrawn by the letter sent subsequently by the solicitor. What does the special endorsement show? Nothing in connection with the $250,000 not being bona fide subscriptions. The claim in the special endorsement was on behalf of special shareholders who wanted their subscriptions set aside by reason of certain fraud and misrepresentation alleged against Travers and other agents who had been selling stock, the fraud and misrepresentation consisting of such statements as that agents, Travers amongst them, I presume, had stated to prospective subscribers that So and So had subscribed $10,000 stock to this bank whereas they had subscribed only $3,000, and also allegations to the effect that certain men, among them Major Beattie, member for London, had agreed to act as directors when they had refused to be associated with the bank. What in that claim shows anything wrong with the deposit of $250,000 with the government?

I would have no hesitation in supporting a request or resolution asking a Royal Commission to investigate the affairs of this bank if I could see what could be accomplished by it. But how would you get the money back to the poor depositors by holding a post mortem inquiry into the affairs of the bank?

Mr. LALOR. We will find out who influenced the Treasury Board.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). My hon. friend will have plenty of time to make a statement afterwards. I know my hon. friend is full of suspicion like many members on that side. I would have no hesitation in supporting this resolution if any one could tell me what good it would do to the shareholders or depositors. No good can be done by holding a post mortem examination into the affairs of the bank. I would be perfectly willing to support a resolution for an investigation into the affairs of all banks in Canada in the same way as we had a Royal Commission some years ago to investigate the dealings of the insurance companies in Canada. For instance, I would like to know some things about other banks. I would like information as to how the Bank of Montreal came to lose somewhere between $1,000,000 and $5,000,000 in Mexico some time ago and whether they lost that money by illegitimate speculation with the funds deposited in that bank. I would also like some information with respect to the dealings of the Bank of Commerce with the Canada Furniture Company. It is generally rumoured among men with whom I associate that the Canada Furniture Company is practically supported by the Bank of Commerce. If that is the case the depositors of the Bank of Commerce have practically no assurance that their funds are being properly dealt with. I would also like to know how it is that the Canadian banks gather in the money from the people of this country at a small rate of interest and immediately send it to New

York on short call loans and get large rates of interest, and what security they have for the money they lend to the stock speculators on Wall street.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend know anything of the truth of the statement he has made with reference to the Bank of Commerce and the Canada Furniture Company.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I do not state that as a fact, I simply give it as a rumour, citing it as an instance to show that it might be in the interest of the country to have some investigation into the methods of the banks in dealing with the people's money. In 1907, in Western Canada, it was impossible even for a farmer worth from $10,000 to $20,000 or a reputable business man to get the smallest loan in Regina, and the reason given there was that all the money the banks had available was on short call loans in Wall street, in New York, and at that time in Western Canada we could not get sufficient money from the banks to move our crops to the eastern market.

To my mind, and I have followed the evidence of what has taken place with reference to this bank in the Ontario police courts, all the information the public can get towards punishing the criminals at the head of the institution can be and is being acquired at Toronto. Perhaps my hon. friends from Peel (Mr. Blain) from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) and from Algoma (Mr. Boyce) who are so suspicious in connection with this matter can tell the House and the people how it was that the Attorney General's department of the Ontario government had all the information about the failure of the Farmers' Bank 24 days before making a solitary move to get hold of Dr. Beattie Nesbitt, the arch-criminal of all the promoters of the bank. I would ask them if some one did not give Dr. Beattie Nesbitt some warning to get out of the country. To show the sincerity of the Ontario government in their desire to capture Dr. Beattie Nesbitt I would point out that they have offered the magnificent reward of $200 for the production of his live body.

If the Farmers' Bank teaches this parliament any lesson it is that in the revision of the Bank Act some measure should be adopted providing for the public inspection of banks. The depositors in all our banks must be protected. This is one of the most important matters we can deal with, to see that our financial institutions are on a sound basis and when the Bank Act comes before the Banking and Commerce Committee of this House, I hope that some measure of public inspection will find its way into the Act and become the law of Canada.

Mr. J. J. DONNELLY (South Bruce). The facts so far made public in connection with the organization and management of the Farmers' Bank have done much to weaken the confidence of the public in the stability of the banking institutions of this country. It appears to me that a thorough investigation by a Royal Commission such as is suggested by this amendment into all the operations in connection with this bank would assist us in locating the weak points in our Banking Act and in so amending that Act as to prevent the recurrence of what has happened to the stockholders and depositors of the Farmers' Bank. The fact that a bank has a Dominion charter is taken by many people to indicate that it not only has a right to transact public business but that it is subject to such supervision by the Dominion government that it may be fairly assumed to be in good financial standing. Now, section 158 of the Bank Act practically wipes out all the private banks of this country. That section reads:

> Every person assuming or using the title of bank, banking company, banking house, banking association or banking institution without being authorized so to do by this Act or some other Act in force in that behalf, is guilty of an offence against this Act.

The object of that legislation was to protect the public by rendering it necessary for them to do practically all their banking with chartered banks. If the fact that a bank has a Dominion charter and is authorized to do business by a certificate issued by the Treasury Board is no guarantee of the financial standing of that bank, why was this legislation passed which practically gave all the chartered banks a monopoly of the banking business of this country? In view of that, it was clearly the duty of the Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board to take every precaution before issuing a certificate to the Farmers' Bank. Now, just a word in reference to the name 'Farmers' Bank.' The persons who promoted this bank were not farmers. I listened yesterday to the Minister of Finance reading over a list of some fifteen names of persons who, according to the prospectus issued by the bank, were willing to act as directors were they elected as such, and among that fifteen there was only one farmer, so that about the only right the promoters of this bank had to be called farmers was that possibly in incorporating it they were placing themselves in a position to farm the public. However, I suppose their object in so calling it was to gain the goodwill of the farming community. The discussion so far has led me to believe that the Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board did not exercise reasonable precaution before issuing the certificate to the Farmers' Bank. We have the statement of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that he warned the Minister of Finance before the certificate was issued; we have the letter of Mr. McCarthy,

warning the Minister of Finance that the promoters of this bank were endeavouring to evade the provision of the Bank Act which said that before a certificate shall be issued, at least $500,000 of stock must be actually subscribed for, and at least $250,000 of that money paid into the hands of the Minister of Finance. We have also a subsequent letter of Mr. McCarthy, in which he gives more detail, and he says:

I have received information that the alleged subscribers for shares paid a large sum of money in cash and have signed notes for other large sums of money, and that the persons professing to act in the name of the bank have transferred notes and received the proceeds, and that a deposit either has been made or will be made of the cash received and the proceeds of these notes, or sufficient amount to make up $250,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that when the Minister of Finance had this information before him he should have made some effort to verify it, but, the Minister of Finance takes the ground that Mr. McCarthy later on withdrew his objection. As a matter of fact, that is not the case. Mr. McCarthy was acting for some half dozen stockholders in the Farmers' Bank who were his clients, and he made his objection solely for the purpose of protecting them. Apparently the promoters of the bank became aware of that fact and they settled with Mr. McCarthy's clients, and he as their solicitor had no further authority to press the matter. But the fact still remains that the minister had the information that this evasion of the Bank Act was being perpetrated, and, Sir, all the other shareholders of the bank were just as much interested in the charges made against the promoters of the bank as were Mr. McCarthy's clients. Mr. McCarthy succeeded in protecting his clients but the Minister of Finance failed to protect his clients, the public, whose representative he was in that case. I say, Sir, that it was the duty of the Minister of Finance to make a thorough investigation in view of these repeated warnings, but in place of doing so what do you think he did but apply to the manager of the bank who was seeking the certificate, the man of all men who would be most anxious that the truth should not be known. And, the Minister of Finance accepts this man's testimony, sworn testimony if you may call it so, against the statement set forth in Mr. McCarthy's letter, against the warning he had received from Mr. Henderson and others, and he issued this certificate. The First Minister tells us that the Finance Department and the Minister of Finance were deceived. Well, if they were deceived it is their own fault because they had every opportunity to investigate and discover whether the charges made and the warnings given them were founded on fact. But, there appears to have been peculiarly undue haste in the issuing of this certificate. There is a great deal of correspondence about it dated the 30th November, 1906. We first have a letter from Mr. Fielding to Mr. Travers regretting that engagements the previous day arising out of the budget prevented him meeting Mr. Travers, and we have a letter from Mr. Travers to Mr. Fielding, saying:

In reply to your letter of the 30th November, I have to say that in the case of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, the provisional directors did not raise the money in the way mentioned by you. You will find the statement put in by me absolutely correct as to the amount of stock subscribed and the amount paid up.

We have another letter of the same date from the Deputy Minister of Finance to Mr. Travers and we have also a letter of the same date—although not received on the same date addressed to the Deputy Minister of Finance and signed by Sir Edward Clouston, and that letter I shall read:

Montreal, November 30, 1906.

T. C. Boville, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

Farmers' Bank of Canada.

Dear Sir,—In connection with the application of the Farmers' Bank of Canada for the usual certificate from the Treasury Board, I have reason to believe that the money lodged, or to be lodged, at Ottawa as stock subscriptions, cannot be regarded as paid-up capital, and that a large proportion of the amount necessary to the obtaining of a certificate is a loan made upon the promise of its payment when returned by your department.

Permit me to request that, if only for the protection of the public, the Treasury Board will exercise its right to refuse to issue a certificate if it thinks best so to do, until a thorough investigation has been made into the circumstances stated herein.

E. S. CLOUSTON,
President.

It is a peculiar coincidence that there should have been so many letters and such undue haste on that particular date. Would it not be, Mr. Speaker, a fair inference that all this haste, this rush, was caused by the fact that the promoters of the bank became aware that Sir Edward Clouston was sending this or a similar letter to the Department of Finance? It has been argued that even if this certificate was obtained by fraud the bank might have gone on and proved a success. That is possible, but we must not forget that had this certificate not been issued these parties would never have been in a position to go out and make the appeal to the people of the country that this chartered bank had to make in order to secure deposits. The story of the organization and management of the Farmers' Bank is a story of crime and inefficiency, it is a blot upon the finan-

cial reputation of this country, and no effort should be spared to place the responsibility where it belongs. Let us have a full and free investigation and base our further action upon the results of that investigation.

Mr. S. SHARPE (North Ontario). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the facts and circumstances in connection with the unfortunate bank known throughout Canada as the Farmers' Bank. I do not think that any hon. gentleman in this House, particularly those whose constituencies are directly affected by this unfortunate failure, have any reason to offer any apology to this House for occupying time upon this important question. After having carefully examined the return that has been brought down by the government and after listening to the case as presented by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, I am not at all surprised that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is disinclined to grant the prayer of the resolution. The man who is being charged with serious omissions and derelictions of duty does not display as a rule any enthusiasm for his trial to proceed, and there is no doubt that, if a Royal Commission were appointed in connection with this bank, virtually and in fact the Finance Department would be on trial. Consequently we are not surprised to see that the Minister of Finance is not disposed to grant a Royal Commission as asked for by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). The history of the Farmers' Bank is certainly an extraordinary one. The Act incorporating the bank was passed on the 18th July, 1904, and subsequently there were two Acts extending the charter, the first for two years, within which a certificate might be granted, and the second extending the time for six months. The Minister of Finance himself stated that he entertained grave fears concerning the success of this bank on the ground of the difficulty in raising funds with which to commence the operations of the bank. I say this, Mr. Speaker, should have placed him upon his guard and should have caused him to see that henceforth and from that time onward all the formalities as required by the Bank Act were adhered to. The certificate was granted on November 30, 1906, and the bank suspended on December 19, 1910. Within about four years the bank depleted its whole capital, ruined thousands and thousands of depositors and altogether dissipated over a million dollars of money. The curator, Mr. Clarkson, made an interim statement of the affairs of the bank, a synopsis of which I propose to give to the House.

LIABILITIES.

Amounts owing to depositors and holders of drafts at various points where branches were situated	$1,281,774 91
Preferred claims	569,987 07
Capital stock	584,500 00
	$2,436,261 98

ASSETS.

Dominion of Canada notes, specie, balance from the banks,, cash in hand, &c.	$140,709 23	
Deposit with government.	20,250 00	
Stocks and bonds	113,895 00	
Surplus in trust and Guarantee Company's hand	81,688 05	
Current loans, &c.	241,434 84	
		597,977 12
Deficit		$1,838,284 86
Stocks and bonds, &c.		535,000 00
As against this the curator has the bank's claim against the Keeley mine		$1,303,284 86

This leaves a net deficit to be met by the asset known as the Keeley mine of $1,303,000. The statement has been made just lately that the Keeley mine is indebted to the Farmers' Bank in the sum of $150,000 or $200,000 only. Consequently it will mean a net deficit, after the obligation to the Farmers' Bank is met by the Keeley mine, of over a million dollars. The results and consequences of the operations of the Farmers' Bank have been most serious. I think it is the most disastrous financial failure in the history of the country. It is the worst tragedy in the annals of banking. The shareholders and depositors are not the comparatively rich people to be found in mercantile circles. They do not reside in cities and towns, and, as the notion is, make a comparatively easy living, but they are poor labouring people in many cases distributed throughout the length and breadth of the province. The savings of a lifetime have been swept away, poverty, ruin and desolation, and, in many cases, actual hunger, face those who have lost all their means in the financial disaster known as the failure of the Farmers' Bank.

The question naturally arises, on whom is the responsibility for this failure to be fastened? Of course we all know that the loss has resulted from the operations of the bank, but the bank could not have started operations without the sanction and license of the department, and hence the question naturally follows what facts and circumstances were known to the Finance Department or the minister who is responsible for issuing that certificate, and which should have prevented this bank from going into operation, and which should have prevented the Minister of Finance from issuing the certificate. I submit that no person can read the record without being convinced beyond peradventure that an ab-

solutely complete case has been made out against the Minister of Finance and his department. The facts fix on the Minister of Finance a perfect knowledge that a fraud was being perpetrated on behalf of the promoters of the bank. A series of most interesting interviews took place before the certificate was issued between my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) and the hon. Minister of Finance. Before the certificate was issued my hon. friend told him that a great number of his constituents were interested in the promotion of this bank, that he felt alarmed for its success, and he asked the minister to withhold the certificate.

What was the answer of the minister? He said: I will delay the issue of the certificate as long as possible. But the facts and circumstances show that instead of withholding the certificate as long as possible, he displayed all kinds of anxiety to get it out of the hands of the Treasury Board into the hands of Travers. After the certificate was granted, we had the hon. member from Halton (Mr. Henderson), going to the Finance Minister and again expressing his anxiety in connection with the operations of the Farmers' Bank. What was the action of the hon. minister? He said: Mr. Henderson, you have no occasion to be alarmed, you are not financially interested in the bank, and besides you have discharged your full duty. You warned the department. I submit that there could be nothing verbally stronger than the warning which my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) gave the Finance Minister on that occasion. I was somewhat surprised to hear the minister say that he had no recollection of that interview, and that, so far as he remembered, such a conversation did not take place. He did not say that if it had taken place and the warning had been given, he would have refused to give the certificate, because he would then have been confronted with the argument that the documents on file in his department were stronger by far than any verbal warning the hon. member for Halton had given. What were these documents? They are in the return brought down and printed by the government, but as these letters have been put on 'Hansard' already, it is my intention to do no more than give a very brief recapitulation of the various warnings given the Finance Minister.

We find Mr. Leighton McCarthy, who was then a member of this House, and who, although elected as an independent, voted for the government on every occasion, giving the strongest possible warning to the Finance Minister. We say Mr. McCarthy who was elected to protect, not merely any possible client he might secure in the way of legal practice, but the people at large, who was elected not only to make the laws but to see that the laws of the country were being observed, and who had great influence with the government, we find him writing on October 8, 1906, to the Minister of Finance, before the certificate was granted, and in that letter he made this statement:

I beg to assure you that grave conditions have arisen which will require careful consideration before the Treasury Board grant any certificate for the organization of this bank. I, therefore, ask you to be good enough to stay any action which might be taken until I have had an opportunity of discussing this with you.

Not having heard from the department for three days, Mr. McCarthy, in his anxiety to protect his own clients, wrote the minister on October 11, three days later, as follows:

Please wire me assurance in reference to stay of certificate of Treasury Board mentioned in my letter of Monday night.

He got a reply on October 11, from the Minister of Finance as follows:

No application yet received for the certificate referred to. Please forward your representations immediately and they will be considered when application comes.

As a matter of fact, the report shows that these representations of Mr. McCarthy were never considered by the Treasury Board. On October 11, we have a letter signed by the Finance Minister himself to Mr. Leighton McCarthy:

I wired you to-day that no application had been made by the promoters for the Treasury Board certificate, and suggested that you send forward at once any representations which you may wish to make, to which we shall give all due consideration.

W. S. FIELDING,
Minister of Finance.

There was assurance from the Finance Minister that any representations regarding the organization and the formalities connected with the inception of the bank would receive due consideration. Yet we have it on the words of the Finance Minister that because the complaint of Mr. McCarthy had been withdrawn and because he asked to have his papers returned, these letters of Mr. McCarthy's and the writ of summons setting out misrepresentation, deceit and fraud in connection with the whole transaction, had never been submitted to the Treasury Board. Then on October 19, 1906, Mr. McCarthy wrote the Finance Minister as follows:

My Dear Mr. Fielding,—I beg to inclose the special endorsement upon a writ of summons in the High Court of Justice for Ontario.

And he goes on to refer to the misrepresentations and other grounds which may

be disclosed upon examination of the alleged subscriptions to shares and he says:

I have received information that the alleged subscribers for shares paid a large sum of money in cash and have signed notes for other large sums of money, and that the persons professing to act in the name of the bank have transferred notes and received the proceeds——

This was in violation of the Bank Act and should have voided any application for a certificate.

—and that a deposit either has been made or will be made of the cash received and the proceeds of these notes, or a sufficient amount to make up $250,000.

Then we find that Mr. Boville, the Deputy Minister of Finance, four days afterwards, writes Mr. McCarthy as follows:

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th instant, to Mr. Fielding's address, respecting the Farmers' Bank of Canada. When application is made by the Farmers' Bank to the Treasury Board for a certificate to enable them to commence business, the representations contained in your letter with its inclosure will be laid before the Board.

Consequently we have the statement of the Minister of Finance himself and of his deputy that when an application for a certificate shall be received the representations made by Mr. McCarthy would be laid before the board and all these facts and circumstances connected with the fraudulent promotion of the bank would be submitted to the Treasury Board in order that it might deal with them before granting a certificate.

On the same day the letter was written, Travers sent down a deposit of $250,000. On October 24, the Deputy Minister of Finance, Mr. Boville, notified Travers that there was opposition filed in the department to his being granted a certificate. Then on October 31, the deputy minister wrote Mr. McCarthy again:

Dear Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 19th instant, addressed to Mr. Fielding, on the subject of the Farmers' Bank of Canada and the issue of a certificate to that bank to commence business under section 15 of the Bank Act, I notice recently a reference in the newspapers for a judgment given by Judge Anglin in a suit relating to this matter. In view of the decision rendered, I shall be obliged if you will let me know if you still desire the protest contained in your letter to be brought before the Treasury Board upon an application of the Farmers' Bank for a certificate to be considered.

T. C. BOVILLE,
Deputy Minister of Finance.

There had been no word from Mr. McCarthy to show any desire on his part to withdraw his objections to the certificate, yet we find the deputy minister writing to him and all but suggesting that he should withdraw all objections. All the facts and circumstances show that the Finance Department displayed a great deal of anxiety, not to safeguard the interests of the shareholders and depositors or the general public, but to get the certificate into the hands of Travers so that he might commence operations under the name of the Farmers' Bank.

Then we find on November 2, 1906, a letter from Mr. McCarthy stating that his clients had been settled with and withdrawing his objection; and because of that letter the Minister of Finance says he was entitled to proceed as if no objections had been made. But the facts set out in the writ of summons, a copy of which was in the hands of the Minister of Finance and on file in his department, showed most serious accusations. It is not my intention to read them in full, but I desire to set out briefly what they meant.

The charges made in this writ were:

(a.) That the subscriptions were procured through deceit, fraud and misrepresentation;

(b.) The particulars of the fraud are stated. We cite one example, namely, that John Sproat, one of the plaintiffs, intended to subscribe for $1,000, and his application was wrongfully entered at $10,000;

(c.) That the directors mentioned in the prospectus have neither subscribed for shares, nor consented to act as directors;

(d.) That agents who procured subscriptions for shares had taken promissory notes on account of subscriptions, which were payable to the provisional directors, and that they were endeavouring to discount these notes in order to make up the deposit of $250,000.

(e.) That a large sum of money paid on account of capital had been unlawfully deducted for commissions;

(f.) That the money and promissory notes taken from subscribers were impressed with a trust under the Bank Act for all the subscribers;

(g.) An affidavit of verification was filed, and notice of motion served and an injunction claimed to restrain the further publication of a notice calling a meeting, and to restrain the directors from making any application to the Treasury Board for a certificate to open the bank.

Now, can any reasonable man who peruses the records on file say that these charges should have been disregarded when the application for certificate was being considered? I ask, was the department concerned only about Mr. McCarthy's clients? What about the hundreds of other poor shareholders and depositors? When the government delayed the certificate in order to get Mr. McCarthy's clients out of the hole, did they discharge their full duty towards the public and towards the shareholders and depositors throughout the length and breadth of the land? Had they still no duty to protect others from fraud

and crime? I submit that a case more complete and unanswerable could not have been made out than that made out by the hon. member for Halton who moved this resolution. Then, we have a letter which is very significant and which has been commented upon. The Department of Finance, in order to shift the responsibility, asks the advice of the Minister of Justice. This is a frequently used device in the various departments of the government when they desire to shirk responsibility. We find the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) himself, when he was defending the Newmarket canal, shifting responsibility to the engineers,—he said he had the engineer's report that the enterprise was feasible and relied upon that report. And the Minister of Public Works tries to shift responsibility to the Minister of Justice when he wants to put in an elevator in a privately owned building the owner of which agreed in the lease to put in the elevator himself. So, we find the same device resorted to on this occasion—the Department of Justice is asked for an opinion. That rose, so to speak, had a thorn in it. The opinion given by the Department of Justice, said:

In reply, I beg to state that the statements in the statutory declaration of Mr. Walter R. Travers are sufficient, if they are accepted.

This throws back again upon the Finance Department the onus of deciding upon the merits of the case, but says that so far as the form of the application is concerned, that was all right. It was not necessary to refer the question to the Justice Department at all, but evidently the Justice Department had the same suspicion that the Finance Department had that everything was not right in connection with the promotion of this bank, and the Minister of Justice and his department were determined not to be made the scapegoat for the Department of Finance. At the same time, we had all these warnings from the hon. member for Halton and from the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) who, as the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) told us last night, went to the Minister of Finance and warned him against issuing the certificate that would allow this bank to commence business, as well as Mr. McCarthy's letter with the serious charges therein contained. Beyond and above that we have the far more important letter that is in the hands of the Finance Department, from the president of the Bankers' Association, Sir Edward Clouston, dated on the identical day on which the certificate is said to have been issued. I submit, as has been stated by other speakers, that this was the time for the Finance Department to act. They must have known, from the warnings they had received, and from this letter of Sir Edward Clouston, that the affidavit of W. R. Travers filed in order to secure the certificate was false and that the man who was to be manager of the bank had been guilty of perjury. The bank at that time had not opened its doors or received a dollar of deposits. That was the time for the Finance Department to act. The Minister of Finance, when defending his course yesterday, asked the question: 'What could I have done? I submit that to ask that question is to have it answered. All he had to do was to wire Mr. Travers that the certificate had to be returned, and, if it was not returned, to issue a warrant for his arrest. Or, he could have issued a warning to the public through the press not to transact business with the bank, and the bank could not have opened its doors. It would have been an infinitely easy matter for the Finance Department to have prevented the Farmers' Bank transacting any business. In addition to all this, the bank had only been in operation three or four months at the outside when there was a most important communication received from the manager of the Milton branch of the bank. Feeling concerned about the irregularity of discounting subscribers' notes, this gentleman wrote to the Finance Minister the letter which is published at page 29, of the Return, as follows:

The Farmers' Bank of Canada,
Milton, April 7, 1907.

T. C. Boville, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Will you kindly give me your opinion as to the following: Our general manager sends to the different branches lists of notes given in payment of our capital stock. These notes he makes the managers put through as discounts, crediting the amount to H.O. This is figured in the government return as paid-up capital and circulation issued to that amount. If I read the Bank Act correctly, section 76, he is asking us to do what is not right. As I do not wish to do anything contrary to the law, I should be much obliged if you give me the ruling on it. With many apologies for troubling you.

G. VANKOUGHNET,
Manager.

Now, it is extraordinary that, though this letter confirms beyond any doubt the allegations contained in Mr. McCarthy's writ and the statements made in Sir Edward Clouston's letter and proved the falseness of the affidavit made and filed by Mr. Travers with the department to secure this certificate, yet the department did not even condescend to notice it for a matter of two weeks. I submit that, if the Finance Minister had appreciated the position he was in as trustee for the people, he would have taken action upon receipt of that letter. As a matter of fact, as I have said, they ignored that important communication for two weeks and then wrote in this way:

Finance Department,
Ottawa, May 1, 1907.

G. VanKoughnet, Esq.,
68 Howard Avenue,
Toronto.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 17th ultimo.

I must apologize for the delay in replying. Parliamentary business at this time in the session takes precedence over other duties.

While it is not deemed expedient to enter into correspondence at this stage, the matter referred to by you is of sufficient importance to warrant further inquiry. This will shortly be made. I should like to have a copy of any of the notes.

T. C. BOVILLE,
Deputy Minister of Finance.

Is routine parliamentary work so much more important than the interest of the public?

Now is it conceivable that the Deputy Minister of Finance would answer an important communication in that manner? Why was it not expedient to enter into communication? Was it not their bounden duty to take cognizance of an important communication of that kind, and to take some action? The bank, as a matter of fact, had only been in operation a very few months. If they had taken immediate action on that occasion, and had issued either a warrant against Travers and had him arrested, or had issued a Royal Commission, or even given notice to the press calling public attention to the fact that the bank was conceived in sin and born in iniquity, and that the public should not deal with the bank, that would have been an effective way to protect the interests of the people. But there was no reply to that important communication for upwards of two weeks. Then, on December 7, 1908, we find the secretary of the Bankers' Association reporting that a deposit receipt amounting to $150,000 was being offered for sale in the New York markets, and still the Finance Minister takes no action. The Minister of Finance says he only heard rumours, or some gossip regarding the irregularities. Now it seems to me that the statement of the minister hardly accords with the facts. Surely the conversations he had with the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), and with the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), the allegations contained in the writs, these important letters warning the department against issuing the certificate—surely all these things were not mere gossip. I say that no person could regard these serious allegations, these serious statements of hon. members of this House in regard to the condition of that bank, as mere gossip and rumour. Before the certificate was granted the department had received the strongest warnings; immediately after the certificate was granted they received more warnings. Why then did the department not act? Was it powerless under the Bank Act to recall or cancel the certificate? If it was, then the Bank Act should be amended. But even after the department had issued the certificate enabling this bank to transact business, it was not, to use a legal expression, it was not functus officio, it still had some power. Was it paralysed that it could not act? Was it speechless that it could not warn the public against the operations of the bank? That the certificate had been secured by fraud and perjury. Only a word or a letter at that critical stage would have been sufficient to save the depositors and shareholders from loss and ruin. The only redeeming feature about the failure of the Farmers' Bank, in my opinion, is that if it had to occur, it occurred at a most opportune time, because the Bank Act is about to be revised; and if the failure of the Farmers' Bank and of other banks have done anything, they have emphasized though at an awful cost to the shareholders and depositors the many defects in the Bank Act, and the incapacity of the Finance Department. I submit that the government as represented by the Finance Department is morally responsible for all the losses that have occurred in connection with this institution. They knew that the notes of the subscribers to the stock were being discounted in order to raise the deposit for the government. They thus knew that the deposit was being illegally raised, they knew a writ had been issued charging the officers with fraud and forgery, they knew that a perjured affidavit was on file in the department, and that the writ containing these serious allegations set out in the writ of summons were filed with the department, also they knew that the action was settled, that the plaintiffs who were expressly mentioned in the writ had been settled with and had withdrawn their action. I submit that the Finance Department should not have turned a deaf ear to all the warnings they received in connection with the inception of this bank. The bank's charter was a mere dead letter, was a mere corpse, until galvanized into life by the granting of that certificate, and I submit that the department should not have allowed an unscrupulous promoter to use a government creation to bring to the people serious loss, and ruin, and desolation. A banking institution with a central office in a large city, and with branches throughout the length and breadth of the province, is like a big octopus stretching out its tentacles into every part of the province. In this case it gathered in the savings and earnings of the poor people throughout the province, and brought them into its maw in order to engage in speculation and criminal operations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say this in all seriousness, that there are three men who are directly and primarily responsible for the

inception of the bank, and the loss that has been inflicted on innocent people. If the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr Stratton), and his institution, the Trust and Guarantee Company, had not loaned money to the subscribers of the stock upon their notes, and thus been guilty of a fraud upon the Bank Act, the promoters never would have been able to raise the money, they would never have been able to make up the deposit, and consequently the bank would never have opened its doors. I submit that the hon. member for West Peterborough—I am sorry he is not in his seat to-night—as the elected representative of the people, a man who is supposed not only to make laws, but to observe them, it was his duty to warn the government that these notes were being discounted. It is said that that very cheque that went from the Trust and Guarantee Company to the Bank of Montreal contained the signature of the hon. member for West Peterborough as its president, and on the face of that cheque it is mentioned that the cheque is to be used as part of the deposit that is made to the government in order to enable the bank to start operations. Now, Sir, it has been asked what the member for West Peterborough made out of the transaction? I do not know whether he made anything personally out of the transaction; but either he or the Trust and Guarantee Company secured thousands of shares of stock in the Keeley mine. They received a large rate of interest, and a large cash bonus besides. Then the next gentleman who appears on the scene was the Liberal whip of the Reform party, he is the next member who comes into the limelight in connection with the organization of the bank. The Liberal whip introduced Mr. Travers to the Minister of Finance, and used his influence to secure the certificate. Mr. Travers, in his sworn statement in the police court in Toronto, stated that Mr. Calvert received a loan of $5,000. Mr. Calvert says it was $3,000, and it was perfectly legitimate, and in the ordinary course of business. If that money was secured in the ordinary course of business, then I ask why it was charged up to commissions, and was not put through the banks in the ordinary shape of a loan. The Minister of Finance asked what a Royal Commission would find out that is not already disclosed. It would be interesting for the public to know, it would be interesting to this House to know, and I am sure the shareholders and depositors desire to know when Mr. Calvert received his loan, and when he paid it back.

Mr. CARVELL. I will answer the hon. gentleman if he wants to know—on the 9th of July, 1909, three years after the bank received its certificate. I have the original note and all the documents.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Then perhaps the hon. member will proceed to answer the question why it was charged up to commissions, if it was a loan in the ordinary sense?

Mr. CARVELL. I do not think it was.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). That is the sworn statement of the manager of the bank.

Mr. CARVELL. The original note has the words marked on it 'Loan, W. R. T.'

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The hon. member (Mr. Carvell) will perhaps agree that many of these doubts and suspicions would be cleared and the atmosphere clarified if we had a Royal Commission. Mr. Calvert could go into the box and explain the circumstances. The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stratton) could explain many things. This is a most serious and grave matter. Upwards of a million dollars have been lost in four years. The money has disappeared, the courts cannot find out where it has gone. Is it not the duty of the government to appoint a Royal Commission and ascertain how such a tremendous loss occurred in such a short space of time?

I would ask the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) to explain another matter. Mr. Calvert as chief Liberal whip had peculiar influence on the ministerial side of the House and applications were made to him. It is not usual when doing business with a department of the government to ask for a letter of introduction from the government whip, to do so is in this case, a very suspicious circumstance. Not only did Mr. Calvert exercise his influence with the Finance Department in connection with the passing this certificate through the Treasury Board, but he exercised his influence with the Customs Department on behalf of Mr. Travers. I moved for a return the other day in connection with a pleasure yacht which Travers had transferred from the register at Detroit to Brockville. Mr. Calvert seems to have been under some obligation and Mr. Travers wrote to him, August 18th, 1909, just when everybody was clamouring for an investigation, when the insurance department of New York State was asking for an investigation into the affairs of the bank. Mr. Travers was doing everything he could to stave off that investigation. Instead of writing direct to the Customs Department we find him writing to Mr. Calvert as follows:

W. S. Calvert, Esq., M.P.,
Strathroy, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Referring to my conversation with you regarding the entering with the Customs Department my yacht 'Wanda,' will you kindly make an application in my behalf to accomplish the same. It is a pleasure yacht for the use of my family only, and is now at Maitland, Ontario. It was a present

to me from Mr. F. C. Whitney, of Detroit. It is sixteen years old and I doubt very much if it would bring $1,000 if offered by auction. If I cannot have it appraised at a low figure I shall have to return the boat as I cannot afford any such luxury.

It enables my family to buy all their supplies at Brockville, and I am sure the people there would be sorry to see me return the boat.

I am sorry to trouble you in the matter, but will be very much obliged if you will be so kind as to see what can be done for me in the matter.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) W. R. TRAVERS.

That is about a month after the loan to Mr. Calvert. Travers writes to him asking him to get his boat passed at a low valuation. Mr. Calvert writes to Mr. McDougald, Commissioner of Customs, on the 19th of August, after having a personal conversation with that gentleman. His letter reads:

Dear Mr. McDougald,—I inclose letter from Mr. W. R. Travers, general manager, the Farmers' Bank, Toronto. As I informed you the other day, unless this old boat can be admitted for a nominal sum, say valuation of $1,000 or so, Mr. Travers will return it as he advises me, it is not worth much to anybody, and was given to him as stated in his letter.

You will, therefore, have your appraiser take a look at it and let me know what can be done. I believe he had it painted this summer and it looks clean, so I am informed. I think if you can pass it at above sum of valuation it will stay in Canadian waters, and if not, then I guess he will return it to the donor.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) W. S. CALVERT.

So you see Mr. Calvert the Liberal whip had personally interviewed the Commissioner of Customs with a view to getting the boat through the Customs at a low valuation, and actually suggested the valuation. If the Minister of Customs were here I would ask if that is the way the Customs Department is managed. This transaction came to light by accident, and I would ask how many entries are made through the Customs Department on the advice of the Liberal whip. It is an extraordinary circumstance and the Prime Minister should take cognizance of the matter. Mr. Farrow, assistant Commissioner of Customs, replied as follows:

File 68283. Ottawa, August 24, 1909.

W. S. Calvert, Esq.,
Strathroy, Ont.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th instant, with enclosure from Mr. W. R. Travers, general manager, the Farmers' Bank of Canada, Toronto, respecting the value for duty of the yacht 'Wanda.'

One of the Dominion customs appraisers will visit Brockville in course of a week or ten days and examine and appraise the yacht for duty purposes.

Then we have a letter from Mr. Farrow to the Collector of Customs at Brockville. I understood that it was the duty of the collector to make these appraisements himself, but in this case a special appraiser was sent down. Mr. Farrow's letter reads:

File 68283. Ottawa, August 24, 1909.

The Collector of Customs,
Brockville, Ont.

Sir,—In a week or ten days Mr. Dominion Appraiser Boughner will visit your port to examine and appraise the yacht 'Wanda,' owned by Mr. W. R. Travers, general manager, the Farmers' Bank of Canada, Toronto.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) R. R. FARROW,
Asst. Commissioner of Customs.

The valuation is interesting. I am informed that the boilers and engine alone for scrap iron would be worth several thousand dollars. It is a most expensive yacht, and it is valued on the suggestion of Mr. Calvert at the low sum of $1,600. Mr. Calvert suggested $1,000 or so, and the Customs Department being in an accommodating mood split the difference and made it $1,600. That matter should be taken cognizance of by the leader of the government. Mr. Calvert had been the instrument in securing the passing of the Farmers' Bank certificate; he was the instrument in having the yacht 'Wanda' passed the customs at one-twentieth of its true value. Why did not Mr. Travers deal direct with the Customs Department instead of using the Liberal whip to secure the valuation of a boat worth thousands and thousands of dollars at $1,600. The Customs Department through the influence of the Liberal whip was defrauded out of hundreds of dollars in duty.

It is worthy of note in passing that Mr. Calvert is now on the Board of the Transcontinental Railway Commission dealing with the expenditure of millions and millions of dollars of the people's money for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I ask the leader of the government if Mr. Calvert should be allowed to retain his position upon that board, or should there not be an investigation into his conduct in connection with these various matters. If he received a loan from Mr. Travers by reason of the influence he used either with the Finance Minister or with the Minister of Customs is it not reasonable to assume that he is open to receive loans, if you designate them as loans, from the contractors engaged in the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific? Is it not a matter of fair comment to say that all this is worthy of the closest investigation, and that is one of the reasons why we earnestly press that a Royal Commission of investigation be appointed. Then there was interested in the granting of the certificate the member for

Peterborough (Mr. Stratton) whose trust and guarantee company, of which he is the master mind, and which he directs and controls, and which would not proceed in a transaction of this kind without his consent, knowledge and direction, is responsible for assisting them in getting illegally a loan in order to raise the necessary deposit to place with the government before the certificate could be issued. I say that Mr. Calvert, who was then Liberal whip, was also to blame and directly responsible for getting this certificate through the Treasury Board. The next hon. member who was directly and primarily responsible for the loss attendant upon the Farmers' Bank is the Minister of Finance himself. Impelled by these unseen influences and in the face of all these warnings, the Minister of Finance cannot escape the responsibility. And yet the Minister of Finance does not show any desire to assist the poor unfortunates who lost their money as shareholders or depositors by appointing a Royal Commission. Is it because forsooth that he or his department, or some of his political friends might be publicly censured for their share in starting this wild concern upon its riotous career? The shareholders have unanimously expressed a desire at their meeting in Toronto for a Royal Commission, and one of their arguments was that a Royal Commission would not be hampered by the strict rules of evidence, and by the strict rules of procedure that obtain in a court of law. There have been one million dollars squandered in the last four years., That money has gone somewhere and the depositors and shareholders and the general public want to know where that money has gone. All the parties who had any share in connection with the promotion and flotation of the Farmers' Bank can, if the Royal Commission be appointed, be put on oath, and all the facts elicited. That Royal Commission would assist the curator to ascertain the facts, and it might probably secure information which would enable the poor people to recover some of their money. I do not wish to go into the personal aspect of the relations between the Trust and Guarantee Company and the Farmers' Bank, but I believe that if the officers of the Trust and Guarantee Company were placed in the witness box before a Royal Commission it would be found that their loans to the Farmers' Bank were illegal and the securities would have to be returned to the curator of the Farmers' Bank and so a large amount of money would be available to relieve the depositors and shareholders from part of the loss they have suffered. I am sure the members of the House will agree with me that the defence of the Minister of Finance in this matter was about the weakest case he has ever made in this House. He told us that the incorporation of the bank was not objected to by the opposition. Why should it? Presumably the men were respectable individuals, and no one would object to the incorporation under ordinary circumstances, and besides it was not Mr. Travers who was asking for the incorporation, it was the provisional directors. Let it be remembered however, that it was Mr. Travers alone who was asking for the certificate. The point was made by the Minister of Finance that the notes that were actually discounted by the subscribers were eventually paid and hence the bank was not wrecked on account of lack of capital. But I submit the answer to that is quite clear, and it is that the bank had been granted a certificate to do business when it was in a crippled condition and the promoters of the bank were forced into speculation and illegal operations in order to try and retrieve the fortunes of the bank, and when the minister says those notes were eventually paid and consequently no capital lost to the bank, I submit that statement is completely answered by the fact that because of the crippled condition of the bank at its birth the manager was forced to engage in illegal speculation which brought loss and ruin to the innocent shareholders and depositors. The Minister of Finance also spoke of the high character Mr. Travers had at that time, but reasonable inquiry on the part of the minister would have disclosed that Mr. Travers had no substantial standing in the community in which he lived. It did not take the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) 24 hours to find out that he would have nothing whatever to do with Mr. Travers. On a Monday morning Mr. Travers' agent came to the member for London, and asked him to be a provisional director and subscriber for stock, but the member for London refused and he went straight into the first branch bank he came to and made inquiries about Mr. Travers, and he decided on the information he then obtained to have nothing to do with the institution. How very easy it would have been for the Minister of Finance to do as the member for London did, and thus prevent the loss, which subsequently fell so heavily upon the shareholders and depositors. I can only explain the opposition of the Minister of Finance to the granting of a Royal Commission of investigation on the ground that he believes that there is something which might come out which would prove to be detrimental to his department, or detrimental to the other members who were connected with the promotion of the bank and the granting of a certificate. If the government refuses a Royal Commission the government must accept the full responsibility for its course. The people of this Dominion, whether financially interested in

the Farmers' Bank or not will condemn the refusal of the government to grant a Royal Commission in order to have this whole sad affair thoroughly investigated.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). I would not speak on this question were it not for the evident attempt on the part of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) to make political capital out of this most unfortunate affair. We on this side agree with our hon. friends opposite that a great wrong has been done to many people in the province of Ontario, and we sympathize with the people who lost their money just as sincerely as they do. We have an impression that if it were only to protect the poor people who have lost their money in this transaction we would not have had two days of the valuable time of this House taken up in the discussion of this matter unless they hoped to make political capital out of it. I intend to discuss the matter for a short time along this line. My hon. friends have for two or three months, in fact, ever since the failure of this bank, by insinuation, innuendo and finally by direct statement, attempted to convince the people of this country that the Liberal party in some way or other were responsible for this unfortunate failure. We had hardly assembled until an attempt was made to prove that the Premier himself was in some way connected with it and had received a contribution from Travers, the manager of the bank, in the form of the first bill that was issued. That was exploded by the Premier reading the letter that he had sent to Travers, and we heard nothing more about it. Next we had an attack by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce), in a notice of motion which he gave to this House on the 23rd of January, in which he stated:

I beg to give notice that to-morrow I will move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance, to wit, the receipt by ministers of the Crown of gifts of money in the form of testimonials and of the reported contribution to such testimonials or testimonial of a sum of money by one William R. Travers, late general manager of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, now in liquidation, said Travers having been convicted and being now under sentence of six years' imprisonment for having falsified returns to the government and for theft of the moneys of the bank.

My hon. friend was not able to prove this insinuation, and all he could do was to quote headlines from such papers as the St. John 'Standard' and the Saskatoon 'Capital.' Next we had a number of notices of motion and questions on the Order Paper by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), and finally we have a debate which has been continued for the last two days. I do not intend at this late hour to go into the details of the case. It is all so simple, it is so easy for hon. gentlemen opposite to be wise after the act, and it is so difficult for people to foresee all these things that I am surprised that my hon. friend from North Ontario would make the ridiculous and wild statements which he has made here to-night, to the effect that the loss which has been entailed upon these poor people can be directly laid to the fault of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). Why does he not go back further than that? He must admit that there was only a hundred thousand dollars out of the total of $250,000 of capital stock which was not actually subscribed. That is only $100,000, and what has become of the $1,250,000? Of course, we know it has been lost due to speculation. That is public property and has been for months. My hon. friends come back and say that the Minister of Finance is directly responsible. Some of them go so far as to say that he is directly guilty of the loss of this monev. Why does not the hon. member for North Ontario go back further and say that the House of Commons is responsible? If the House of Commons had not incorporated the bank it would not have been possible to have stolen this $1,250,000. But, I am getting away from the point that I want to discuss. All the facts of this case have been so thoroughly discussed and placed on 'Hansard' that I would only be repeating if I were to undertake to discuss them at length. The fact is before the House that the affidavit of Travers bore the names of the very respectable gentlemen who were the first directors of the bank. I would like to ask my hon. friends if there is one of them who would have considered that Lieutenant-Colonel R. McLennan, of Cornwall, Lieutenant-Colonel James Munro, Mr. Allan Eaton and Mr. Robert Noble, not to mention their bosom friend at that time, one Dr. Beatty Nesbitt, were such characters that it was the duty of the minister to have sent detectives up and down the country to look into their antecedents, their previous history and their records, before he should grant that charter? There is not a man sitting opposite who would not have done exactly what was done with the documents in their possession. It is true that the minister did receive an intimation from Leighton McCarthy that there was trouble about a certain sum of money before the certificate was issued, but he also received notice from Mr. McCarthy that his clients, having received their money in full, there was no further trouble. Mr. McCarthy asked the minister to return to him the documents and papers in connection with the matter. Then the certificate was issued, the bank commenced doing business and unfortunately stole from the people of this country something like $1,250,000. When the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) was addressing this House last evening, he made use of these words:

We have been told—I do not remember whether in this House or outside of it—that the person who was chief whip in the Liberal party in this House at that time introduced Travers to the Finance Minister. It has been established that, shortly afterwards, that chief whip made a loan from this bank—stated by some to amount to $5,000, but, I believe, stated by himself at $3,000, and that loan was charged up to commissions. Something occurred we have not learned yet.

The Finance Minister never would have acted as he did upon the facts we have and no more; there are other facts we have not got yet. The people of this country have a right to know the whole of these facts.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friends say 'hear, hear.' I say 'hear, hear,' because I will give you the whole of the facts.

Mr. BOYCE. All of them?

Mr. CARVELL. Yes. I think that even the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) will admit that, when I have given him all the facts that are set forth in the document in my hands. This was followed by an article which appears in the Ottawa press of this afternoon and which is as follows:

Mr. Crothers of West Elgin declared that at the meeting of the Treasury Board, at which the certificate was granted, there were only three present, and not a quorum. 'Sir Richard Cartwright was not present or the certificate wouldn't have been issued,' said he.

The manager of the bank was introduced by the then chief Liberal whip, and we find that the chief whip a few days afterwards obtained a loan of $3,000 or $5,000 from the bank, which was afterwards charged to commissions.

My hon. friend from North Ontario reiterated that statement. He used the word 'commission.' I do not know what is the source of that word 'commission' but I must say that in the absence of some evidence to the contrary it must have originated in the imagination of some hon. gentlemen opposite who are anxious to make political capital out of this unfortunate transaction. Now, we have had this information for the last two months. It remained for the hon. member for North Ontario to-night to come out flat-footed, bold and open and make the charge which he has made against a former whip, and now a member of the Transcontinental Railway Commission. I think it would have paid my hon. friend from North Ontario to have made some inquiries into the facts of this transaction as far as that gentleman was concerned, before making the violent and vicious attack which he has made upon him to-night without the least foundation in fact and without having made the least attempt to verify the charges and insinuations that he was making. If my hon. friend from North Ontario is—I will not say mean enough, because that, I presume would be unparliamentary—but my hon. friend from North Ontario in making the charges which he has made against a former member of this House, and who now occupies an important position on the Transcontinental Railway Commission, has not done himself justice. let alone making those statements without first trying to find out some of the facts with reference to the matter. If my hon. friend from North Ontario were half as anxious to do justice in this case as to make a vicious, unwarranted, unmanly attack upon a man occupying an important position——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CARVELL—He would have taken some means to have verified this information.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the word 'unmanly' is not parliamentary.

Mr. CARVELL. I will take it back, and I will call it the most manly act which the hon. gentleman has done that I have known since he has held a seat in this House. I propose now to give to the House the whole transaction between Mr. Calvert and the Farmers' Bank, and I have here a statement which I shall read and put on 'Hansard.' I have the original notes, the original letters, all the documents in connection with this matter, which I propose to give the House.

In the first place the certificate was issued on the 30th November, 1906. Almost three years later, on the 9th July, 1909, Mr. Calvert borrowed from the bank the sum of $3,000 and gave his demand note for that amount as follows:

Toronto, July 9, 1909.

$3,000.

On demand after date, I promise to pay to the order of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, three thousand dollars with interest at six per cent, at the Farmers' Bank of Canada.

W. S. CALVERT.

On the lefthand corner of the note, in the handwriting of W. R. Travers, are these words: 'Loan W. R. T.' Then there is this stamp: 'F. B. of C., L. 160, Tor., Ont.'

Mr. LALOR. No endorser?

Mr. CARVELL. No, sir.

Mr. LALOR. Is it usual for a bank to lend money without an endorser?

Mr. CARVELL. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that I get money without an endorser.

Mr. LALOR. I can tell the hon. gentleman——

Mr. CARVELL. Probably your credit is not as good as Mr. Calvert's. I tell my

hon. friend that I get money from the Bank of Montreal without an endorser. Now remember that that was on the 9th of July, 1909. On the 22nd of July, or only fifteen days afterwards, Mr. Calvert paid back on that note $750. The endorsement is as follows: '$750 paid on account 22nd July, 1909, and that is initialed 'H'. That went on until the 9th of August, 1909, three weeks later, when Mr. Calvert borrowed $200 more, which was paid him by means of a check, and that brought the principal of the note up to $2,450. That remained as it was until the 1st December, 1909, when the interest was added to that amount of $2,450, and that brought the total amount to $2,510.82. And on that date a new note was given as follows:

Mr. SMYTH. Where did you get that information?

Mr. CARVELL. From Mr. Calvert. I have the original documents here—no copies:

Toronto, Ont., Dec. 1, 1909.

$2,510.82.

On demand after date, I promise to pay to the order of Farmers' Bank of Canada, twenty-five hundred and ten dollars and eighty-two cents with interest at 6 per cent at the Farmers' Bank of Canada here.

W. S. CALVERT.

Mark, again, and I hope my hon. friends opposite will take a note of this. It is in Travers' own handwriting: 'Loan W.R.T.'

Mr. SMYTH. How do you know?

Mr. CARVELL. Because I have Travers' handwriting here, and I compared the two. That was on the 1st December, 1909. On the 3rd January, 1910, or one month and three days afterwards, Mr. Calvert paid on that note the sum of $1,000, and on the 30th of June, 1910, or about six months later, he paid another $1,000. The endorsements on the back of this note are as follows:

$1,000 paid on account, 3rd January, 1910—R

$1,000 paid on account, 13th June, 1910.

That brought the amount down to $568, and on the 30th June Mr. Calvert gave another note. But in order to make the matter complete, perhaps I should first read this letter dated June 16, 1910. On that date the following letter was addressed by Travers to Mr. Calvert:

The Farmers' Bank of Canada,
General Manager's Office,
Toronto, June 16, 1910.

W. S. Calvert, Esq.,

C/o the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Yours of the 14th instant received, inclosing not for $568. and I now have the pleasure of returning your old notes cancelled.

July 9, 1909, $3,000.
December 1, 1909, $2,510.82.
The latter being a renewal of the former.

Yours truly,
W. R. TRAVERS.
General Manager.

That was followed by a note dated June 30, 1910, for $568, as follows:

Toronto, Ont., June 30, 1910.

$568.

On demand after date, I promise to pay to the order of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, five hundred and sixty-eight dollars with interest at 6 per cent per annum until paid at the Farmers' Bank of Canada here, for value received.

W. S. CALVERT.

Again marked in the handwriting of W. R. Travers is the word 'renewal' and also the letter 'L', which I presume stands for loan, 'W. R. T.' There was no endorsement on that note, and it was finally handed over to the Trust and Mortgage Company, and on the 27th of December, 1910, Mr. Calvert received the following letter:

Toronto, Dec. 22, 1909.

W. S. Calvert, Esq.,
Comnr. Transcontinental Railway,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Re Farmers' Bank. We beg to notify you that we are the holders for value of your note as follows:—Date, June 30, 1910, for $568 and interest, due on demand.

This note is drawn in favour of the Farmers' Bank of Canada and by them endorsed to us. Please provide for payment at maturity on presentation of the note.

Yours truly,
JAMES J. WARREN,
General Manager.

That was paid by Mr. Calvert on the 31st December, 1910, and at that time the amount was $585.04. Mr. Calvert has therefore paid the total amount of $3,200 which he borrowed, and $133.04 in interest, and the statement which I have here, and which I want to have on 'Hansard', is as follows:

Farmers' Bank certificate issued November 30, 1906.

Mr. Calvert borrowed on demand note for business—

July 9, 1909, demand note..	$3,000 00
July 22, 1909, paid on account.. ..	750 00
Balance..	$2,250 00
August 9, 1909, received by check..	200 00
Balance due bank..	$2,450 00
January 2, 1910, paid on account.	$1,000 00
June 13, 1910, paid on account..	1,000 00
December 31, 1910, paid on account	585 04
	$2,585 04
Amount paid as interest..	$ 135 04

There is the whole transaction so far as Mr. Calvert is concerned. I would like to ask my hon. friend—and I am not saying this for the purpose of annoying anybody—if it would not have been more manly on the part of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) and the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Crothers) to have gone to Mr. Calvert and have taken some means to find out the details of this transaction without advertising to the world that Mr. Calvert had received $3,000 from the Farmers' Bank for introducing Travers to the Minister of Finance in order that Travers might obtain the certificate? I leave it to the sense of justice and manhood of my hon. friends to say whether it would not have been more manly on the part of these hon. gentlemen to have taken that course, rather than cast these insinuations broadcast for the purpose of aspersing the character of a man who occupies an honourable position and who stands as high in the esteem of the public as any hon. member on that side. Would it not have been more manly to take that course than to try to besmirch his fair name with insulting insinuations and statements without verification? I can only say that if the Tories had been as anxious to see justice done in this case as they have been to bring Liberals into discredit, they would not have allowed Dr. Beattie Nesbitt to escape when he could have been arrested as well as not. I wish to lay these documents upon the table of the House for investigation by any hon. gentleman who wishes to look them over.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). I do not intend to offer any excuse for making some observations, even at this late hour, in connection with the failure of the Farmers' Bank and giving some reasons why I deem it my duty to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). The evidence already offered before the House, both by the speeches which have been delivered and by the return which has been laid upon the table of the House, to my mind is sufficient to convince any hon. member of this House who is disposed to look at that evidence in a fair and impartial manner that this transaction is one of the most iniquitous and indefensible in the financial history of this country. I have the special reason for taking part in this debate that the transactions of this bank were carried on in two branches in the riding which I have the honour to represent, and I have personal knowledge of the misfortune, the loss, and the misery entailed upon some of the people of my riding through the notorious transactions of this bank. Why, Sir, during the past four or five weeks, we have seen most strenuous efforts put forth on the other side of this House by hon. members supporting the government, and by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) especially, to convince the farmers of this country that that hon. gentleman took a special interest in their welfare and that he had carefully guarded and protected and advanced the interest of the farmer by the recent bargain he has made with the United States. But I venture to say that by his conduct in connection with the granting of a certificate to operate the Farmers' Bank, in the course of its two years' operation, he has made it possible for that bank to rob the farmers of this country of more thousands of dollars than they will be able to make from the reciprocity transaction in their lifetime. I paid very close attention to the remarks offered by the hon. Finance Minister himself, and also to the speech of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in answer to the charge made by the hon. member for Halton in support of his amendment now before you, and I must say that, never, during the ten years I have had the privilege of occupying a seat in this House, have I listened to a more lame defence—if it could be termed a defence at all—than has been offered on this occasion. It is not a defence; it is not even a reasonable excuse, for the conduct that has characterized the Treasury Department in this matter. As I view the evidence that has been offered before this House, there are certain facts that are admitted or are proven beyond any controversy; and upon these admitted or well-proven facts, it appears to me, there is no good reason why the motion of the hon. member for Halton should not be granted. The evidence has established, and no one would undertake to contradict it, that this bank has failed, has ignominiously failed, and that it has entailed loss and hardship upon some of the people of this country that no man can picture in words. That fact stands out clear and beyond dispute. A second fact is patent—that this failure has been caused by reason of the Bank Act not being in fact complied with, and by bad management. I do not think that any hon. member of this House would question that that is the fact. The third point that is made perfectly clear that the possibility of bad management and the possibility of evading the letter and spirit of the Bank Act was through failure to discover a fraud. These are the three facts that appear to me to be established beyond any question by the evidence that has been offered here.

These facts being admitted, the only question remaining for solution is: Where does the responsibility and blame rest? The Finance Minister says that he is not responsible; that he has been deceived. He admits that he has been deceived, but he lays the blame at the door of the manager of the bank, Mr. Travers. The people of

this country who have been defrauded out of their money, who trusted this bank, say that they have been defrauded just as the Finance Minister says that he was defrauded. But they say not that it was Mr. Travers who defrauded them, though he has been the direct means, but that it was the act, or want of action, on the part of the Minister of Finance that made it possible to rob them. And there is a fair, square issue between the hon. Finance Minister and the people who have been defrauded by the transactions of this bank. And, if there is one reason more than another why a royal commission should be appointed, and why a royal commission should be desired by the Finance Minister, it is that it will duly try that issue; and if, as he states, he is perfectly innocent and did his duty in connection with this matter, then the royal commission will establish that position for him and free him from any responsibility or any charge.

But if, on the other hand, the royal commission in its investigation of the affairs of this bank, its incorporation, and the granting of the certificate, should arrive at the conclusion that these people could not have been robbed but for the carelessness and negligence of the Finance Minister, then I can understand why the minister would not want a royal commission to be appointed. Sir, in the answer of the Finance Minister to the various speeches that have been made in the support of the motion for a royal commission, the only reason given why this motion should not carry and a royal commission be appointed, so far as I can understand it, is that all the material facts to enable any one to pass a proper judgment upon this question, are now before this parliament. That, it seems to me, is begging the whole question. It has been declared upon the floor of this House during this debate that there is evidence, important and material evidence, to fasten the responsibility for this crime—I cannot call it anything else—to fasten the responsibility for this matter where it properly belongs, that is not yet before this parliament or before the country. I am assured from a source that I deem to be perfectly reliable that in addition to the evidence offered by the leader of the opposition, there is more evidence, and perhaps more important evidence, evidence going to the very root of this transaction, evidence that would be a help to the people who have lost their money, evidence to show where the money of which the people have been robbed has gone to. That is what the people of this country are anxious to find out. Everybody knows that they have been robbed, everybody knows the money has disappeared, everybody knows the money has gone somewhere, but the question is, where, and the only answer is an echo. The evidence will be forthcoming, I have no doubt, if this royal commission is granted, to establish where that money, or a very large proportion of it, has gone.

Mr. MILLER. Does the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Halton ask for an investigation that would show where the money went to? Does it not merely ask that the matter of issuing a certificate be inquired into?

Mr. PORTER. I think if the hon member had read the resolution he would not have needed to ask the question at all. It is plainly given in the resolution itself.

Mr. MILLER. I think not.

Mr. PORTER. I thoroughly believe that the evidence will show where a very large portion of this money has gone. I do not underake to say that any hon. member in this House, any one who has been mentioned, or has not been mentioned, nor do I undertake to say who are those outside the House, who have received this money. But certain it is that somebody has it, and this royal commission would have the effect of unearthing that person or those persons who have it, and enable the people to know what has become of their money.

Now the hon. the Finance Minister and the right hon. the Premier have urged as a reason for not granting this royal commission that the courts are already seized of this matter, and are able to make a full and complete disclosure. I take direct issue with those two hon. gentlemen. The courts are only seized of the individual cases that are before them upon information of some individual, and the very moment in the investigation of these particular cases that counsel on either side asks a question that is not directly pertinent to the issue that is being tried, that moment the court will head off the investigation, and counsel will be told that that is not within the purview of this court. Let me go further. If it is true that Mr. Travers practised a fraud upon the Finance Minister or upon the Treasury Board, and if the Finance Minister and the Premier are anxious that that fraud should be investigated and everything in connection with it made known then why has not the Finance Minister, or somebody in his department, laid an information in connection with that fraud, and then the court could have gone on and investigated to the fullest extent. But nothing of that kind has been done, the courts are not seized of that matter, and it is utterly impossible for them to make an investigation and ascertain the facts.

Now it has been argued by different speakers on the government side of the House that a royal commission can do no more than the courts are doing. Now what

can a royal commission do more than the courts of the land can do? Let me summarize. The courts of the land cannot determine whether fraud was practised upon the Finance Minister by Mr. Travers, or whether the Finance Minister, by his negligence and carelessness, practised a fraud upon the people of the country. The courts cannot determine that, but a royal commission can. A royal commission can ascertain who received this money and where it has gone; the courts of justice cannot determine that, because there is no proceeding before them which would enable them to investigate to that extent. A royal commission can determine whether there is anything wrong with the machinery of the Bank Act by which corporations or individuals may obtain charters or whether the Bank Act is not sufficiently clear and strong to prevent such persons from practising fraud upon the Minister of Finance or upon the Treasury Board. But a royal commission having power to bring before it witnesses, documents and all the evidence that can be procured, will be conditioned to offer suggestions and advice in regard to the line of amendment of the Bank Act, that would be of material benefit, and a great advantage to the commission who are considering the revision of the Bank Act. These are reasons why it appears to me that this royal commission should be granted. I can quite understand from the experience of the government with royal commissions why they should not court an investigation by such a tribunal if they can possibly avoid it. There was an investigation by a royal commission into a department of this government not so very long ago, and the results of that investigation were most disastrous to the good name of this government and of that department. After all, the granting of a royal commission asked for by this motion would be very largely an investigation of another department of the government, the Department of Finance. If the facts already disclosed were all the facts, they would seem to me to be an absolute justification for anybody to characterize the conduct of that department as being not only negligent but wilfully negligent in connection with this matter.

If that is so I can understand the Finance Minister not wanting an investigation such as is asked for here. In the time I have been in this House, I do not know of a single case where the Prime Minister has undertaken to defend a Minister of his Cabinet where he has been so lamentably weak as he was in his effort to defend the Minister of Finance. He could not offer a defence of that conduct, he did not pretend to defend what had been done, but he endeavoured to draw the attention of this House away from the real question at issue, and to send forth over the country the idea that this motion was such that it would not produce any good results or any results that would be of advantage to this parliament or to the country. He laboured the point, he went over it two or three times, reducing it down to a single point, and then whittling off that point by saying even if evidence was given on that point it would be of no advantage to parliament or to the country. He had no defence, the conduct of the Finance Minister and the Treasury Board was indefensible. If it were defensible, every member in this House knows that with the astuteness and ability of the Prime Minister he would have offered a better defence than he did to-day. But the right hon. gentleman contented himself with the observations I have just referred to. The Finance Minister was good enough to say that he sympathized, he deeply sympathized with the unfortunate people who had lost their means in connection with the transactions of this bank. It is too late in the day for the Finance Minister to offer his sympathy. Sympathy is a good thing, it is a noble sentiment in any misfortune, but when the sympathy is offered by the very man who has made it possible to inflict the injury upon the person with whom he is sympathizing, the sympathy comes with very poor grace, it is gratuitous and will not be received with any kind of favour by those people who have been injured.

Speaking of the evidence of fraud that was in his possession, reference has been made to the fact that the letter of Mr. McCarthy was withdrawn or returned to him on the 7th day of November and that the meeting of the Treasury Board at which this certificate was granted was not until November 30. Those two facts being proved, if Mr. McCarthy's letter and exhibit had been returned to him, then it was impossible that they should have been before the Treasury Board on the 30th of November. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) yesterday asked whether the endorsement on the writ and Mr. McCarthy's letter were before the Treasury Board and the answer, as I recollect it, was that no doubt the whole matter was generally discussed. The Finance Minister could not say at the moment what particular document or matter was discussed.

In the face of all that written evidence that he or his deputy had returned the documents to Mr. McCarthy on November 7, he knew perfectly well, or if he did not he should have known when he made that answer yesterday, that those documents were not and could not be before the Treasury Board on November 30.

The Minister would have the House believe that he was very anxious that no step or proceeding should be taken in this

matter unless he was assured that everything was perfectly legal and right. He takes the precaution to send a letter to the Minister of Justice asking for his legal opinion on this question. This bank was applying for incorporation. It filed in connection with the application for a certificate what the Finance Minister thinks now were necessary and sufficient documents. That was on one side, but the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) had raised objection on the other side, and Mr. McCarthy had raised objections backed by a petition in writing by sending to the Minister a copy of the endorsement upon a writ giving all the particulars. There were the two positions. The bank with the evidence in support of its application and the opponents of the application with the evidence in support of their objection. With all this in his possession what does the Finance Minister do? He writes to the Minister of Justice for his legal opinion, and he gets a reply from the deputy Minister. You will notice that this reply is dated November 28, 1906. Mr McCarthy's documents had been withdrawn on the 7th. The letter of the Minister of Finance is of the same date. It will be observed that when the Finance Minister wrote to the Minister of Justice for a legal opinion he did not have and could not have the evidence that he had before in opposition to the application of this bank, yet he writes and incloses certain documents. The letter of the Deputy Minister of Justice shows clearly what these documents were He says:

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 28th instant, and of the inclosed papers, being the application from the Farmers' Bank of Canada for a certificate to commence business, under sections 13-17 of the Bank Act, and papers in support thereof.

Now, it is remarkable to say the least that with the evidence in support thereof, and with the evidence in opposition thereto, the Minister of Finance who is anxious to obtain a valuable opinion upon the whole case, withheld—because I cannot term it in any other way—withheld the evidence in opposition to the application and simply inclosed the evidence in favour of the application. That such was the case, and that the Department of the Minister of Justice understood it perfectly well let me read the next sentence of his letter:

You ask me to advise you if on the papers submitted such certificate may legally issue.

Well, the deputy Minister of Justice had not a blessed thing before him, but the evidence in support of the application, and the Minister of Finance has declared to this House that these documents were the documents required by the Bank Act, and were sufficient for him and he sent these documents along to the Deputy Minister of Justice, and upon these papers submitted, which are all in favour of the application and are in compliance with the requirements of the Bank Act, he asked: Can I issue this certificate? What sort of an answer could he have expected, but the answer he got. The Deputy Minister of Justice wrote:

In reply, I have to state that the statements in the statutory declaration of Mr. Walter R. Travers are sufficient, if they are accepted.

Apparently the Deputy Minister of Justice had in some manner or other been advised or had heard of there being some evidence in opposition to this certificate being granted, and he very carefully guards his action, and his advice by reciting in his letter that upon the evidence submitted, if you believe that evidence he says to the Finance Minister, then you may issue the certificate. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is asking too much of any hon. member of this House, I think it is asking too much of the people of this country to believe that that written evidence discloses all the facts in connection with this transaction. I will not put it stronger, but I think I am perfectly justified in putting it thus strong: That there must be back of this, something that a royal commission would unearth, and which I think the people of this country are entitled to have uncovered, and the fullest disclosure made of it. The Minister of Finance said that it was not possible now that any relief could be obtained; the certificate having been granted, the bank having gone into operation, these frauds had been perpetrated, the people had lost their money, and there was no redress. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if before he granted that certificate he considered what the consequence of improperly granting that certificate might be. If he did consider, it would have occurred to him at once that the very thing that has happened here might happen unless he exercised the care that in his position he should exercise, and unless he safeguarded the interests of the people of this country. And in view of the fact that he did not make such inquiry, that he did not exercise the power and authority he possessed, and that he entirely ignored or overlooked the rights of the people, I say to put it mildly, that the Minister of Finance for that alone deserves the censure of the people, at all events of those who have lost their money. Now, Mr. Speaker, I intended when speaking upon this matter to call attention to one or two particular cases which have arisen in the constituency I have the honour to represent. Inasmuch as so few illustrations of the wrong-doing of this bank have been so far offered to the House, I think I would be justified even at this late hour in mentioning one or two of these cases which

I know from my own personal knowledge. In one case a widow whose former husband was an employee on one of the railways was killed in a railway accident, and she was left with two small children, four years and six years old respectively, absolutely penniless. An action was brought on behalf of the widow to recover compensation from the railway company, and the litigation was successful, and the railway company paid $2,500 as compensation. A cheque from the railway company came to my office on a Saturday, and the widow was written to to come in for the cheque. She came in on Monday a little before three o'clock in the afternoon, and when I handed her the cheque I said: You ought to put this money in some bank where it would be safe until you find an opportunity of investing it. I advised her to put the money in the Bank of Montreal. Her answer was that the manager of the Farmers' Bank had heard in some way or other that she was getting this money, and he came to her house and asked her if she would not deposit it in the Farmers' Bank. She said she had promised him to do so, and that she must keep her word with him. I handed the cheque over a few minutes before three o'clock, and she carried it three blocks down the street to put it into the Farmers' Bank. The Farmers' Bank was closed for the day in less than fifteen minutes afterwards, and the doors never opened again, and the widow lost her money. And, Sir, all this misfortune was brought on her by the want of caution, to put it mildly, of the Treasury Board in granting that certificate to the Farmers' Bank. Let me give the case of two farmers for whose welfare the Minister of Finance is always so solicitous. These two neighbouring farmers in the township of Sydney had purchased their farms two or three years ago, paying a high price as the land there is very valuable. Last year the Canadian Northern Railway Company came along, and ran through these two farms, and expropriated the right of way, and in due course the compensation was paid to the farmers by the railway. The local solicitor for the Canadian Northern railway who is also the solicitor for the Farmers' Bank, issued cheques to these farmers for $750 each upon the Farmers' Bank, and they took the cheques over to the bank, and it was then after banking hours, and the cash was locked up. They left the cheques there on deposit until the bank opened next morning when they were to come and get the money, but the next morning came and the farmers came, but the bank was closed and has never opened since, and the money they received as compensation for their land was stolen in this way. In view of all these facts is there any possible justification or reason why the government ought not to grant the motion that has been made by my hon. friend from Halton? It surely cannot be on the ground of expense, it surely cannot be on the ground that the people of the country do not want it. What is the reason? If there is any good and bona fide reason, why it ought not to be granted, then, for heaven's sake, let somebody on the government side of the House get up and tell us what it is.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, I regret that the debate yesterday was not listened to by me; I was absent but I have had the pleasure and privilege of reading the speeches of both sides and possibly I have obtained more good from that than if I had been present and listening. There is very little left for me to say. One of the points in connection with the matter is that the government seem to have given up their love for royal commissions. I cannot say what has come over the spirit of their dreams. They have always been very ardent supporters of royal commission until the present moment. Mr. Courtney, who has distinguished himself on one royal commission, I have not the slightest doubt, would be perfectly willing to act upon another royal commission to investigate matters in connection with the Farmers' Bank and possibly the scope of the inquiry might be enlarged so as to take in general matters in connection with the banking system of the country in view of the necessity of the new bank law which is to be brought in.

The county that I have the honour to represent was unfortunate in having three of these branches located in it, one at Dunsford, one at Kinmount and one at Lindsay. The depositors there have lost upwards of $106,000. Therefore it is needless for me to say to this House and the country how deeply these localities are affected. I may say that it was in the town of Lindsay that the final collapse of the Farmers' Bank was brought about by the exposure made there during a trial which had been instigated by this man Travers. He secured the arrest of three young gentlemen in connection with one of the banks for warning customers of the Farmers' Bank that in their opinion their money was not safe in that institution. He had these men arrested and after long preliminary proceedings the trial came on and the exposure was made showing that Travers was the real criminal instead of the three young gentlemen that were sought to be implicated. It was as a result of that trial and the exposure which took place that the doors of the Farmers' Bank were closed.

In supporting the motion for this royal commission I do so on these grounds. The charter was obained in the ordinary

way; that counts for nothing. Following that was the issue of the certificate and if all the conditions prescribed by the Bank Act necessary for the issuing of the certificate were complied with, then the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the government have nothing to fear from the granting of a royal commission and, in furtherance of the same idea, the government are in no wise responsible for anything in connection with the Farmers' Bank. But, if the government did not take due precautions, if the government have been negligent, if the government have been more than negligent, if they have committed a blunder—and we are told that a blunder is worse than a crime —then I say that it is the duty of the government not only to grant a royal commission, but, I go further and say that the people who were the victims of this failure have a very just claim against the treasury of this country for the loss that they have sustained. We find that the certificate was not properly obtained. More than that, the Minister of Finance admits that he was notified by Mr. McCarthy to investigate the information which had been furnished him. The Minister of Finance says that Mr. McCarthy withdrew his objection. Will the Minister of Finance say that Mr. McCarthy withdrew the facts of the case? What were the facts of the case? That notes were being given for subscriptions to stock and that subscriptions to stock had been raised in that way. These were the charges that were made to the Finance Minister. The mere fact that Mr. McCarthy had been settled with and that this settlement had removed his objection did not remove the facts of the case at all. In other words, Mr. McCarthy's statement shows that fraud was being perpetrated in a certain case and it was the duty of the Minister of Finance to see if fraud was being perpetrated in other cases. He should have ordered an investigation into the matter. Had he done so the true condition of affairs would have been discovered, the certificate would not have been issued and these innocent people would not have been swindled. I shall not take up the time of the House further than just to present briefly this view of the case. It has been well argued all through. I support the motion of my hon. friend calling for a royal commission in order that there may be a full investigation into the affairs of the bank with the view of ascertaining, as has been said, where these funds have been disposed of and how they have been disposed of and of ascertaining still further whether some of them may not be honestly and fairly reclaimed in order to lighten the burdens of the poor people who are the victims in this transaction. I support it also in order that evidence may be obtained which will be of great assistance to us in moulding the new Bank Act, and still further I support it on the ground that I am satisfied that if a royal commission is granted the matter will be brought home so closely to the government and the negligence of the government in issuing this certificate will be so clearly shown that the people concerned will have a just claim against the government for the loss that they have sustained.

Reference has been made to the negligence of the Ontario government in not capturing Beattie Nesbitt. I may say as one who has more or less acquaintance with that gentleman that the moment I saw his name as president of the bank I warned every friend that I encountered to have nothing whatever to do with the institution. I do not see what is the cause of this government's being so solicitous about saving Beattie Nesbitt. They were not always so. Is there not something else behind this refusal to grant a royal commission, and if the government are true to their former objection to and suspicion of Beattie Nesbitt I should imagine that they would use their influence in order to secure this royal commission so that Beattie Nesbitt may be properly exposed. All the evidence that we have is from newspaper scraps, police court records and even the records of superior courts and localized references. A cohesive statement cannot possibly be obtained from such sources as these, and a commission is necessary in order to give the members of this House and the people of the country an opportunity of forming a correct conclusion as to the facts in connection with the whole case. In other words, the evidence submitted thus far is simply scrappy. We have no systematic history, no systematic report, no systematic record of the matter at all. I shall not detain the House farther as it is late. If the fraud perpetrated had been traced up and discovered at the beginning the certificate would not have been secured, the organization of the bank would not have been permitted, and this loss would not have been inflicted upon the public. Let the government issue this royal commission. I maintain still further and I am prepared to stick to the position that the government is morally bound. if not legally, to recoup the people who have been swindled all over the country.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I am very reluctant to prolong this debate and would not think of doing so but for some observations made last night by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) and the hon. the leader of the

opposition (Mr. Borden). I do not intend to discuss at all the disposition which we ought to make of this motion by our votes. In that respect I have nothing to add to what has been said by my hon. colleagues, the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister. I think that they both have shown conclusively that no advantage can accrue to any one in this country by the carrying of the resolution moved. But with regard to the other subjects which have been discussed, and especially with reference to the charges made of inattention to duty or negligence on the part of the Treasury Board and particularly on the part of the Minister of Finance, I want to say a word. I speak with the more freedom on that subject as I am not, and never have been, a member of the Treasury Board. I do not know the way in which the business transacted by that board is carried on except to the extent to which, in common with other members of the government, I see the results of that business in the reports from that board to the Privy Council. But with reference to the manner in which this granting of a certificate to the Farmers' Bank was carried out and with reference to the circumstances, which, it is said, called for some additional investigation or inquiry by the Treasury Board and especially by the Minister of Finance, it seems to me that the reasoning which has been advanced by the hon. member for East Hastings and the hon. leader of the opposition was pressing the case against the Minister of Finance and against the Treasury Board far beyond anything which the facts would justify. I say nothing with reference to the unfortunate difference of recollection which exists between the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and my hon. colleague, the Finance Minister, as to the substance of conversations which took place between them. But they were speaking, it is to be remembered, of occurrences which took place some four years and more ago. I think I am saying only what every man on this side would say with me, that there is no member of this House on either side who is held in more universal respect than my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), and I am certain that every one who heard what he said or has read it in 'Hansard' is convinced that my hon. friend felt to be true every word he uttered. I certainly do not in the least degree doubt what he has said in that respect. I do not think it is possible to reconcile the statement of that hon. gentleman with that of the Minister of Finance. All I can say is that I give equal credence to what my hon. colleague has said and I believe that each of these hon. gentlemen spoke, to the very best of his recollection, the exact truth as he remembered the conversations in question. But it does not seem to me that we need, if we were sitting as jurymen trying to decide what the facts may be, come to any conclusion in our own minds with regard to the difference of recollection which exists between these two hon. gentlemen, because if every warning which the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) says he gave the Minister of Finance actually took place, just as the words were repeated before this House, it does not carry the matter certainly any farther, and in my judgment does not carry it as far as what afterwards came from Mr. Leighton McCarthy and the information given by the writ of summons, a copy of which was sent the Minister of Finance.

It is with reference, in the first place, to the contents of that writ of summons and the letters of Mr. McCarthy and the observations with regard to these circumstances which were made by my hon. friends the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for East Hastings, that I want to say a word. Most of us, perhaps every one of us, has some acquaintance with writs of summons and the endorsements thereon, and many of us—at any rate those of us who are lawyers—know something about the way in which such charges or allegations of fact are prepared. It is the business of the lawyer, when his client comes to him and instructs him to institute legal proceedings, to examine carefully the statements his client makes and put upon paper the legal result or the summation of what his client has told him, in the form of legal phraseology, for endorsation on the back of the writ. When a writ of summons is issued, in Ontario at any rate, no verification of the statement made upon it is required from the person sueing or from the attorney by whom that writ of summons has been issued. So long as the allegations are not scandalous, irrelevant or impertinent in their character, the lawyer is at perfect liberty to frame his charges in exactly the language he may see fit to use, and I need not say that it is but ordinary prudence on the part of any practising solicitor, in preparing a writ of summons, to cover if possible all the ground that may by any chance be open to him and not leave untouched anything there may be even a hint or a hope of his being able to prove when the case comes to trial. I do not mean for a moment to say that no one should take otherwise than as serious the charges made in any legal document which may come to his notice, but I do want to impress upon every one that no one reading the lawyers allegations upon a writ of summons or other legal document is bound to accept those statements as being statements which necessarily will afterwards be established by proof. Let me give an illustration which may come home to most of us. There is probably no member of this House

who has not seen an election petition. Fortunate is the man who has not seen his own name figuring upon such a document. Now any one who has read the ordinary election petition, which is prepared by the petitioner's solicitor and which, bear in mind, is not allowed to be put on the files of the court until it is verified by the sworn statement under oath of the petitioner who seeks to unseat his successful antagonist—no one who has ever read the general allegations therein made of fraud and wrong-doing with which every election petition bristles, will fail to understand just how much information is to be had from such a document and how much confidence is to be placed in it.

The way in which an election petition is ordinarily prepared is by the solicitor—if he does not utilize some printed form that has been given to him for the purpose—sitting down and taking up seriatim the clauses of the Controverted Elections Act and charging that the sitting member has, by himself or by his agents, with or without his own knowledge and actual consent, been guilty of breaches of each one of these sections. That is a much longer story than it would be if the decalogue were taken and a man were charged seriatim with having broken each and every one of the ten commandments. And just exactly as much dependence is to be placed upon what is called the 'special endorsement,' if you please, on the back of the ordinary writ of summons. I make no point of the circumstance that the allegations in the writ of summons are not verified by affidavit. I think that experience has demonstrated that the requirement of an affidavit verifying the statements in an election petition is the merest form and farce; and, although there is an affidavit there, none the less every election petition contains wholesale charges of fraud, charges of corrupt practices, charges, it may be, of perjury and personation for which, when the case comes to be investigated, even after, it may be, weeks of trial, it is demonstrated, there never was any shadow of foundation in fact. Now, when I look at the endorsement upon the writ of summons, a copy of which was sent to the Finance Minister in connection with this matter, I find in it, I think, just the same sort of wholesale declamation that is ordinarily to be found in the average election petition. It is all very well now, in the light of subsequent events, in the light of the knowledge which, years later, has become public—it is all very well now for any one to single out a few lines here and a few lines there in this long averment of wrong doing and fraud on the part of those organizing this bank, and say: Look at that; is not that a specific allegation which should have put any one reading it upon his guard and which was the most distinct possible warning to him that this was all wrong? If the writ had been issued making one specific charge, I grant it would have been a circumstance to which considerable attention would have been drawn. But when there is, as there is here, literally a volume of general averment of fraud of every kind and description, I think the very wholesale nature of these charges would at once lead one to think, this is the kind of action in which, very probably, the plaintiffs have but little to go upon and are seeking by some possibility to find something illegal or wrong in the course of the organization of this proposed institution.

Mr. PORTER. May I ask the Minister of Justice a question? Does he think Mr. Leighton McCarthy to be a lawyer who would endorse a writ as this writ is endorsed without having some evidence upon which he believed the charge to be established?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I think I may answer what I understand to be the question of the hon. gentleman in the Irishman's fashion, by asking my hon. friend from West Hastings (Mr. Porter) if he never prepared a writ of summons in the course of his legal practice that he would not be willing to swear to the truth of? I say it is an every day matter in ordinary practice for a solicitor to endeavour to cover every possible ground of objection which will support his case.

Mr. PORTER. The minister has asked me a question, and I will answer him by saying: 'I never did to my knowledge, prepare a writ to go out of my office, when I did not believe I had evidence to support the charge made. And I do not believe that Mr. McCarthy would do so either.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Under the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to accept the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Porter's) statement. Now, I say, any ordinary business man reading the allegations with which this writ of summons is replete, could come, I think, to no other conclusion than that here was an action in which, for some reason or other—probably for good reasons if you please—plaintiffs who had subscribed to certain shares of stock in this bank rued their act, wished to get out of it, and had gone to a lawyer to advise them and to issue a writ beginning a suit to relieve them from their responsibility. That is the purpose of the suit and what I should consider the material allegation in this long narrative of charges of every kind of illegality and fraud is the statement that the subscriptions of these particular individual plaintiffs were procured by misrepresentation and fraud. Now that is not, at all events, so uncommon a thing in ordinary business affairs as to excite much suspicion. I have known—

and I should be quite able on very short notice to show to any hon. gentleman interested—cases reported in the law books—where men who had subscribed for sums of greater or less size for the building of a church were afterwards sick of it, tried to get out of it, brought suit to be relieved, or defended suits that were brought against them to collect. It is not at all an uncommon thing for a man who has appended his name to some subscription list, whether for shares in a proposed company, for shares in a bank, or to an application for life insurance, to seek to get out of his contract, and, in so doing, to charge that there had been grave misrepresentations or frauds inducing him to give his name to the agent who had canvassed him. That is the nature, speaking in a general way, of this suit which was brought. They have gone on to specify particular misrepresentations which, whoever sought their subscription is said to have made to them, and they have also added what I have spoken of as these general charges of irregularity and infraction of the provisions of the Bank Act in different specified matters and in further matters that are not specified.

Well, that writ having been issued, and a copy of it having been given to the Minister of Finance, some days later the solicitor for the plaintiff tells the Minister of Finance: My client's claims are satisfied, I am not proceeding further with this suit, and I withdraw any objections which I have made to your acting in this matter of issuing the certificate to the Farmers' Bank, just as you would have done if I had never intervened in the case. But that is not all. This action is disposed of by the court, is formally dealt with by a judge of the court, his judgment is upon record and his judgment and the decision do—what? Not declaring that the allegations are established, not declaring even that there was any attempt to prosecute the action to a hearing, or to make good these charges of fraud, but on the contrary, showing on its face that the action is dropped, and being dropped, is dismissed out of court. Now, do not let me be misunderstood as seeking to convey the impression that the formal judgment of the court indicates at all that the charges have been disposed of. I am not pretending anything of that nature. The judgment speaks for itself, and is quite distinct. The action is formally dismissed because it is not being further prosecuted, because no proof is being offered in support of the charges which have been made in the writ. And the reason for it all is made plain upon the face of the judgment, the reason for it is simply that these nine or ten subscribers, or whatever number they may be, have been relieved of their subscriptions, not that they have been bought off, as it has been put in the course of this debate, not that they received hush money, not that they have done anything which is discreditable, but simply that some one has come forward and said: I will take your place, transfer your rights to me, I will buy your shares, I will pay you back the money you have paid in, and I will relieve you of the matter out and out. That is all they wanted. They have brought the suit, they have gone to a lawyer only to be rid of their subscriptions, some one comes to them and says: Very well, you are not content with your proposed investment, I am; you have no confidence in this institution, I have; I will take your place, here is your money back. There was nothing immoral, nothing wrong or reprehensible in their saying: Very well, that ends it so far as we are concerned. No more is there anything wrong, or suspicious, or in any way reprehensible in the man who had handed them back their money and bought out their rights, saying: For my part, I am content, I do not want this suit to go any further. It may be I have no evidence of the truth of these averments, but whether I have or have not, I, having bought out those plaintiffs' rights, now standing in their shoes, and being content with the position of affairs, say that this suit is to stop, I am not going to invest any more of my money in it. And taking that position, going before the court and stating that it is not proposed to substantiate these averments, the court deals with the matter by declaring accordingly that the action is dismissed. Now, in that state of matters how can it be argued that the whole matter of this suit, and of whatever information, or warning, or ground for suspicion the statements in the writ beginning that suit might have caused to the mind of any reader, was not absolutely at an end, withdrawn, put an end to as completely as though it had never existed? If one wanted to dwell upon the letter of the thing, the suit is disposed of by the court dismissing it, that is the form it takes, that is the actuality and the substance of it. But in those circumstances I think the argument that is attempted to be made by the hon. member for East Hastings, and to a less strong extent by the leader of the opposition, is one that is not well founded.

Now, I want to say one word upon the connection of the Department of Justice with this matter, in which some hon. gentlemen, and especially the hon. member for East Hastings, find ground for additional grave suspicions. Apparently it is thought to have been a suspicious circumstance that the Department of Finance should ever have referred to the Department of Justice in this matter. Well, I am very sure that hon. gentlemen opposite who have themselves been in charge of depart-

ments of government, would never seek to convey any such impression to the House. I will admit that when I first took charge of a department of government as Postmaster General, having as I thought, enough legal knowledge to attend to any legal difficulties which arose in connection with the business of that department, it seemed to me there was no sense in my referring to the Justice Department. I thought I could be my own lawyer, and I tried it for some little while, until I found that was not the course of business. It is very well, I think, that it is so. Our statutes put upon the Minister of Justice the obligation, the duty, of advising other departments of government and no minister other than the Minister of Justice, though he may be a better lawyer than the Minister of Justice is, ought to be expected to take the responsibility of determining for himself legal questions when there is a proper official of the government appointed for that duty. It was the ordinary course of business for the Department of Finance to refer to the Department of Justice the question whether or not the papers which were presented in this matter were regular and in form, whether the requirements of the Bank Act seemed to have been sufficiently complied with on the face of these papers. That is just what the Department of Justice was asked for, and nothing else. There was nothing extraordinary, nothing out of the ordinary course of business, in the answer to the Finance Department in that respect being limited to the one question whether or not the papers which were presented in this case seemed to be regular, and whether or not, upon the face of them, the requirements of the Bank Act had been complied with. Exception seems to be taken by some hon. gentlemen to the wording of the answer which was made over the signature of the Department of Justice. I cannot remember at this moment whether the matter in any way came before me personally; I suppose very likely it did not. In the ordinary distribution of the daily business of the Department of Justice, it is only in the case of matters upon which there seems to be some advantage in a consultation between the deputy minister and myself, that I would know personally anything of a reference from another department of the government. This matter was largely of a formal character, requiring simply an examination of the provisions of the Bank Act, with the papers in question before the lawyer who made the examination, and the verification of the fact that the requirements of that statute had been met. The deputy Minister of Justice writes in reply what my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) considers a very careful letter, as though for some reason or other something on the face of the papers excited some suspicion in the mind of Mr. Newcombe, and he was guarding himself at the expense of the Finance Department, instead of doing his duty as he would have done if he had seen any reason in the world for calling attention to something specifically. He writes:

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 28th instant, and of the inclosed papers, being the application from the Farmers' Bank of Canada for a certificate to commence business under section 13-17 of the Bank Act, and papers in support thereof.

And then the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) breaks off the reading of the letter to make this observation:

He is very careful to repeat their question, he takes no responsibility.

The letter proceeds:

You ask me to advise you if on the papers submitted such certificate may legally issue.

That repetition of the question propounded every lawyer who has ever drawn an opinion for a client or any other correspondent knows is simply the ordinary custom of the profession. I am astonished at my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup). It is the commonest thing in the world for the lawyer who is preparing an opinion to state on the face of his opinion, even although it is but a repetition in so many words of the letter, in which is asked the opinion, what that question is; and so Mr. Newcombe has, in this instance, pursued only the ordinary everyday practice which certainly prevails in his method of discharging the duties of his office in taking the course which he did. He proceeds in reply:

I beg to state that the statements in the statutory declaration of Mr. Walter R. Travers are sufficient, if they are accepted, to show compliance with the statutory provisions, and that the evidence thus afforded is such as the Treasury Board may lawfully accept under the Act, and thereupon issue to the bank a certificate under section 14 of the Act.

The presence in that letter of the phrase 'if they are accepted,' is seized upon here as indicating in the mind of the writer some question of whether those statements ought to be accepted. I have not referred to Mr. Newcombe in the matter; I do not suppose that at this day he would have any recollection independently of the papers of the circumstance of writing the letter in question. I speak of the words which he has used simply from my general knowledge of the way in which such legal opinions would be framed either in the Department of Justice or in the law office of any ordinary practitioner, and I say that to my mind there is nothing in the least degree remark-

able, nothing in the least degree worthy of comment in the language which Mr. Newcombe has chosen in which to express his opinion. He was not pretending to pass upon the truth of the statements in the papers that were submitted to him, he was not asked to do so, he was simply saying in so many words: That is for the Treasury Board, it is for the Treasury Board to say whether or not they will accept these papers as evidence sufficient to their minds upon which to act under the provisions of the Bank Act. The Bank Act does not require an affidavit, it requires simply that the board shall be satisfied by affidavit 'or otherwise' that all the requirements of this Act and of the special Act of incorporation of the bank have been complied with. It might well be that the board would be satisfied without any affidavit. They might be satisfied by the evidence of documents other than affidavits. They might conceivably be satisfied by statements verbally made, although I doubt if there has been any instance in actual practice in which the board have been satisfied without verification of details on affidavit or statutory declaration. But in this case what Mr. Newcombe was saying was plainly, simply: I pass upon the legality of the papers, I give you my opinion that the requirements of the Act have been met so far as the face of these papers is concerned. I say nothing one way or the other about the contents of the papers, as to that the Treasury Board is to be the judge. It may be that the board will not accept these papers as sufficient evidence under the statute; it may be that the board will call for affidavits from somebody else. This is from the general manager. It may be that they will ask something from the president, it may be that they will make further inquiries or it may be that they will not do so. Upon all that Mr. Newcombe was not purporting to express the slightest opinion one way or the other. The use of the expression 'if they are accepted' simply indicates that he was not expressing any opinion one way or the other upon that point.

In reference to this whole matter—I do not mean by that what has taken place in this House yesterday and to-day, as much as the failure of this bank and the circumstances of fraud and of crime which have surrounded its operation—I can readily understand how any man, even if he were a man of very different make-up than I think my hon. friend the Finance Minister is, would feel greatly troubled under the heavy weight of responsibility, although what he did was done for the best in the ordinary course of business and in the exercise of his very best judgment under the circumstances as they appeared to him at that time. I can understand how any man placed in the position in which he is now placed, after the event, when it is so easy forevery one to be wise, and especially under such attacks as have been made upon him here in the course of this debate should go away with a feeling of great discomfort that perhaps if he had done something different, if he had acted in some other way than that in which he did, the fortunes and the property of many people might have been saved; but speaking for myself, at any rate, and I think speaking for the majority of the members of this House, I have only to say that I cannot see in the circumstances which have been disclosed here anything in respect of which he should have any feeling of self-condemnation or anything upon which it can be properly said that he has in the very least degree forfeited the confidence which we as members of this House have always felt in him.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). While my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) in the speech which he has just closed was expounding what he believed to be the law upon this subject, I could not but think of the lines of Shakespeare:

> In law what plea so tainted and corrupt,
> But being seasoned with a gracious voice
> Obscures the show of evil.

I have the utmost respect for the legal opinion of the Minister of Justice. At the bar of Ontario he was a shining light. He brought to bear upon the investigation of those cases with which he was entrusted high talents; but I am constrained to the opinion that since he has become Minister of Justice these great talents and that bright intellect have been clouded and warped by contact with the political squabbles of the day. We have seen time after time where the Minister of Justice has allowed his legal opinions and his legal judgment to be swayed by the political exigencies of the matter before him. And, Sir, there never was a case in which that is more clearly shown than in the frantic, laboured and almost hysterical effort of the Minister of Justice to evade the law, to get around the facts, in order if possible to put out a helping hand to aid the Minister of Finance in the desperate position in which he finds himself. Then again, the lines of Shakespeare in 'Macbeth' come to my mind in connection with the facts of this case as we have them now and which absolutely condemn the Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board. Sir, they are the blots that will not come out, and though the hands which bear the blots be washed and washed and washed, and though he cry: 'Out! out! damned spots!' the Minister of Justice cannot wash out these spots by any such specious argument as he has presented to-night. The hour is late and I shall have to deal briefly with the facts

of the case, but I shall attempt to show the position which this country and this government has to face in connection with this deplorable matter. Let me say at the outset that I must confess that in a matter of such great consequence to this country and of such great pith and moment to our commercial interests, I never saw displayed such laxity, such lofty and supreme indifference on the part of the ministry as I have seen to-night. For the most of the day and into the night when the Treasury Board and the ministry has been under scathing criticism and charged with the most serious neglect, we have been treated to empty benches opposite, and for the most of the time not one member of the Treasury Board has been in his place. That is the kind of lofty indifference that the government shows to grave accusations of this kind, accusations of a character that have galled the government so badly that not one member of it has been able to stand up in his place and offer even a semblance of defence to the charges. And, Sir, what is the question before the House? Under our banking laws, which we all supposed were the most stable of any civilized country in the world, which we believed were a guarantee of good faith and soundness in our banking institutions, there was constructed this financial ship called the Farmers' Bank, which was launched upon the stormy waters for trading purposes. But, Sir, that ship could not leave port to embark upon its trade unless it had sailing orders, and the sailing orders for that commercial ship had to be given by the Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board, and before the Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board could issue letters of marque, the law provided that they had to be satisfied in every respect that the conditions of the law had been fulfilled and that that financial ship was seaworthy, well captained, well manned and provisioned, and fit to undertake the commercial voyage for which she was intended. But, Sir, what of the owner of a ship who sits in his comfortable counting house and sends to sea a vessel he knows to be unseaworthy, which goes down and carries with it human lives, and freight amounting to a million or two of dollars. What of his responsibility? I put this case to the Minister of Justice: If the Minister of Finance or the Treasury Board knew that the Farmers' Bank was not properly equipped to do business, that there was the merest suspicion of fraud in connection with it, and if the Minister of Finance allowed that bank to go before the people of Canada with the stamp of government approval, to open its doors and to receive deposits, I ask the Minister of Justice if, by all law, and by all reason, and by all common sense that can be applied, the Minister of Finance, and the Treasury Board and the government are not responsible for all the evil that results from the issue of that certificate? And what is the principle involved? I may be wrong in my conception of what the certificate authorizing a bank to commence business means, but my belief is—and I invite the Minister of Finance to correct me if I am wrong—that the issue of this certificate is the stamp of government approval upon the institution, which, the moment the certificate is granted is empowered to open its doors, and by virtue of that certificate and that certificate alone to say to Tom, Dick or Harry, Martha, Jane, or Mary: You can put your whole fortune in this bank, and it is as safe as in any chartered bank in Canada. The Minister of Finance does not dissent from that proposition; he cannot dissent. The sign of a chartered bank in Canada, and the opening of its doors have always been, and they are to-day an invitation to him who passes on the street to come in and transact business without any fear of being robbed. Well, Sir, the Minister of Finance was entrusted with no small duty, and no small responsibility in connection with launching this bank upon the commercial sea. The Farmers' Bank received that certificate, the Farmers' Bank failed, the failure brought misery to thousands, and a grievous cry has gone up from the people, a cry that rends the heart of any one who feels, a cry that can only be satisfied by this government granting that which the cry demands, a full and thorough investigation into all the circumstances attending the issuance of the certificate to the Farmers' Bank

Is there any other answer that would suit the people? Can the people be held to be silenced, can the widow who has lost every cent in the world, and the man who is unable to work, absolutely shorn of his strength, unfit by age or illness to bestow his work upon anything that will be productive of results? Shall you make the answer to the children who are deprived of their bread by this lamentable failure, as the Minister of Finance has made answer, that it is a formal matter, a very deplorable circumstance, but one which cannot be helped? Or, shall you tell them, in the language further of the Minister of Finance, that there is a police court in Toronto before which evidence is being given concerning criminal acts in connection with the affairs of this bank? No, Sir, I say a thousand times no. Public opinion will not be satisfied until the Crown says: By virtue of the authority that is vested in us, there is something wrong here, we will investigate in the most concise, in the most thorough manner, every

incident in connection with that bank, and we will at once issue a royal commission. The certificate granted to this bank was granted on the 30th day of November, 1906. Notwithstanding what the Minister of Justice has said there are certain circumstances in connection with it that call for a great deal of criticism, and a great deal of explanation at the hands of the ministry. Explanation as to it is absolutely wanting and a reply to the questions which have been propounded with respect to it is absolutely wanting. The facts and the letters in connection with the matter have been so fully gone into and placed upon 'Hansard' that I am not going to refer to them except cursorily. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice attaches no importance and argues that no importance is to be attached to the writ of summons which was filed by Mr. Leighton McCarthy. Well there again his statements bear a show of reasoning. We know that writs of summons in themselves are not documents which, outside of any other evidence, amount to very much as evidence of facts. But I will not refer for a moment to the writ of summons. I will refer to the letter that accompanied the writ of summons, and ask the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice what they think of it. At page 3, Mr. McCarthy's letter of the 19th October, appears the following passage. This is Mr. McCarthy, an ex-member of this House, a government supporter, one who gave the Minister of Finance pretty loyal service for his party, and this is a gentleman whom the minister knew, whose word he could trust and whose sincerity he had no reason whatever to doubt:

> I have received information that the alleged subscribers for shares paid a large sum of money in cash and have signed notes for other large sums of money, and that the persons professing to act in the name of the bank have transferred notes and received the proceeds, and that a deposit either has been made or will be made of the cash received and the proceeds of these notes, or sufficient amount to make up $250,000.

Apart from any writ of summons, there is a direct statement of fact throwing light on the whole transaction in writing and signed by a gentleman whose word the Minister of Finance could not deny, putting before him a charge which he could not overlook, and which the Minister of Finance never paid the slightest attention to, and disregarded. Leave out the writ of summons, says the Minister of Justice, but will the Minister of Justice leave out Mr. Leighton McCarthy? Did the Minister of Finance ever get from Mr. Leighton McCarthy a statement or explanation of that paragraph in his letter? Did the minister ever get Mr. McCarthy to disprove the grave charge to which he had appended his signature that this deposit was made up out of borrowed money? Why is the Minister of Finance so silent on this subject? He has not one word to say, and he answers me with a smile. A smile! A smile! This wreck involves the loss of millions of dollars of the money particularly of farmers, widows, old men and women, and when it is brought home to him that he received notice in writing from one of his own followers that the very conditions upon which alone he could issue this certificate had been falsified, the minister smiles!

Well, let us go a little further. One of my hon. friends behind me reminds me of the sympathy that the minister has always shown for the toiling masses as against the knights. I wonder how much money of the knights went into the Farmers' Bank, and what proportion of the money of the toiling masses as against that of the knights went into that bank? But, when it comes down to the actual, concrete question as to whether the money of the toiling masses has been fraudulently disposed of, has been stolen by virtue of a certificate over his signature, he laughs, he smiles from his place in the House and makes no explanation when I confront him with the absolute written notice that the minister had before him when the certificate was issued. I want to say with regard to the Minister of Justice that there was a writ of summons, and that the writ of summons did make certain charges. What else was there, may I ask the Minister of Finance, accompanying that writ of summons? There was an affidavit sworn to in the high court by William Laidlaw, K.C., of Toronto, swearing to facts upon information, some of them on personal information, some of them on personal knowledge, some upon information and belief as a result of personal interviews with some of the subscribers, that the subscriptions were false and fraudulent, and the Minister of Finance had before him this evidence, this sworn affidavit of Mr. Laidlaw testifying to these facts. Does the minister deny it? It is rather a serious condition of things when a man of such high standing as Mr. William Laidlaw, K.C., of Toronto, a lawyer well known throughout the length and breadth of Canada, and known to the Minister of Finance, pledges his own oath to the very facts contained in the writ of summons.

File that in the Department of Finance, put it under the nose of the minister, and it is absolutely laughed at as he laughs at the charge I now bring to his notice. That affidavit was filed before the certificate was issued. It accompanied a copy of the endorsation on the writ, and what does the Minister of Finance do? He carefully keeps that evidence from the Treasury Board. In order to bolster himself up for some reason or other, some sinister reason or other--

because there is one, if not more than one, and it is bound to come out, royal commission or no royal commission—in order to justify himself he pretends to submit the correspondence to the Minister of Justice for his opinion. But in submitting that correspondence, he carefully removes from the file beforehand the writ of summons, the affidavit backing it up and everything else which would give the minister any suspicion that any one had made any objection to the granting of the certificate. Then the Minister of Finance stands up and justifies forsooth the issue of that certificate on the ground that he had submitted the whole matter to the Minister of Justice and got the opinion of the deputy minister that he could do so. The Minister of Justice differs with his colleague about the position into which the latter has got. The Minister of Finance told us that all he had to do was to look at the statutory declaration of Travers. But the Minister of Justice did not say anything of the kind, and he rather rapped his colleague over the knuckles. He quoted from the Act to show that the Treasury Board had to be satisfied by affidavit or otherwise. Well, the Finance Minister had the declaration of Travers, and he also had the affidavit and the letters from one of his former supporters in this House, absolutely disproving the allegations made in that declaration. Yet in spite of these, he issued that certificate and put the bank in the position of being able to prey upon the public. I must confess that I never heard of a minister of the Crown in a more unenviable position. But says the Minister of Justice, no importance is to be attached to this writ. He forgets, however, that there was a judgment following that writ. The action was settled, but how was it settled? It was not simply withdrawn but was settled by the defendants giving up those notes and documents which they had fraudulently obtained. Did he take any cognizance of this? Yes, he did, because the Deputy Minister of Finance referred to it in one of his letters. He referred to Judge Anglin's judgment, and that judgment proved the existence of claims made in the writ of summons, proving that this was a fraudulent organization, proving that the deposit made with the government, which can only be made in money, was raised by way of loan, to the extent of $80,000 or more, advanced by the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stratton), as President of the Trust and Guarantee Company. That the money was being illegally raised was proved by the very settlement of the action itself, if not proved by the previous affidavit and by the statements of Mr. McCarthy which were never withdrawn. The Minister of Justice did not help the Minister of Finance as much as the latter thought he would. Instead of bringing comfort to the soul of the latter, he must have brought anguish, because he put the whole responsibility upon the Treasury Board. Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister of Justice, said that this declaration of Travers could be received if it was acceptable. Then I find that the Minister of Finance has a qualm of conscience, and does not accept the declaration. Why? There can only be one reason. He has got the declaration and he says that it is sufficient under the Act. In order to bolster that up he refers it to the Minister of Justice, and the Minister of Justice says: yes, it is enough if you believe it. But two days later what did he do? On that 30th of November he does not believe the declaration because he writes that most peculiar letter of the 30th of November to Mr. Travers. He wants something more than the declaration, and he is satisfied with the merest, shallowest pretense of a letter from Travers saying that the money was all contributed in cash and none borrowed. Taking the word of Travers putting himself in the hands of Travers, absolutely tieing himself to Travers when he has, at his hand so many other avenues of information to pursue. What could we have done if he had displayed that keenness and alertness which he is wont to display? I am not minimizing the acumen or ability of the minister. I regard him as shrewd and keen, and with a particularly polished acumen when he has to deal with questions of political expediency. What could he have done? He knew Mr. Laidlaw, why did he not ask him to come to Ottawa and find out if he had sworn to what was false? Why did he not send for Mr. McCarthy and question him about the statement of facts in his letter? Why did he not send for some of his other friends, such as the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stratton), with whom I believe he was talking a good deal at that time about the certificate. Why did he not confer with him? Why did he not confer with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) who had warned him about these transactions? He had only to cross the floor of the House to question that hon. gentleman.

The Minister of Finance admitted that he had conversations at that time with the hon. member for Halton. This House of Commons was sitting on that day, that Friday, the 30th of November, 1906, and all the Minister of Finance had to do was to walk across this floor and say to the hon. member for Halton that he was going to issue that certificate that day and ask whether he had anything further to tell him with reference to it. Why did not he do it? Did he see Mr. Osler? If not, why did not he speak to that hon. gentleman about the matter? There were many avenues open, but the Minister of Finance ignored them all and pursued his own way. And on that day, in the space of a very few

hours, all these transactions went through: first, the letter to Travers saying he would meet him at one o'clock or at five o'clock; second, the reply from Travers to the Minister of Finance; then the meeting—or alleged meeting—of the Treasury Board, and the minute of that meeting; then the drawing up of the certificate; then the return of the cheque for $250,000 less the deposit of $5,000 as security for circulation; then the letter inclosing the cheque, the delivery of that letter and the obtaining of the receipt from Travers for the $245,000;—a very hurried transaction for the Finance Minister to engage in on a busy parliamentary day, especially when the facts of which he had had notice and the evidence in support of which he had before him, were so strongly indicative of something being wrong in connection with this matter.

Now, that certificate having been issued, Travers went away. Why was there so much need for haste on that day? Why was all this thing 'railroaded' through on that day in so hurried and unceremonious a manner? Was there a suspicion that the Canadian Bankers' Association were on to the job and were coming down the very next day? Had the secretary of the Canadian Bankers' Association not telephoned the Minister of Finance that that letter was on the way that day?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. BOYCE. Did the secretary of the Canadian Bankers' Association not telephone the minister about the transaction?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. BOYCE. I simply say that I accept the words of the Minister of Finance that the secretary of the Canadian Bankers' Association did not telephone him that day that the letter was on the way. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, as I would say to a jury in connection with all the circumstances of this case: With substantial evidence, with fact linked, with fact making a chain that is absolutely complete by which knowledge is brought home to the Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board of all the irregularities in connection with this transaction, the greatest suspicion arises from this haste by which all these things were done in one day which under ordinary circumstances would have taken weeks or at least a week, and done the very day when, in a city only three hours distant, and from which a letter could have been received that very day, a protest was prepared and sent from the Canadian Bankers' Association against the issue of this certificate. We have no evidence as to whether that letter, which is a very vital point in the case, was received on the 30th of November, 1906, or not. The minister has not given us any information about it. He has been taunted with that letter; and I say there is a very strong suspicion that it was in the hands of the minister before Travers left for Toronto that night with the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stratton). I say there was a strong suspicion that the minister thought he ought to get that certificate back. There was a strong suspicion that the minister tried to get it back and failed—tried to get it back and failed. Does the minister pretend to say, standing here as a responsible minister of the Crown, that, having delivered that certificate, and having received, either before that certificate was delivered or immediately after, the protest of the Association of Bankers which association is contemplated by the Act as auxiliary to the minister in his administration of the Bank Act, protesting against that certificate being given and asking that it be delayed—does he mean to say that, even though the certificate had been delivered, he was doing his duty to this country and to the people who might be defrauded and cheated if he did not demand the certificate back? Did not he go and demand the certificate back?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. BOYCE. Then, I ask if ever there was witnessed in any deliberative body such a lamentable exhibition of feebleness of explanation as that which has been given by the Minister of Finance;—that he did, on this 30th of November, 1906, in the most hurried manner possible, deliver the certificate authorizing the Farmers' Bank to prey upon the farmers and the poor of this country, and on that night or the following morning—that night, I believe, before Travers left for Toronto, while the certificate was still in the capital—he received a written protest from the Canadian Bankers' Association, and yet he never went and demanded that certificate in order to prevent the people of this country being defrauded by it. What explanation can the minister or his government give of that? Does he pretend for a single instant that the power of this government is so miserably small, so inadequate, that, a certificate of that kind, having been obtained, to his knowledge, by fraud—he having had laid before him the protest that the most highly credible authority recognised by the Bank Act—he could not go down and replevin that certificate by the sheriff, or by fifty Dominion police if necessary? What did he do if not that? Did he do anything? Sir, he did nothing towards revoking, cancelling or suspending that certificate of the Farmers' Bank. That night the minister knew, from the most authoritative source possible, that it was an improper certificate to grant. That night he had power to revoke it, to cancel it, to suspend it, to recover it. That night, the full force of this government—if necessary, the full force of

parliament—because parliament was sitting—might have been used. That night, or two or three days afterwards if necessary, a special Act could have been passed cancelling that certificate or revoking the charter of the bank for fraud.

The minister knows that, but he did absolutely nothing towards cancelling that certificate. He, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, and I suppose all the other ministers, will stand up in their places and by their vote against the motion will say that the Minister of Finance was entirely blameless when he did nothing whatever to protect the people of this country from the ruin and misery that followed his inaction. The minister will not deny that the issue of that certificate to the bank incorporated under the Act is a representation to the public that the government has put its seal of sanction upon that bank as a bank. I am sorry the Minister of Justice is not in his place; but I would ask the Minister of Finance whether the Minister of Justice assents to this proposition, that not only was it in the power of the Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board, but it was their bounden duty, just as soon as representations were made after the issue of the certificate, to take proceedings forthwith, either to compel a return of the certificate, or to take such action as would render it inoperative. Does not the Minister of Finance think himself that after receiving from the Canadian Bankers' Association that protest, the certificate should not have been issued?

Now a word as to the contradiction between the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for Halton. The hon. member for Halton states that he spoke to the Minister of Finance, and that the Minister of Finance said to him that he had seen Travers, and that Travers had said that the money had been paid in cash. The Minister of Finance says, first, that there was no such conversation, secondly, he has no recollection of it; thirdly, when I asked him if his memory upon that point might not be treacherous, he said, yes, it might be. Now I put this to the Minister of Finance, is not the word of the member for Halton absolutely borne out by the exchange of letters between Travers and the minister on that date of November 30, 1906? Did the minister not, by that letter, put it up to Travers as to whether the money had been paid in cash or not, and did not Travers, by the letter which the minister got from him, deny, and say that the money was not paid in cash, and is that not the strongest corroboration of the word of the member for Halton? I think it is an entire vindication of the member for Halton. But the Minister of Finance takes umbrage at the member for Halton repeating in this House what he the minister, thought was a private conversation. I do not think myself that anything relating to a matter of such importance as this ought to be treated as privileged. But the minister is not always so keenly sensitive about private communications and their publication. Not long ago when the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Crocket) wrote to the Minister of Finance a personal letter——

Mr. FIELDING. No, the letter has not 'personal' marked on it, it is an ordinary public letter.

Mr. BOYCE. The letter, according to the principles laid down by the minister in this House, with regard to letters of that character, was personal, and was surrounded by that cloak of privacy which the minister has thrown about letters, at any rate, coming from members on his side of the House. And what did the minister do with that letter? He handed it over to another member of this House who read it in the House and put it on 'Hansard.'

Mr. FIELDING. No, it was from the clerk; it had been laid on the table.

Mr. BOYCE. Then I say the minister had no right, upon his own statement of the privileges that surround such a letter as that, to put that letter on the table without leave of the member himself.

Mr. FIELDING. Then I cannot put anybody's letter on the table without his leave——scores of letters, without anybody's leave?

Mr. BOYCE. Well, nothing was done after the certificate was issued authorizing the Farmers' Bank to transact business, nothing was done between the 30th of November and the 1st of January, 1907, except that the bank was preparing to do business. And during all that month the bank was gathering in money from the farmers, from widows, from aged men, and the government took no proceeding whatever to prevent fraud. Why, in a month Travers could have been prosecuted, and have been undergoing the sentence of a court for the fraud he had practised upon the Minister of Finance. A whole month went by, and nothing was done by the Treasury Board, although the facts were plain before them. The government did absolutely nothing, while that bank was getting into position to carry out the fraud they had so successfully inaugurated. The minister does not deny that the government were deceived. The Prime Minister last night repeated over and over again that the government was deceived. The knowledge of that deceit was brought home to the minister. It might be a disputed question as to whether it was brought to his knowledge before the

30th of November. But after that date, a month went by and the bank had commenced to do business. Does the minister say that during the whole of that month he was powerless, and could do nothing. I have not heard the minister say that. I wonder whether the minister will say it now. Will the minister say that during that month, while the bank was preparing to do business upon a certificate fraudulently obtained, it was utterly impossible for him to do anything? The Minister of Finance went to the Minister of Justice and got some little authority in a letter upon which he built up authority to issue that certificate. But did he go to the Minister of Justice when he ascertained the real facts to find out if he could cancel that certificate? The correspondence does not show that he did and I say if he did not he was not a vigilant minister, the Treasury Board was derelict in its duty and the government of this country absolutely neglected that fostering care which it owed to the people of Canada. I do not charge that the minister assents to that proposition by his silence, but I do implore him, if he dissents from that proposition, to make it known as part of his defence because it is a cogent circumstance to those people who have been miserably robbed and cheated out of their all by the consequences of what he did. I hope, if only for his own sake, that he will get up and say that it is part of his defence, that during that time he could not for certain reasons take any steps to recover that certificate.

A word with regard to the warning received by the minister as it appears in his speech last night. The position taken by the minister is most extraordinary. Does he recollect that last night he took the ground: Why of course I was justified in dealing with these men, the proposed shareholders were well known men. He read a list at page 5422 of 'Hansard.' Then again when my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie) rose in his place the minister said at page 5423:

Mr. FIELDING. Of course, I am not seeking to make any point against my hon. friend, but I am simply showing that when Mr. Travers came to the Finance Department he came under these excellent auspices.

Excellent auspices! After having quoted from the list of names of proposed shareholders, in reply to the member for London who said:

I had no stock in the bank and they had no right to use my name.

The minister said:

Mr. FIELDING. I accept my hon. friend's statement without hesitation, but what I say is that all these names were those of highly respectable men and calculated to give Mr. Travers strength when he came to deal with the government, and my hon. friend's name was among them, and it was one calculated to give the application some strength. I now come to the names of the provisional directors in that application. They are as follows:

Lt.-Col. R. McLennan of Cornwall, Ont.
Lt.-Col. Jas. Munroe, M.P., of Embro, Ont.
Allan Eaton, Esq., of Mount Nemo, Ont.
Robt. Noble, Esq., of Norval, Ont.
W. G. Sinclair, Esq., of Zimmerman, Ont.
A. Groves, Esq., M.D., of Fergus, Ont., and
N. M. Devean, Esq., W Beattie Nesbitt, M.D., and John Gilchrist, Esq., of Toronto, Ont.

All these gentlemen were at that time apparently the associates of Mr. Travers.

Mark you, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Travers came to us buttressed.

Buttressed by these good names. That, Sir, is part of the hon. gentleman's defence in the House. How does it go before a jury of the Canadian people? The minister says that he was justified in depending on such names, yet some of these very men swore they have paid nothing for their shares and have not benefited by the operations of the bank.

Let me take the names in the statement before the minister and the affidavit of William Laidlaw, filed in his department. What does it say: William Noble was one gentleman who buttressed Travers, Noble whose name was entered in the prospectus as one of those who had consented to be a director, who had subscribed to shares to the amount of $10,000, whereas he had only subscribed to $3,000. Colonel Munro was represented as a subscriber for $10,000 whereas he had, in fact subscribed to the amount of only $1,000. Major Thomas Beattie who was represented by the prospectus to have consented to act as a director, had not subscribed for any shares and refused to be a director or to allow his name to be used in any way in connection with the bank, and it is alleged that the names of several persons were used by the directors who had not subscribed for any shares or given any authority for such publication. That is the way the minister buttressed himself up and buttressed Mr. Travers up. When the minister made that statement last night he made it in absolute forgetfulness of the fact that in his department there was absolute evidence that these men disclaimed the interest in the bank which had been attributed to them in the prospectus. Did the minister know that? Was it not the minister's duty to look and see before he allowed Travers to be buttressed up by names of men who themselves disclaimed and complained about the fraud practised on them.

I ask the minister another question. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask this House whether in its judgment the Minister of Finance was just playing quite fair with

his colleagues on the Treasury Board when he was the only one responsible to the people of Canada for what took place in this matter, that on him alone will rest the responsibility for the issuing of that certificate. He has five colleagues on the Treasury Board, and in all this iniquitous transaction, with all these facts condemning it, he kept that information back from his colleagues on the Treasury Board, and yet seeks to place the responsibility on the Treasury Board. He did not go to the board and say: Colonel Monroe says this, Leighton McCarthy says this, Mr. Henderson of Halton tells me this, and the affidavit of William Laidlaw says this. Does the minister pretend to say that if he had done so his colleagues would have said: Go ahead and issue the certificate, never mind the affidavits, never mind what you have been told or anything contained in these affidavits or any other affidavits. I say it was not a fair position for the minister to take or to ask his colleagues and parliament to occupy in connection with this matter.

What was the nature of the transaction between Travers and the hon. gentleman? It is apparent to any reasonable mind that there was some reason why the Minister of Finance, disregarding all the evidence issued that certificate, and after the issue having ascertained it was fraudulently obtained, took no steps to withdraw it. One is led to the conclusion that there was some motive which actuated the minister, and if not some motive, some influence. Does not the minister think that the circumstances require investigation? The hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) pointed out that the Minister of Finance was not now as favourable to commissions as he used to be. He did not shrink from issuing a royal commission under the guise of an investigation into insurance companies, when the only object of it was to endeavour to drive from public life the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) one of the most brilliant minds in this Dominion. But when a royal commission is asked for now which it is believed will expose the absolute feebleness, if not worse of the Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board, he dares not issue it. Dare he in the light of all the facts grant that royal commission? He dare not. I say it unhesitatingly to the minister across the floor upon my responsibility as a member of the House, that the minister shrinks from granting that commission for fear of the disclosures which may follow. The minister has had a better opportunity of knowing all the facts surrounding this matter than any other member of this House, and yet he comes to the House to make a defence which any 10 year old school boy could make. Surely the reasons which influence the Minister of Finance to hurry so much and to show himself so helpless in the issue of the certificate are worthy of being inquired into. What meetings did he have with the present member for West Peterborough (Mr. J. R. Stratton), and Mr. Travers?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not want to be constantly answering questions and interrupting, but on this occasion it would be unfair to the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stratton) if I should not say that I never in my life had a word with the hon. member for West Peterborough on this subject.

Mr. BOYCE. I gladly accept the word of the Minister of Finance, and I will put the proposition in another way—when that certificate was delivered on that afternoon of the 30th of November, 1906, to whom was it delivered, does the minister know?

Mr. FIELDING. It was in the hands of my deputy, I presume he delivered it to Mr. Travers. Mr. Travers was here for the purpose of getting it, and I take it for granted it was delivered to him.

Mr. BOYCE. Will the minister, who is so fair about giving answers, answer another question? Did he have interviews with any one else in connection with Mr. Travers about this certificate?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot recall that I had. If my hon. friend will mention any particular person I will be able to answer more definitely; but I cannot recall any interview with any person on this subject except as stated in the House during the debate.

Mr. BOYCE. One is irresistibly forced to the conclusion that there was some influence at work which forced the Minister of Finance to absolutely disregard the warnings he received, and which rendered him helpless to resist. And, after having found that the certificate was obtained by fraud, and not having taken steps to cancel it, does he not think that he should take the responsibility? Well, the certificate being issued the branches of the Farmers' Bank opened in different towns, the traps were laid, and the hard earned savings of the farmers wrested from the soil by the sweat of their brow, poured into that bank. The money of the widow, the money of the aged, the money of the orphan, the money of the poor, went into that bank and the Minister of Finance knew it and took no action. The bank failed, and misery, ruin, and destitution followed. I say that the cry of the widow, the cry and the groan of the weary and the sick and the aged who have had their all swept away by this criminal negligence, is the cry that comes from the province of Ontario and through the Dominion of Canada right up to this parliament and

into the interior chamber of the Finance Department. And that cry will continue. and the burden of the groan and of the destitution it carries with it will increase until the Minister of Finance and this government realize their responsibility and grant the investigation which justice demands. Look at the sort of defence which has been put up by hon. gentlemen opposite. Two supporters of the government whose constituents are affected by the failure of this bank say they are in sympathy with an investigation, but that because of the nature of the motion moved by the hon. member for Halton they are obliged to vote against it. There is practical sympathy from public men for you. And, there are two other defenders of the government, one from the Northwest and one from the far east and it would seem as if the Minister of Finance had put up members whose constituents are not affected; at all events it looks suspiciously like it. But, no defence has been given to the charges, no reasonable excuse has been given for the refusal of this royal commission, and if the government desire to save themselves from the severest criticism that can possibly be laid at their doors, and relieve themselves from the reproach and condemnation which must lay upon them, if full inquiry by royal commission be denied, they will, without hesitation and without any further parley, accept the motion of my hon. friend from Halton, grant the royal commission, and fully investigate this matter.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Henderson).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Lortie,
Arthurs,	Macdonell,
Barker,	McCall,
Barnard,	Maddin,
Best,	Meighen,
Blain,	Middlebro,
Borden (Halifax),	Northrup,
Boyce,	Perley,
Bradbury,	Porter,
Broder,	Reid (Grenville),
Burrell,	Rhodes,
Campbell,	Roche,
Clare,	Russell,
Crosby,	Schaffner,
Crocket,	Sexsmith,
Crothers,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Daniel,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Doherty,	Smyth,
Donnelly,	Sproule,
Edwards,	Stanfield,
Elson,	Staples,
Foster,	Stewart,
Goodeve,	Taylor (Leeds),
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Taylor (New Westminster),
Henderson,	Thoburn,
Herron,	Thornton,
Hughes,	Wallace,
Jameson,	White (Renfrew),
Kidd,	Wilcox and
Lake,	Wilson (Lennox and
Lalor,	Addington).—62.
Lewis,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allard,	McAllister,
Allen,	McCoig,
Aylesworth (Sir Allen),	McCraney,
Beauparlant,	McIntyre,
Béland,	McKenzie,
Bickerdike,	McLean (Huron),
Borden (Sir Frederick),	McMillan,
Boyer,	Marcile (Bagot),
Brown,	Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Bureau,	Martin (Regina),
Carrier,	Martin (Wellington),
Carvell,	Meigs,
Cash,	Michaud,
Chew,	Miller,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Molloy,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Murphy,
Clark (Red Deer),	Nesbitt,
Clarke (Essex),	Neely,
Congdon,	Oliver,
Conmee,	Papineau,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Parent,
Delisle,	Paterson,
Demers,	Pickup,
Douglas,	Prowse,
Dubeau,	Pugsley,
Ethier,	Rankin,
Fielding,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fisher,	Richards,
Fowke,	Rivet,
Gauvreau,	Ross (Middlesex),
Geoffrion,	Roy (Dorchester),
Girard,	Rutan,
Graham,	Savoie,
Guthrie,	Schell,
Harty,	Sealey,
Hodgins,	Sinclair,
Hunt,	Smith (Middlesex),
Knowles,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Kyte,	Sperry,
Lachance,	Tobin,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Todd,
Lapointe,	Tolmie,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Law,	Turgeon,
LeBlanc,	Turriff,
Lemieux,	Verville,
Loggie,	Warburton,
MacNutt,	White (Victoria, Alta.) and
	Wilson (Laval).—97.

PAIRS.

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Brodeur,	Haggart (Lanark),
King,	Ames,
Harris,	Beattie,
Black,	Bristol,
Gervais,	Blondin,
Champagne,	Fraser,
Ecrément,	Chisholm (Huron),
Templeman,	Cowan,
German,	Currie (Simcoe),
Devlin,	Price,
McGiverin,	Osler,
Talbot,	Owen,

Mr. BOYCE.

Gordon (Kent),	Wright,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Lafortune,	Forget,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Worthington,
Pardee,	Lennox,
Low,	Marshall,
Seguin,	Paquet,
Proulx,	Nantel,
McColl,	Magrath,
Smith (Stormont),	Lancaster,
McLean (Sunbury),	McCarthy,
Roy (Montmagny).	Monk.

Amendment negatived.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FIELDING presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting supplementary estimates for the year ending March 31, 1911, which on motion was referred to Committee of Supply.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 1.50 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 17, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 139) for the relief of George Addison Brown.—Mr. Thornton.

SUPPLY — ALIEN LABOUR LAW ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Mr. Speaker, I desire to briefly call attention to the conditions at Sault Ste. Marie in reference to the administration of the alien labour law. I shall first quote an article from the 'Evening News,' published at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, under date Wednesday, March 15, 1911.

ELECTRICIANS' PROTEST FOREMAN'S DISMISSAL.

Men say Newcomers are Getting the Pick.

Dismissed Official was Old Employee and Popular.

Immigration Officials are asked to make Overtures with Department to stay Influx.

As a protest against the dismissal of 'Jack' Wilson, foreman of the electrical engineers employed by the Lake Superior corporation, the entire staff of 22 struck yesterday, and have not yet returned to work. Wilson has been in the service of the corporation for a number of years and is popular among the workers, who regard him as an extremely capable official. In his stead W. Shumaker has been placed, and the ire of the men was raised in consequence.

'It is not this case alone that has prompted the walkout,' said one of the men this morning to the 'Evening News.' 'For a long time there has been a steady importation of help from the American side, and as soon as the old employee has initiated them into the requirements of the different posts the Canadian is let out. Every Canadian at the plant now feels that his bread and butter is in jeopardy, and it was decided to make a demonstration of disapproval when Wilson was let out.'

Shumaker was communicated with this morning over the 'phone and in reply to the question as to whether there had been a walkout, said: 'I am not aware that anything of the kind has taken place.' Asked if it would be incorrect to state publicly that a walkout had occurred, he replied that it would, which is in contradiction to the statements of the men who have left their work.

Inspector Armstrong, senior official of the Dominion immigration service at Sault Ste. Marie, stated this morning that there had been a number of persons applying to him within the past few days asking if overtures could not be made to the department at Ottawa with a view to insuring their positions, which they stated were being daily filled up with men imported from the American side.

Another despatch from the Sault under date March 14, states:

This morning twenty-six electricians employed by the Lake Superior Corporation in rail mill went on strike, alleging that the management had dispensed with the services of electrician, J. Wilson, yesterday without cause. It is not yet known to what extent the strike will affect the operations of the mill. Strikers have not yet shown any disposition to return to work.

This is only the culmination of a long series of grievances which have been in existence at the towns of Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton. These grievances both now and in past years have been due to the fact that the Canadian Alien Labour Law has been laxly administered if there has been any attempt to administer it at all, and by reason of the lax and gravely inefficient administration of that law at the Sault there have been hundreds of importations into the towns of Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton of Americans in violation of that Act to the displacement of the working men of Canada, who are thus deprived of their wages and the bread and butter of themselves and their families. This is not the first time I have had occasion to make complaints about the conditions at Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton. I know of my personal knowledge that the Labour Department has on record that there have been continued importations of labour men from the American side in violation of the Alien Labour Law, and that no proceedings whatever have been

taken by the Labour Department to check them. The Alien Labour Law, as I understand it, is both reciprocal and retaliatory; reciprocal in that it will admit imported labour upon the same conditions as the United States will admit imported labour from Canada, and retaliatory in that it prohibits and penalizes the importation of contract labour to the same extent as contract labour going into the United States from Canada is penalized. Our Alien Labour Law professes to prohibit the importation of the sort of labourers who are coming in by hundreds to the towns of Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton and displacing Canadian workmen. The Minister of Labour knows because it has been on the records of his department and of this House for three years at least, that this is daily occurring, and three years ago a remedy was solemnly promised by the government. At the present moment this grievance is marked; it may be said that a crisis has arisen and the newspaper report which I have sent over to the Minister of Labour points to only a small amount of the dissatisfaction that exists. It is a pity that with an Act on our statute-books which is apparently workable and for the enforcement of which the government has appointed an officer—I think I am right in that?

Mr. KING. On that point the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BOYCE. Then, although three years ago it was shown beyond question that there had been steady and constant violations of the law the minister has not yet appointed an officer to enforce it. I gave him and his predecessor in office more credit for vigilance than they deserved. I regret the acknowledgment of the minister that after the promises and the pledges made by his predecessor in the Department of Labour no official has been appointed to administer the provisions of the Alien Labour Act. Let me refer the minister to the report of the proceedings of the House on July 6, 1908, where at page 12156 of 'Hansard' for that year he will find the following petition:

To the Hon. the Minister of Labour, Ottawa.

The petition of the undersigned citizens of the town of Sault Ste. Marie, in the province of Ontario, most respectfully showeth:

1. That by reason of close proximity to the international boundary your petitioners are more than usually alive to the fact there is no rigid enforcement of the provisions of any law in force in Canada to restrict the importation and employment of aliens, and that in consequence industries here suffer by the employment of foreign labour.

2. That your petitioners are aware of, and will draw to your attention, the fact that across the border the law is rigidly enforced, and that on that side of the line drastic and prompt measures are taken to immediately deport any Canadian citizen who goes across to look for work and that in that respect your petitioners believe that the powers of the United States customs and immigration officers are exceeded.

3. That in the opinion of your petitioners the present Act is not capable of giving prompt and adequate remedy which will meet the conditions which your petitioners know to exist, and your petitioners believe that more drastic and less cumbrous legislation should be enacted so as to enable prompt action to be taken by way of deportation of any aliens or foreigners seeking to enter Canada to work therein under contracts made out in Canada, and so as to meet the condition of the things and the methods in which the law in the United States is enforced against Canadians.

4. Your petitioners further would draw to your attention that there is no immigration inspector or other officers located here whose duty it is to see that the provisions of the Act in force are enforced and the consequence is both from the nature of the Act itself and from its non-enforcement, that the Canadian workmen are not adequately protected against foreign labour.

5. Your petitioners therefore pray:

I commend to the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) who at that period was not in charge of the department, the remarks which I had then the honour to make in support of that petition, and I also commend to him the answers of his predecessor in office, the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, which are reported at page 12159 of the 'Hansard,' 1908. Speaking on July the 7th, 1908—in answer to my remarks upon the subject—the Hon. Mr. Lemieux said:

Mr. LEMIEUX. I thank my hon. friend for bringing this matter up this evening. His remarks as they appear in 'Hansard' will serve me to-morrow as a brief for the Minister of Justice. It is true that practically the administration of the labour law is in the hands of the Minister of Labour, but when these cases are taken to the Attorney General of Canada, that is the Minister of Justice, he acts jointly with me. My hon. friend says we should have a law similar in its effects to the law in the neighbouring republic. I believe in retaliatory measures, we should favour the doctrine of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.

These were the words of the present Postmaster General: 'Ay eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is Christian.

Mr. BOYCE. That is the Mosaic law as well as the law of the Postmaster General. During the same debate the Postmaster General used this language further:

I have no doubt the remarks of my hon. friend which have been made in a fair spirit will have weight. I shall communicate with the Minister of Justice and see what better provision can be made to render the law more pliable and more effective in protecting our own people against the alien labour.

That was on July 7, 1908, and here we had a direct and definite promise by a minister of the Crown that the remarks made to, and the grievances, and the petition, which were laid before the House in a fair spirit as he says, should form a brief for the Minister of Justice to take prompt action next day to render the law more effective in protecting our own people against alien labour. I ask the Minister of Labour whether anything has been done to carry out the pledge of his predecessor thus solemnly made. Has there been any attempt to amend the alien labour law so as to make it more pliable, and so as to protect the Canadian working man, his wife and family from the terrible effects of the importation of alien labour to the town of Sault St. Marie or at any other point on the Canadian border.

My hon. friend himself admits that nothing whatever has been done in reply to that earnest petition to appoint an officer to enforce the provisions of the law. Why has that not been done? This is not a mere temporary grievance. It is a permanent grievance. It is one that has existed from day to day and from year to year since that time. There have been, I understand, constant importations of labour in violation of the Alien Labour Law, which have been brought to the notice of the minister and the minister has done absolutely nothing. I am now asking what he proposes to do. Does he not think that after three years it is high time something should be done to carry out the pledge made by the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), then speaking as Minister of Labour, to render more efficient the protection of the workingmen of Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton and elsewhere along the border. The hon. Postmaster General then promised that he would have our labour law applied more effectively and made something else besides a law in name only. I have said that the labour laws in the two countries are either reciprocal or retaliatory. The Postmaster General takes the more drastic view. He says they must be considered as retaliatory and believes in the doctrine of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. Well, I believe in the application of that doctrine laid down by the Postmaster General. I believe he should put an end to the conditions that have existed since July, 1908, as appears by the clipping from a newspaper I have referred to. I say that our Alien Labour Law should be treated as retaliatory and why? Because the Alien Labour Law on the other side of the line is administered in that spirit. We have heard a great deal lately about reciprocity in trade products, but if there ever was an example to show how that reciprocity will work out in favour of the United States against Canada, it will be found in the condition of things under the Alien Labour Law. We have the same law here as they have in the United States, the same reciprocity, and the same power of retaliation. How does our law work out? No attempt whatever is made to stop the importation of alien labour from the United States; but let a Canadian citizen go across the line in search of work, and he is promply arrested and detained and deported under the Alien Labour Law of that country. I have here a despatch from Hamilton of March 9, a Canadian press despatch:

Alfred Stiles, a well known cutter, who left this city last week to accept a position at Terre Haute, Ind., was stopped by immigration officers at Detroit, and sent back to Canada with a warning that if he set foot in the United States again within a year he would render himself liable to imprisonment.

If that is not retaliatory law I do not know what is. What I want is to have our law administered in the same spirit. But hundreds of Canadians have been displaced in the factories and workshops at Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton by Americans imported in violation of the Act, and no steps were taken to have the aliens deported. It is now three years since this matter was brought to the attention of this House, and since the Minister of Labour solemnly promised a remedy. I earnestly commend it again to his attention and ask him to get to work and put in force our Alien Labour Law, even if it be necessary to appoint 20 officers in order to protect our Canadian workingmen and their wives and families.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). I am obliged to my hon. friend for having brought up this matter if only because he has given occasion to make a little clearer what is the nature of the laws of this country respecting the entry into Canada of aliens. Frequently the Department of Labour is charged with being indifferent in the administration of our laws regarding the admission of aliens. This attack is made regardless altogether of the fact that the Department of Immigration and other departments of the government have also a great deal to do with this matter. In fact the greater part of the work of restricting the entry of aliens falls within the scope of the Department of the Interior, and the immigration officials. It is only that part of immigration which has to do with contract labour that comes within the purview of the Alien Labour Act. My hon. friend has said that at Sault Ste. Marie he does not think there is any inspector for the purpose of enforcing this law, and left the impression that the Department of Labour was indifferent in this matter. I may inform him that within the

last few weeks officers of the Immigration Department have been very active at Sault Ste. Marie in refusing admittance to a large number from the United States. My hon. colleague the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) will be able to inform my hon. friend more particularly on that point; but I do happen to know that within recent days he has received complaints from the management of the company at Sault Ste. Marie about the rigid manner in which our laws are being enforced and admission refused to a large number who came from across the line. My hon. friend read an article from the 'Evening News,' of March 15, respecting the dismissal of one of the employees of the Sault Company. I shall just quote the words of that article, because on it my hon. friend has largely based the complaint he has made.

Mr. BOYCE. That is only a public illustration of what is taking place, and it does not necessarily apply to all the conditions that exist there.

Mr. KING. At any rate my hon. friend introduced his remarks by quoting this article, and it is as he says a public illustration. It is as follows:

As a protest against the dismissal of Jack Wilson, foreman of the electrical engineers employed by the Lake Superior Corporation, the entire staff of twenty-two struck and have not yet returned to work. Wilson has been in the service of the corporation for a number of years and is popular among the workers who regard him as an extremely capable official. In his stead Shumaker has been placed, and the ire of the men was raised in consequence.

I contend there is nothing in that article on which my hon. friend can found a charge as to the laxity of administration of the Alien Labour Act. All it states is that an employee of many years service, who was popular with the men, was dismissed and somebody else put in his place, and the employees to show their resentment at his dismissal, had gone out on strike.

As respects the administration of the Alien Labour Act, my hon. friend will realize that there are two methods which might be employed. One would require the federal government to take action every time that Act was violated; the other would leave it in the hands of the parties themselves to take immediate action. As the law stood originally, before any action could be taken, the assent of the Attorney General had to be obtained. A number of complaints were made that inasmuch as the Attorney General of the Dominion had to be consulted before the law could be put into motion, the delays were such as to render it practically ineffective.

Mr. KING.

Mr. BOYCE. Has the minister not received reports and complaints from Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton that the provisions of the Act had been violated.

Mr. KING. I shall answer that in a moment. Complaints were made that inasmuch as parties were obliged to send their complaints to Ottawa there was too much delay, and the labour organizations, particularly of British Columbia, which were specially interested, asked that the law should be so amended as to render it unnecessary for the workingmen to come to Ottawa for redress. That seemed very reasonable, and in 1901 the law was amended in such a way that those who complained of its violation could make their complaint either before the Attorney General of the province, or a judge of the county court, and, on getting the consent of either, could take immediate action. I would like to read the section of the law in that particular. In the first place, the clause which sets out the offence in the broadest terms, as follows:

It shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership or corporation, in any manner to prepay the transportation or in any way to assist, encourage or solicit the importation or immigration of any aliens or foreigners into Canada, under contract or agreement, parole or special, express or implied, made previous to the importation or immigration of such alien or foreigner, to perform labour or service of any kind in Canada.

The penalty fixed for the violation of the section is a fine not exceeding $1,000, and not less than $50, which amount may be 'sued for and recovered as a debt,' or——

Such sum may also, with the written consent . . . . . of a judge of a superior county court, be recovered upon summary conviction before any judge of a county court, being a justice of the peace or any judge of the sessions of the peace, recorder, police magistrate or stipendiary magistrate, or any functionary, tribunal or person invested by the proper legislative authority with power to do alone such acts as are usually required to be done by two or more justices of the peace, and, when recovered, shall be paid to the Minister of Finance.

In other words, the provisions of the law have been made such that any party, anywhere in the Dominion who feels that this the broad clause which I have read is being violated can immediately take action of his own initiative to secure the enforcement of the provision. And not only is that the law, but there is a further provision which says that in the event of it being shown that the law has been violated and a fine imposed, the party who has been instrumental in bringing about the prosecution may be awarded a part of the fine imposed. I have here a communication received only a few days ago from Judge

Fitch, of the District of Rainy River, not far from where my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) resides:

Mr. BOYCE. Quite a long way.

Mr. KING. Of course, the distances are considerable in this country. Judge Fitch says:

I to-day found the Johnson-Carey Company, railroad contractors, guilty of a breach of the Alien Labour Law and fined them $500. From the evidence, this company has not been paying any attention to this Act, but I do not imagine we will have much more trouble in the future. I would be obliged if you would advise me as to the disposition of the fine. Will it be paid to the clerk of the peace or to the Dominion government? I would recommend that the informant, Ed. Oleson, who laid the information and hired a solicitor, should receive $200.

As Minister of Labour, having authority under the Act so to do, I have advised the Minister of Finance that, under the circumstances, half of this penalty—a greater amount than that named by the judge himself—should be paid to the informer. And, I think, as the judge has stated, that this company, having learned what the law is and having seen that it is possible for any person to put it in force in a summary manner, will be careful to observe the law in the future. This is only one of a number of cases. I have here quite a number of similar communications received during past years from magistrates and others informing the department of convictions under the Act. The department has, in every case, recommended payment to the informant part of the penalty imposed as a result of the conviction which he has been instrumental in obtaining. I think that my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce), if he reflects, will feel that, on the whole, this is a more effective way of securing compliance with the provisions of the Act than for this government to have one or two officers whose business it is to watch possible violations of the law along a border of between three and four thousand miles between the Atlantic and the Pacific.

Mr. BOYCE. No.

Mr. KING. There is a difference of opinion——

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. King's) predecessor in office admitted that it was not so. I quoted the speech the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) made on July 7, 1908.

Mr. KING. I listened to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) read. I think that in the statement which the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) then made, he said he would refer the matter to the Minister of Justice to ascertain his opinion whether the law could be made more effective in that particular. I understood from my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) that he did this, and the conclusion, apparently, was that the law in its present shape was likely to give the most satisfaction to the public generally. I have nothing more to add, except, possibly, to refer to the expression of my hon. friend as to 'lax administration' of the law. As I have already pointed out, the administration of the law is in the hands of the interested parties. If it is being laxly administered, that is because those who have opportunity to get redress under it do not seek to avail themselves of that opportunity. It is not due to any indifference on the part of any department of the government. We have received a good many communications on the subject. The hon. gentleman asked me as to communications from Sault Ste. Marie. I am informed that a communication from Sault Ste. Marie was received this morning, and one or two others may have been received within the last two months—parties writing to be informed as to the manner of proceeding under the Act.

Mr. BOYCE. Can. the hon. minister (Mr King) tell me from whom the communication was received to-day?

Mr. KING. From Mr. Denman, correspondent at Sault Ste Marie of the Labour Gazette writing on behalf of others. A reply is being sent to Mr. Denman explaining the procedure and asking him to inform the parties that any one who lays information against a violator of the Act and obtains a conviction will be entitled to one-half the penalty which may be imposed. I think that if my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) will take into account the fact that it is only that part which has to do with contract labour that is administered by my department, while the general law respecting immigration comes under the Department of Immigration and has regard also to the effective means being taken by the Department of Immigration to administer its part of the law, he will find that there is really no ground of complaint.

RECIPROCITY—OPINION FROM SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina). I desire to bring to the attention of the House a telegram I have received concerning action taken at the convention of the rural municipalities of Saskatchewan, which has been in session in Moosejaw for the last few days. This association consists of representatives of the various municipalities from one end of Saskatchewan to the other, and is an exceedingly representative body. The telegram is as follows:

Moosejaw, Sask., March 16, 1911.

W. M. Martin, House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Reciprocity agreement endorsed unanimously to-day by two hundred delegates at convention of Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities held at Moosejaw.

JAMES SMITH.

As yet I have to find one solitary man in the province of Saskatchewan who is opposed to the proposed reciprocity agreement.

PUBLIC HEALTH — CONDITIONS AT GROSSE ISLE.

Mr. S. BARKER (East Hamilton). I desire to call the attention of the government to a matter of importance—I think it may be said, of urgent importance. I have a memorandum here from a gentleman of very high reputation in the country, well known to every member of the government, and, I think, to almost every member of the House. It is as follows:

It is considered by gentlemen whose opinion is entitled to respect that dangerous conditions exist in the quarantine station at Grosse Isle. In view of the possible outbreak of a fresh cholera epidemic in Europe, they say there is cause for alarm in view of the fact that last autumn a cholera case was allowed to pass the quarantine station and reach Quebec. The facilities at Grosse Isle do not permit proper inspection to be made there. If a ship arrived with a case of contagious disease on board the victims have to be taken ashore in a small tug and all sorts of dangers are likely to result. Considering the enormous expenditure for useless wharfs, why is not the wharf at Grosse Isle extended so as to allow ocean steamships to approach and discharge their passengers?

However that may be, certainly, I think this should not be allowed to pass without serious attention from the government. I recollect that last year there was some rumour about a cholera patient arriving and being allowed to go as far as Quebec or some such point. If that occurred in one case, it might possibly occur again. I hope the government will take pains to consider what is stated here and provide a barrier against the danger referred to.

HEALTH CONDITIONS IN OTTAWA.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). In view of the alarming reports presented by Dr. Hodgetts with regard to the unsanitary condition of the city of Ottawa, I would like to know something more as to the authority under which he was acting—it seems he is acting under the Conservation Commission—according to what principles he is acting, and when he was induced to take action. I have referred to this question once before, many weeks ago, from information that I had received, when I spoke pretty strong on the subject. I have watched the action of those who ought to be interested, and who I think are largely responsible, and it has seemed to me as a medical man that very little was being done which ought to be done to improve the unsanitary condition of the city of Ottawa, and to protect the health and lives of the members who, for the time being, reside here, and of the citizens as well. I said at that time, speaking as a medical man, that I had reason to believe that the medical health officer was absolutely useless, and that there was imminent danger to the health and the lives of the people of this city in consequence. I said that because of the number of people who live temporarily in Ottawa during the session of parliament, I thought it was imperative on the government to take some action, to insist upon the city doing its duty, and that some constituted authority ought to be empowered to take the work in hand, and do that which the city authorities were failing to do. I based my argument for this upon the ground that the Dominion government are spending large sums of money in the city of Otawa to ornament it, and to help improve the city generally, and from certain supplies furnished to the country, one of which was a supply of water for these buildings and for needs in event of fire. I was told then that it was not the duty of the government to act, that they had nothing to do with the matter, and perhaps in one way they had not. But at any rate, week after week has passed, during which hundreds of cases of typhoid fever have developed, accompanied with many deaths, and we have gone so far as to make an analysis of the water two or three times, which analysis has disclosed the fact that the city water is unhealthy, which must be known by every person without an analysis. The very fact that so many cases of disease have started up, and could be traced to no other source, was strong presumptive evidence that the water was the source of the trouble. In the 'Citizen' of this morning I find a report by Dr. Hodgetts, in which he says:

Acting on the reports made by the officers now engaged in the work of the collection of information for the Commission of Conservation, I have personally visited some of the premises reported to be in an unsanitary state. I find conditions existing in some of the homes where privy pits are in use to be of such a disgraceful character as to warrant my drawing your immediate attention to the same. They are a menace to the persons living in the immediate vicinity and, if allowed to continue, the untreated excreta of typhoid patients which have been deposited in these sometimes overlooked privies and, in some

instances, even thrown upon the ground, cannot fail to be a source of infection and will, with the approach of milder weather, prove a ready means of spreading the disease.

Where such a relic of mediævalism (privy pit) is in use and becomes the receptacle of the excreta of a typhoid fever patient, it is imperative there should be thorough and careful disinfection of the contents; and for this purpose the health department should exercise the greatest vigilance by systematically performing the necessary services, for if left to the individual householder, it is found the work is never properly performed.

The conditions to which your attention is directed are such as to call for immediate action by yourself and the local Board of Health.

He goes on to give a list of houses.

Accompanying this communication is a list of houses in which typhoid fever has been reported and where the officers of the commission find privy pits in use. Similar lists will be sent you from time to time. A copy of this letter is being forwarded to His Worship, Mayor Hopewell.

The list of houses mentioned contains fifteen names on Stirling, Lauretta, St. Patrick, St. Andrew, Church, Water, Victoria, LeBreton, Murton and Wellington streets. The second letter, dated March 13, was as follows:—

Having examined a portion of that section of the city situated along Cave creek in order to ascertain the sanitary conditions, I am of the opinion it is necessary that immediate attention should be given the same.

Instances are many where outside closets are discharging directly into the creek, and in one case the back portion of the house is built over the creek, and all the excremental matter is deposited in the creek down an outside closet. From this house the creek flows under other houses in process of construction.

Again, the creek has overflowed into back yards carrying sewage with it, and in the floor of a shed of one house I found several inches of frozen sewage with masses of human excreta embedded therein. A more disgusting sight I have never seen in any city; and with the advent of spring the condition will not improve.

As it is now, Cave creek is simply a sewer of the crudest and most dangerous type, and drastic measures should be adopted forthwith whereby its pollution will be prevented.

I find that water is being taken from Lazy bay at a point not far distant from the mouth of Cave creek and sold to residents in the vicinity. If the sale extends to residents within the city limits, the practice should be prohibited.

It is possible you are already aware of the condition indicated above through your sanitary inspectors.

He goes on to speak of the conditions in other respects. Now when we know that that condition has continued for weeks in the city of Ottawa, which has nominally a board of health and a medical inspector at the head of it, and when attention has been pointedly drawn to the condition through the press of Ottawa day after day, and week after week, and that up to the last few days nothing has been done, the situation seems to me beyond comprehension. I think the government has been very remiss, their attention having been drawn to it over and over again, and they have practically said, what can we do?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This government or the government of Ontario?

Mr. SPROULE. The government of the Dominion right where we are located at the present time, and which is paying to the city a large amount of money to help defray the expenses of the city, to adorn it, and to make it more healthy and attractive than it is and for the water supplied. This is the place where we have our Inland Revenue Department, where we have our analytical chemists, where we have our experimental farm, where we have professional men who are specially qualified to look into these things, and to make a report to the government. This is the city where the Dominion government has so much at stake, with two or three thousand civil servants employed doing the work of the country, and all dependent upon the government for their subsistence, and the government, which has entirely neglected these things, is in my judgment not doing their full duty, and we are right in drawing attention to it. I want to ask under what authority, or by what means, or under whose instructions, Dr. Hodgetts is acting? I am told that it is under the authority of the Conservation Commission. I did not know whether the Conservation Commission had authority delegated to them to institute such an inquiry or appoint a medical inspector to inspect the city. If it is done under the Conservation Commission, the Conservation Commission is under the government and the Conservation Commission has been in existence ever since the commencement of the session of parliament. Why could not the government have acted earlier. Why could they not have taken the action that they have done within the last few days, six or ten weeks ago? It was quite apparent then, as it is to-day, that something was wrong, that there was practically no board of health of any value or medical health officer worthy of the name.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Whose fault is that? Are they not appointed by the Ontario government?

Mr. SPROULE. It is the fault of the city council. They have the power and duty to appoint this local board of health, and to see that the local board is doing its duty. But, with the fact made evident to us that

the board is not doing its duty, is it not strange that the government has taken no action until within the last few days. I would like to know under what authority they are acting now, how they propose to carry on the inquiry that is taking place, and what they propose to do regarding it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) has asked a question with regard to the authority of Dr. Hodgetts, and by whom he has been appointed. Dr. Hodgetts is in the employ of the Conservation Commission. One of the objects that the Conservation Commission has to deal with is the health of the people, but I understand that under the law his work will be confined to making investigations into the public health and giving advice. I presume that is what he is doing in this case. I do not understand that he would have any authority to carry his recommendations into effect. I understand that that is a matter entirely for the local board of health. My hon. friend sought to find fault with the government because we had not taken action earlier. He has read a long report as to the condition of different houses and privies in various places in the city of Ottawa. This government has no power over that. It is a matter entirely for the local authorities.

Mr. SPROULE. Had the government not power to appoint Dr. Hodgetts two months ago?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Dr. Hodgetts is simply going to investigate, that is all.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a valuable part of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He cannot give orders; he cannot have his recommendations carried out. He has no authority over the matter; all he can do is to investigate and advise, and that, I take it, is what he is doing. I do not know how it is in the province of Ontario, because I have not read the Health Act, but in the province of New Brunswick, whose Health Act is largely the same as the Ontario Act, the appointment of the boards of health rests to a very considerable extent with the provincial government. They appoint the provincial board of health and the provincial board has the control over the local boards of health. I think that my hon. friend, instead of finding fault with this government, if he wanted to find fault with anybody, would perhaps have done better if he had sent a communication to the government of Ontario, urging that they should see that their authorities on the provincial board of health took active measures to see that the necessary steps were taken in the city of Ottawa. My hon. friend says that the local board of health is useless. Well, we have no control over the local board of health,

no power to interfere with it in any way. It is very true that the government is a large consumer of water, just the same as the citizens of Ottawa are large consumers of water. There is nothing I see that we could do immediately which would ensure a better water supply than we have. To get another source of water supply for the city of Ottawa would cost a great deal of money. That is for the local authorities to attend to. I would suppose that they would feel that it would be right to tax the people for the purpose of going to any reasonable expense in order to get a pure and good supply of water, but that is not something that the government can do. We have endeavoured to protect the health of the members of this House, the members of the Senate, and the employees of both Houses of parliament by sterilizing the water. We have gone to considerable expense, and I believe that the report which I read to the House yesterday shows that the water which is being supplied and which is being sterilized as absolutely free of sewage bacteria. It is reported by the pathologist to be entirely safe for drinking purposes, while he also reports that the water which comes from the taps unsterilized as not safe for drinking.

I have thought that it would be well for us to consider what we could do in the near future to have a better supply for drinking purposes in connection with the buildings and the departmental buildings as well in case no effective steps are taken within a reasonable time to get a pure water supply for the city of Ottawa. I have thought that we might bore down for an artesian well upon these grounds. I believe that in the vicinity of Ottawa they have some very fine springs of pure water, and that they have got a good supply by boring. I am now having inquiries made by the officials of my department, who are in communication with the officials of the geological branch of the Mines Department, with the view of having all the information possible to guide us in regard to the matter, in order to see if we would be justified in boring a thousand or two thousand feet in the hope of getting a pure supply of good water which would be absolutely safe for drinking purposes. That matter is now under consideration. We are not blind to the fact that we ought to do what we can to give the members and employees of the House and the employees of the government a pure supply of drinking water, but I do submit to my hon. friend that there is nothing more that we can do. We have taken the necessary steps to purify the water for drinking purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that is quite proper and I have made no adverse criticism of that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. By the analyses that we have had made we have brought the matter

to the public attention, and impressed upon the municipal authorities the fact that the ordinary tap water is unsafe for drinking purposes. I really do not see how we could have done anything more than we have done.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. member for St. Antoine division, Montreal (Mr. Ames), has asked me to inquire of the Minister of Public Works when he may expect a return which was ordered on the 13th of December last, in reference to public buildings. He is anxious to have it before certain estimates are placed before the House.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, there is a matter that I wish to bring to your consideration and to the consideration of this House. I do it because I see that the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) is in his seat. It is a matter that has been brought up already in this House by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). It is with regard to an article that appeared in the 'Globe' of date Saturday, March 4, of this year. At a meeting at Woodstock, in Ontario, the hon. member for North Oxford, in addressing the people, there spoke as follows. The speech is so good I shall read it all:

With regard to reciprocity, he noted that very little had been heard about the consumer's interest. He did not believe the reciprocity agreement being negotiated would affect the price to the consumer adversely. That might seem strange, as it was supposed the farmer would get a better price.

He was addressing, I understand, an aggregation of men who were more or less engaged in manufacturing. He went on to say:

He could not see that manufacturers would be touched very much, as few articles manufactured in Canada were affected. He was sure the Bain and Woodstock wagon companies would compete in the world's markets even with 2½ per cent reduction in the tariff. He thought the manufacturers opposed reciprocity because of what might follow, the 'thin end of the wedge,' but he had been assured——

This is what I want to bring to your notice:

—he had been assured by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding that nothing of the sort would follow. They had gone as far in the farmers' interests as they would.

As a farmer and a representative of farmers, I want to emphasize that point that one of the most aggressive members on the Liberal side of this House, one of the strongest supporters of the First Minister and his government, in a public meeting gives his word as a member of this House to the people of Woodstock, a manufacturing centre, that he has the word absolutely of the First Minister and the Minister of Finance that the farmers' interests would not be conserved any further than was done by this agreement. He goes on to say:

It would be foolish for us to think of tinkering with the tariff or putting it on an unstable basis.

He was talking to manufacturers.

Therefore, the present government, in his view, would not tinker any more with it unless to make some minor adjustments.

This matter was brought up by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), and the First Minister in reply said:

With regard to the other question, I think my hon. friend had better wait until the hon. member for North Oxford is in his seat.

This is the first opportunity I have had of bringing the matter before the House when the hon. member was in his seat. I hope that he will reply to me either that he is misreported in this Liberal newspaper or that he will repudiate this statement. From a farmer's standpoint, I hope he will not say the statement is correct.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I can relieve my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) from answering the question of my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell). I can answer him now. There is no doubt whatever as to the attitude of the government. It has been defined on this floor more than once, the last time it was defined was only two or three days ago, when the Minister of Finance, in answer to a question put to him with regard to the speech of President Taft and that answer will give all the information which my hon. friend wants. The Finance Minister was questioned as to the speech delivered by President Taft, at Atlanta, especially to the following extract:

When we entered upon these negotiations, I asked the Secretary of State and his commissioners to offer free trade in everything, but this Canada could not grant us, because she has a protective system and she was afraid of the competition of our better-organized industries.

To this the Minister of Finance replied:

That statement may be entirely correct, and I have no doubt is, as to the instructions that the President gave to his officials. But as to what actually occurred in the conference, the matter did not advance to a position which would enable these gentlemen to make such a formal offer in that way. At the very earliest stage in the negotiations we certainly gave them to understand that we could not undertake to have any free trade in manufactures, speaking generally.

This is the position of the government. We have undertaken to have reciprocity in natural products, not in manufactured products. At the present time our policy is before the House to have reciprocity in natural products, and I shall be very glad if we have the assistance of our friends that far in favour of the farmers. I doubt very much if we will, but we will see what we will do afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid the Prime Minister missed the meaning of my hon. friend's question. A supporter of my right hon. friend goes to a rural constituency and says he has the authority of the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Finance to make that definite statement. What my hon. friend wants to know is whether the member was authorized by the Prime Minister or Finance Minister to make that statement. I have noticed a tendency this last few years on the part of members on the government side to make announcements in various portions of the country of what will be done, and what will not be done. That is permissible, to a certain extent on the part of members of the government, but it has obvious disadvantages when the government authorizes lay members to make governmental utterances. If the statement of the hon. member for North Oxford is correct this was apparently done in this instance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The statement made by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) was quite consistent with our policy, it was nothing new, and he had perfect authority, not only he but every member of the Liberal side, to make that statement.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance authorize the member in question to make that statement?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have answered that already. It is perfectly true. The hon. member for North Oxford and every Liberal member had such authority, he was not kept in ignorance of our policy in this matter and knew it well. He only stated what is our general policy.

Mr. HUGHES. In view of what has transpired, is he not going to withdraw the Bill?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend will have to explain his logic, I do not understand it. The farmers want reciprocity. To that extent, they are immediately justified. Does he object?

Mr. W. D. STAPLES (Macdonald). I do not believe the farmers of the west are being justly used by the government in this matter. The hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) was very prompt to rise this afternoon and to read a telegram and state that he had not received intimation from a single person in the west that they were opposed to the reciprocity agreement. I venture to say that if the farmers of the west are informed that by the passing of this reciprocal agreement, there will, as the member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) states, there will be no hope for many years to come that there will be a reduction in the tariff on the articles they use, then you would soon find the farmers of the west adopting a different attitude, and sending a different kind of telegram. The farmers of the west are being misled, and only one side of the story is going out to them through a paper called the 'Grain Growers' Guide,' edited by a man who is here at the present time lobbying with the Liberals in this House. It is easy for him to make a strong appeal through that journal to the Conservative members of parliament to vote for the government on this particular question, but I wonder if the 'Guide' will tell the people the actual fact: that this government does not intend to reduce the duty on agricultural implements. If the farmers knew that we would be getting a different kind of resolution from the various associations, and this resolution, I venture to say, has been prepared by Mr. McKenzie, the editor of that 'Guide' and Mr. Hunders, his associate in the west, who is the president of the Grain Growers' Association. They have been decimating this resolution at all these meetings, and every day I get in my mail a copy of the resolution.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. STAPLES. Yes, I admit it, but just wait a minute. It is the same resolution all through word for word, syllable for syllable, and it is sent out by that association to the farmers. I tell you, Sir, that if the farmers knew that this government was not going to make any reduction in the duty on agricultural implements there would be a different kind of letter and a different form of resolution coming to the members of this House. We have at last succeeded in getting from the Prime Minister an admission that he is not going to change the tariff, but after all his remarks to-day are not very different from those he addressed to the deputation from the Manufacturers' Association some time ago. The farmers of the west will find, I believe, that they are not going to get out of this agreement what they had expected.

Mr. NESBITT. A word of explanation—I was very correctly reported considering that I was just speaking offhand without any notes. I did say that I had discussed the matter with the minister, and that I could assure them—pretty nearly as stated

in the paper—that there would be no further reduction.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That you had the assurance?

Mr. NESBITT. I do not want the hon. gentleman to put words in my mouth. I did not know until this afternoon that my speeches were of such great importance. But at all events I said I could assure them there would be no further reduction in the tariff at present, and so far as the other part of it is concerned, I was speaking simply about the tariff and not about any other matter in reference to the farmers.

Mr. KING. The hon. member for Dauphin in his remarks has certainly conveyed to my mind an entirely different impression as to the purport of the remarks of my hon. friend from that which the remarks of the hon. member for Oxford did at the time they were made. I heard the hon. gentleman (Mr. Nesbitt) make his speech, and I heard everything he said, and I think I can speak as to his words. Did I understand the member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell), when he used the expression: 'The farmers' interests would not be conserved any further,' to quote these words from a paper, or are they his own words?

Mr. CAMPBELL. These are my own words.

Mr. KING. I thought that must be so.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Let me put the minister right. I said it seemed that if what this gentlemen said was correct, that the farmers' interests were not going to be conserved any further with regard to the tariff.

Mr. KING. Then it is simply—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has already spoken.

Mr. KING. The hon. member for Dauphin just interrupted me in the course of my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did not the hon. gentleman speak in reply to the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce)?

Mr. KING. I did with regard to alien labour.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, and it is on the same motion to go into Supply.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). I, like my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples), have had some communications from the farmers of the west, and from all I can learn the farmers of the west have laid well to heart that the best method of accomplishing human progress whether in politics or anything else is by a step at a time, and they have also a great belief in the proverb that half a loaf is better than no bread.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). I would ask the Prime Minister if his remarks also apply to the British preference.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish the House to understand that on the motion to go into Supply, if questions are put to ministers it opens up the point whether a minister can speak more than once on the same motion. If these questions may be put the minister must be allowed to answer, and consequently you would have a minister speaking several times on the same motion.

Mr. FOSTER. We can stand it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then the House must be willing that the rule should be broken.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

RECIPROCITY—RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY ASSOCIATIONS.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN (Huron). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker I desire to place on record two communications which have been sent to me for that purpose. The first one reads:

Egmondville, Feb. 21, 1911.

Mr. M. Y. McLean,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—At the last meeting of the executive of the Seaforth Branch of the National Council of Agriculture the following resolution was passed unanimously:—

We, the executive of the Seaforth Branch of the National Council of Agriculture, desire to place on record our approval of the tariff agreement entered into between the government of Canada and the United States, believing that it will be a great benefit to the Canadian people. We, therefore, urge upon you as our representative to do all in your power to bring about its enactment.

Yours truly,
The Seaforth Branch,
National Council of Agriculture.
JAMES COWAN,
President.
THOS. G. SHILLINGLAW,
Secretary.

I may say that this association has a very large membership, and is composed of both Liberals and Conservatives, and all of them, I think, are farmers. This communication I have also received:

Brucefield, March 9.

A non-partisan meeting of the farmers of this vicinity was held to discuss the reciprocity agreement, and although the chairman invited United States.

To a large and enthusiastic audience several of the local farmers spoke in favour of the agreement, and although the chairman invited any who might be opposed to it to express their views, no one responded.

The following resolution was then moved by Mr. Byron Waldron, and seconded by Mr. Jno. A. McEwen, and carried unanimously:—

That we, the farmers of this vicinity, hereby wish to place on record our hearty approval of the reciprocal arrangement between the government of this country and that of the United States, believing that if adopted

it will be of very great benefit to the people of Canada.

ALEX. MUSTARD,
Chairman.

Mr. DANIEL (St. John). As the reading of resolutions appears to be in order, I wish to direct the attention of the House to the following:

St. Stephen, March 13.—The parish of Dufferin, in which is located one of the best of the prospective winter ports of Canada, has an energetic Board of Trade, which held a largely attended meeting Saturday evening, and passed unanimously the following resolution:—

Resolved, that the Board of Trade of the parish of Dufferin, particularly desires to endorse the position of those, both Liberal and Conservative, who, believing the country's welfare to be greater than party, are opposing the proposed reciprocity treaty with the United States.

First, because we believe the proposed agreement is hostile to the best interests of the agricultural and labour interests of Canada, as well as against the commercial and manufacturing centres, on which the farmers depend so largely for their best markets, and labour depends so largely for its employment.

Second, because it lets free into the Canadian market, in ruinous competition with the Canadian farmer, the surplus farm products, not only of the United States, but also the Argentine Republic, Denmark, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, Japan and other countries, in which owing to the low wages, the cost of production is far less than in Canada, and because the agreement does not provide for free entry of our farm products into those countries.

Third, because it would reverse the fiscal policy by which Canada has been establishing at home a more profitable market, thus realizing one of the great purposes of the fathers of confederation, and because it will nullify the work of years in developing trade with the mother land and thus retard the grandest ideal of all patriotic Canadians, imperial unity and the growth of imperial power within the empire.

Mr. BLACK. Where is that from?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not from Hants.

Mr. BLACK. Never mind, I am asking the question.

Mr. DANIEL. This parish is in the county of Charlotte, N.B.

Mr. TALBOT. It is a printed document?

Mr. DANIEL. A county represented by my hon. friend opposite, and it is, I presume, inhabited principally by fishermen and farmers.

Mr. CARVELL. And controlled mainly by Mr. Ganong, the late Conservative member.

Mr. DANIEL. If the people there support the Conservative party, that shows their very good sense. I offer this as a sort of antidote.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CROSBY. Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to read a resolution which will no doubt be of some interest to this House. I take it from the Montreal 'Star' of March 16th:

Kentville, N.S., March 15.—After a long discussion the Board of Trade at an early hour this morning passed a resolution protesting against the proposed reciprocity agreement on the ground that it would cause disturbance in Canadian trade, hamper Canada's freedom in developing her own resources, and diminish Canada's position as a unit within the British Empire.

That is from a town in King's County represented by the hon. the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), and a county which has very seldom sent a Conservative to this House or even the local parliament. Only a few weeks ago, whether owing to the operations of the Minister of Militia or not—he knows best himself—they succeeded in electing a representative to the local legislature who was a Liberal. I have therefore something to warrant my saying that this resolution at least must have been passed by Liberals. Therefore, while there may not have been any very strong disposition on the part of the government to withdraw the reciprocity agreement, I am sure there will be no difficulty about their doing it now. If there be any part of the Dominion which could be benefited by this agreement, it would be that particular section. In fact it has been said by a great many that the fruit interests there and throughout the eastern part of Canada at least would be benefited. That resolution comes on from a centre which has always been accustomed to elect Liberals both for the Dominion parliament and the local legislature.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Can my hon. friend give me any names?

Mr. CROSBY. I have only what I find in the newspaper.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Very meagre. With regard to that, I would like to say that a meeting of the Kings County Board of Trade in Kentville—not the Kentville Board of Trade—was held the other day at Kentville at which people from every portion of the county were present and a great many speeches were made. I am sorry I have not the newspaper here, but a resolution in support of the reciprocity proposals was moved and a vote taken of 87 in its favour and 2 against. I think that more correctly represents the feeling in Kings county than the result of the

meeting to which my hon. friend has referred and of which I have had no report whatever. The hon. gentleman has mentioned the fact that, very recently, in Kings county a by-election was held for the provincial legislature. And I may say, in parenthesis, I believe my hon. friend was quite anxious because I happened to be absent from the House during that time, taking part in that election—doing my duty, as the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) pointed out, as one of the citizens of Kings county. It is quite true, the country of Kings was carried by the Liberals by acclamation on that occasion, and one of the reasons why it was carried by acclamation was that, a few days before nomination day, the full text of the reciprocity proposals now before this House were published from one end of that county to the other. I had the pleasure of speaking throughout the county at some ten or twelve meetings, and took occasion to read to the people the text of the proposal, and to point out—and they did not require very much argument—the advantages which would accrue to them from this reciprocity arrangement. I had not intended to refer to this matter on this occasion, but, as my hon. friend mentioned it, I thought that, perhaps, it would be better to go a little further. A little later on, I shall hope to have the full report of the meeting which he has quoted as having taken place at Kentville. I have here, in the Halifax 'Chronicle,' a full report—two or three columns—of the meeting of the Kings County Board of Trade to which I have referred. But I may have occasion later on to refer to this matter again, and I will not detain the House now by speaking of it further.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo). As the reading of resolutions seems to be in order, and as the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), is in his place, I would like to read one more, especially as it concerns a part of the country to which he made strong reference on the 23rd of February last. He will remember reading an editorial from the Summerland 'Review' setting forth, the minister presumably intended to show, a reliable expression of the opinion of that district, an opinion favourable to the reciprocity agreement. Now, I ask leave to read a resolution which will show how the case is regarded in the particular part of the country of which he spoke:

Summerland, B.C.,
February 21, 1911.

Martin Burrell, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour to submit for your consideration the following resolution which was unanimously adopted at a joint meeting of the Summerland Farmers' Institute, Fruit Growers' Association and Agriculture Association, held here recently:

Resolved, that the above named associations strongly endorse the resolution passed by the Associated Boards of Trade regarding the tariff on fruit, a copy of which herewith follows, and that a copy of said resolution be sent to Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Hon. Senator Bostock, Hon. Clifford Sifton and Mr. Martin Burrell, M.P.

I do not think it is necessary for me to read the resolution referred to, because I have already put it on 'Hansard' twice. It is a strong resolution deploring the effects of the reciprocal proposals as regards the fruit industry. I wish to specially call the attention of the Minister of Customs to this as showing the absolutely false position he took before this House, in presumably, giving the impression that the editorial which he read expressed anything but the sense of the editorial writer himself.

Mr. B. B. LAW (Yarmouth). I desire to call attention to a resolution of the Yarmouth Board of Trade.:

Whereas, the reciprocal trade arrangement recently drafted by representatives of the United States and representatives of Canada is now before the parliament of Canada for ratification;

And whereas, in the opinion of this Board of Trade the ratification of said arrangement and the amendment of the customs tariffs of both countries in accordance with the schedules to said proposed arrangement will establish between Canada and the United States, not only a more liberal trade policy than heretofore, which must have many advantages, but will promote and encourage the commercial interests of both countries and strengthen the friendly relations now happily prevailing between them, and thus add another safe-guard to the peace of the empire by further promoting the union of Anglo-Saxon nations for their common interests;

Therefore resolved, that this Board of Trade place on record its approval of said trade arrangement, and of its hope and desire that it may be ratified both by the Canadian parliament and the American Congress, believing that its ratification will effect a marked increase in the prosperity of the people of Canada.

Further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Hon. W. S. Fielding, Minister of Finance, and to B. B. Law, M.P., at Ottawa.

Yarmouth, N.S., Feb. 13, 1911.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Board of Trade of Yarmouth, one of the most influential in the province, and composed of both Liberals and Conservatives.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin), stated—I do not remember whether he said he had not met or that he had not

heard of a single man in Saskatchewan opposed to the reciprocity pact. Of course, if he meant that he had not met such a man, I could well understand it, because while a resident of Ottawa, he is not likely to meet very many men at this distance from his own province. But, if he meant he had not heard of a man resident in Saskatchewan who was opposed to this reciprocity pact, I beg to call his attention to a press despatch in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of March 5, which purports to give an account of a meeting, not of any manufacturing concern or of any board of trade, but of no less an association than a Grain Growers' Association, and that in the province of Saskatchewan:

Fleming, Sask., March 5.—A largely attended meeting of the Fleming Grain Growers' Association here Thursday night strongly condemned the proposed reciprocity treaty, and passed a strong resolution against the proposed ratification of the agreement. It was stated that the Canadian wheat would lose its reputation in the markets of the world, trade would be transferred from the Canadian lines to United States roads, and that it would be detrimental to the best interests of the empire commercial relations.

I commend this to the attention of the hon. gentleman for Regina, who, apparently, is not conversant with what is going on in his own province, and would also draw his attention to the fact that there are some Grain Growers' Associations that do not allow their thinking to be done by another set of men. It is true that there are resolutions cut and dried, manufactured, as the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples), said, sent out to the local associations throughout the west and passed as a mere matter of form —we all know how easily that is accomplished. On the other hand, there are associations composed of intelligent men who do their thinking for themselves, who are not going to be dictated to by any other set of men, but pass resolutions in accordance with their own judgment.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Is not Fleming situated on the boundary between Manitoba and Sackatchewan, and would not these men be mostly residents of Manitoba?

Mr. ROCHE. Are the residents of Saskatchewan very different from the residents of the province of Manitoba, just across the boundary line between the provinces? This letter is dated Fleming, March 5, and Fleming is in Saskatchewan.

Mr. MARTIN. Has the hon. gentleman any evidence that it was a Saskatchewan man?

Mr. ROCHE. That is a silly question.

Mr. ROCHE.

PRIVILEGE—MR. CROTHERS.

Mr. CROTHERS. A few minutes ago my attention was called to the reading last night by the hon. member for Carleton, N. B., (Mr. Carvell) of a few sentences from some newspaper purporting to give what I had said the night before with reference to the members of the Treasury Board who were present when the question of issuing a certificate to the Farmers' Bank was up. It will be remembered by hon. gentlemen then present, that the Minister of Finance had stated that there were present at that meeting of the board, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the Minister of Finance himself. The sentences the member for Carleton read last night made me say that notwithstanding what the Minister of Finance had said, the Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright had not attended that meeting of the Treasury Board. They are in these words:

Mr. CARVELL. This was followed by an article which appears in the Ottawa press——

I presume he means the Ottawa 'Free Press'.

——of this afternoon, and which is as follows:—

Mr. Crothers, of West Elgin, declared that at the meeting of the Treasury Board, at which the certificate was granted, there were only three present, and not a quorum. 'Sir Richard Cartwright was not present, or the certificate would not have been issued,' said he.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything of the kind, and if my hon. friend from Carleton had taken the trouble to look up in 'Hansard' what I did say, he would have found it very different. On page 5483 I used these words:

We have been told that there were present on that occasion Sir Richard Cartwright, the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur), and the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). Well, I do not believe that Sir Richard Cartwright had his attention called to the facts, or he would certainly not have consented to the issuing of this certificate.

So I did not contradict the Finance Minister, I would not for a moment question a statement of fact made by the Finance Minister that Sir Richard Cartwright was present at that meeting of the Treasury Board. What I did say was that I did not believe his attention had been called to the facts of the case, because if they had, I do not believe he would have assented to the issuing of the certificate.

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

SUPPLY.

Dominion Lands and Parks—salaries of the outside service, $370,000.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Before explaining the details of this vote, I would like to be permitted to place before the committee some facts and figures in regard to the work done under this vote during the past and previous years. As the committee is aware, the administration of Dominion lands has a very important influence upon the increase of population and of the productive wealth of Canada. Therefore, it is a matter of great interest to the country to know the results which have been reached by the expenditure of this money. I am sure the committee will be gratified to know that under the vote for Dominion lands during the calendar year 1910, there was the largest amount of land settlement in the prairie provinces that has ever taken place in the history of Canada. The number of individual entries for land were 52,072, besides 18,352 pre-emption entries. In all therefore, there were taken 70,424 separate entries for land. These 70,000 entries represented a total area of 11,617,600 acres. It may interest the committee to know that the amount of land in the three prairie provinces which passed to individuals last year on conditions of residence and cultivation, was almost equal to the total area of the 23 countries which constituted the western peninsula of Ontario, an area of 11,840,000 acres. It may be of further interest to know that in this corresponding area in the western peninsula of Ontario, there was, at the census of 1901, a population of 1,313,000 people, a little short of one-fourth of the total population of the Dominion at that time. That is to say, under the operation of the Dominion Lands Branch of the Interior Department last year, an area of land passed into the hands of individuals on conditions of residence and cultivation, equal to the 23 counties constituting the western peninsula of Ontario, including York and Simcoe.

This area, judged by the standard of the western peninsula of Ontario, is capable of supporting at any rate over a million and a quarter of people. The conditions of cultivation which are attached to the entries of which I spoke, without the fulfilment of which conditions the title to the land cannot pass to the individual, applied to 2,500,000 acres, that is to say the government of Canada entered into contracts with 52,072 people last year to bring under cultivation 2,517,020 acres of land, the condition being that the title should not pass unless that amount of land was cultivated. It may further interest the committee to know that this area of cultivation under contract is very nearly double the total area of the province of Prince Edward Island. Last year there was put under contract to cultivate 2,517,020 acres of land while the total land area of Prince Edward Island is 1,397,760 acres.

The rapidity of the increase of settlement is also, I assume, a matter of some interest. While the individuals making entry during 1910 were 52,072, in the year 1909 the individuals making entry were 40,408. Five years ago the number of individuals making entry was 34,503; five years before that, in 1900, it was 7,764 and five years before that, in 1895, it was 2,326. In the three periods of five years each the number of entries has practically doubled in each period and during the last period, while the number of entries has not been actually doubled, the amount of land entered for has been more than doubled and the amount of cultivation contracted for has increased fourfold.

It may also be of interest to the committee to be informed as to the result following the passage of the Land Bill of 1908, which placed at the disposal of homestead settlers all the land not then alienated in these prairie provinces without regard to whether it was comprised within odd or even numbered sections. By the Act of 1908 the lands which had been held under reservation for the purpose of aid to railways or such other purpose as might be through fit were made available to homestead settlement without distinction of number or place.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). That was not in the railway belt?

Mr. OLIVER. Not in the railway belt of British Columbia. I am not speaking of that; I am speaking entirely of the three prairie provinces. That feature of the Bill of 1908 was that in a certain area of Saskatchewan and Alberta a pre-emption privilege was allowed for reasons which were set forth at that time. Within that area a homesteader was entitled, when entering for his free homestead, to enter also for an adjoining quarter-section as a pre-emption upon which he should pay a price, and upon which he would do cultivation duties and in regard to which he had to establish residence. I need not perhaps repeat that the area of country extending, roughly speaking, for a distance of 400 miles along the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway between Moosejaw and Calgary —I do not wish to be understood as saying extending from Moosejaw to Calgary, but for a distance extending 400 miles along the railway between these two points—up to the passage of the Bill of 1908, contained very little settlement. For one reason or another it had not proved attractive to settlers. I am not able to give the number of homesteaders who were settled within that area up to that time, but those who are familiar with the conditions will, I am

sure, agree with me that the number, as compared with the area under consideration, was comparatively small. Since the adoption of the principle of pre-emption which took effect the 1st September, 1908, there have been taken within that area, as the result of the provision of the Act of that date, 46,066 pre-emptions representing a total area of 7,370,560 acres upon which, in order to earn title, cultivation was required amounting to 2,303,300 acres. It may be of interest to the committee to know that the area taken in pre-emtions since the 1st September, 1908, in a district which up to that time had not been considered favourable by settlers, is more than equal to the total area of that part of the province of Quebec which lies south of the St. Lawrence river extending from the western limit of the province to a point south of the city of Quebec, containing altogether twenty-two counties. In a little over two years under the pre-emption provision of the law of 1908 an area of land was taken up in that particular part of the northwest which hitherto had not been considered attractive to settlers equal to twenty-two counties of the province of Quebec, and I think I am safe in saying the twenty-two counties in the province of Quebec which contain the greater part of the presently occupied agricultural area, at any rate, that which is most densely peopled and most profitably worked. The area of the twenty-two counties is 6,508,000 acres, as compared with 7,370,560 acres taken under pre-emption and entry since September 1, 1908. In connection with these pre-emption entries there were taken of course an equal number, 46,066 of homestead entries. Some of the homestead entries had already been taken, but there were taken after the first of September, 1908, in connection with the pre-emption entries not less than 46,000 homesteads representing an area of 6,400,000 acres, and calling for cultivation to the amount of 1,200,000 acres. That is to say in that one area of the Northwest under the special provision of the Act of 1908, an area of land has passed to actual settlers under conditions of residence and cultivation that is more than double the total area of the twenty-two counties of the province of Quebec which contain the major portion of the population of that province.

Another feature of the Act of 1908 which was looked upon with some doubt by a number of the members of this House was the purchased homestead provision. Under this provision a man who had exhausted his homestead right became entitled to acquire 160 acres of land within the pre-emption area under conditions of residence and cultivation equal to those required in the case of an ordinary homestead, and in addition he was required to pay the sum of $3 an acre. It was suggested at the time by those who were opposed to this provision that to allow the settler to acquire an additional homestead at such a low price would tend to unsettle the conditions existing throughout the greater part of the prairie country. It was declared by a gentleman who had some right to speak with authority, a member representing a constituency in the province of Manitoba, that such a privilege would be bound to be a serious detriment to the already settled sections of the country. However, the provision was agreed to and went into effect with this result: While 46,066 pre-emptions were taken, only 3,726 purchased homesteads were taken, an area of 596,160 acres, calling for cultivation to the amount of 186,300 acres. The fears which were expressed at the time of the injurious effect of this provision have not been realized. The acquirement of a matter of 3,726 purchased homesteads in the pre-emption area has not injuriously disturbed existing conditions of settlement in the older settled portions of the prairie provinces, while it has at the same time afforded opportunity to the man who had already exhausted his homestead right, and for one reason or another desired to take another chance at fortune, an opportunity on reasonable terms and was availed of in 3,726 cases. The operation of the provision, I think, justified its adoption by the House, and has not at all borne out the objections that were urged against it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How many of those 3,726 purchased homesteads were acquired by men who, having already acquired homesteads, say in Manitoba, had perhaps without a due appreciation of the law, fraudulently acquired new homesteads in other provinces by taking what were really false oaths, as subsequently ascertained by the officials of the department.

Mr. OLIVER. None of the 3,726 purchased homesteads would come into the class mentioned because the man who had exhausted his homestead right by coming into the purchased homestead area had the right to take another homestead under these conditions. The cases mentioned by my hon. friend are not within the law, and are not included within this number. They are cases where men acquired their homesteads and afterwards illegally acquired other homesteads not in the pre-emption area, and having acquired the second homesteads illegally, thereby placed themselves under penalty of the law. In many of these cases we have taken a lenient view, and have sometimes cancelled the fraudulent entry, and sold them the land at a price which would take away the clean profit that they would have made if they had got the land on their first fraudulent entry. Within the

pre-emption area the price at which the land can be purchased is $3 an acre. When we find a man who has secured fraudulent entry outside the purchase homestead area we charge him a price over $3, sometimes $4, or sometimes more. In no case that I know of have we demanded a price on the actual valuation of the land. We may have been more lenient than we should, but we cannot be accused of having dealt unfairly by these people. Some of them possibly may have had a misunderstanding, but whether or not we are inclined to deal leniently rather than harshly with them. Of course, if a man puts himself within reach of the criminal law he takes his chances, and if he is punished he has no ground of complaint.

Mr. HUGHES. I notice that some have been punished for fraudulent homestead entry and some have not, and I trust the minister will be careful to see that all are uniformly dealt with. It is not fair of course to let one man who makes a fraudulent entry go scot free and to put another fellow in jail for doing the same thing. Even handed justice should be dealt out in all these cases. One man should not have the right to buy himself off and the other fellow who cannot do so be sent to prison. I do not know what the details are, but I would impress this on the minister.

Mr. OLIVER. This department has nothing to do with the administration of criminal law. In some cases prosecutions have been entered under the criminal law, which is under the administration of the province. Our compromise with any man in regard to the ownership of the land does not relieve him from the operation of the criminal law if any one chooses to invoke it against him.

Mr. HUGHES. It might mitigate the offence.

Mr. OLIVER. It might, but we have nothing to do with the criminal aspect of it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Some years ago a man who had had a homestead in Manitoba asked, through the legal column of the Winnipeg 'Free Press', the Liberal organ, whether he could take a homestead in one of the western provinces, and the answer was that under the law he had a perfect right to take a homestead in Saskatchewan or Alberta after having taken one in Manitoba. The minister knows as well as I do that the farmers of the Northwest, particularly the pioneers, have not much time to read the newspapers; they do not know anything about the quibbles of the law, and when they hear that the government organ gives such advice, and when they act upon it, they certainly ought to be treated as leniently as possible. Now, there is no doubt that in many cases where perjury has been committed and a second homestead taken or it may be a third, the government has been very lenient and has taken care that certain individuals should have the privilege of buying these homesteads at prices below the real value. I believe in that leniency myself, but I point out to the minister that I know of three cases in my own constituency, and about them I have spoken to the minister, where the men are the worst Tories or the best Tories, just from the point of view you look at it, and who are unfortunate enough to be illiterate, but who relied absolutely upon what was expounded as the policy of this government in the Winnipeg 'Free Press', and perjured themselves it is true —I do not excuse that for a moment—but thinking they had to comply with some quibble or some phraseology to get what they thought was their right, they did apply for a second homestead. These three men are languishing in jail to-day, and at the same time I could name to the minister off hand a dozen staunch Liberals who have committed the same perjury, but who to-day are freemen and have their homesteads and have been granted their patents. I do not wish to mention the name of any man who has not the right to come here and answer me, but I say this is a fact, and I say it is absolutely unfair to give one man, because he is a Liberal and has a political pull with some one in this House, rights and privileges that are not extended to the Conservatives who support me. I do not believe for a moment that the Minister of the Interior knows of these facts; I think he is too big to do anything of the kind. I do not want to throw a bouquet at him by any means, but I can tell him that his department is and always has been absolutely rotten in that particular regard, and I want him to know it. I ask him to guide himself by that knowledge. I will hand to him if he asks for them the names and he may rest assured that the facts are as I state them. I have three men languishing in jail for doing what dozens of Liberal heelers and government supporters have done in the last ten or fifteen years in the Northwest, and who are to-day freemen. These men are in jail because they would not support my opponent last election; there is no other reason. The man who sent the information to the department against them is the man who put in a petition against me and accused me of every crime in the calendar. As was ably said by the Minister of Justice to-day, the fact is that a man who has been chosen by the people of his constituency is open to some scallawag getting up and accusing him of every crime in the calendar, and there is no possible law by which that individual can be punished. This man to whom I refer, who petitioned

against me, tried time and time again in the office in Dauphin to break the laws and perjure himself and get a second homestead, but the officers of the Interior Department there knew him; they knew the circumstances, and they would not permit such an infraction of the law. The same man went to Saskatchewan and entered for a homestead, stayed there for a year or two, and perjured himself to the knowledge of the Minister of the Interior, or at least of his department, and after a year or two his homestead was taken away from him. Was he prosecuted for perjury? Not much. He was too good a Liberal; he was the petitioner against my election.

Mr. HUGHES. Who is this man?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I shall not mention his name. I want to appeal to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to put in practice what the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton has brought to his attention. While leniency is a good thing, and we all approve of it, especially where there is illiteracy and want of knowledge, let that leniency not be onesided, let it be fair, let the poor, illiterate Tories—and there are some illiterate Tories, but not as many as there are Liberals—get a fighting chance to make good. I could go on and tell the minister about two of those cases in Dauphin—boys who hardly can write their names—who were told by the Liberals that the 'Free Press' said that they could go and do this if they went into another province. They went and did it and are now in jail. One is an old man married to an invalid wife, a bedridden woman, with no money and nothing to keep her except the charity of the people. The other is the son, the sole support of his parents, and he is in jail. Why? Because he is a Tory and voted against Burrows—nothing else.

Mr. TURRIFF. I can hardly believe that any such state of affairs exists such as my hon. friend depicts.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You ought to know.

Mr. TURRIFF. I cannot believe that any man is treated by the Department of the Interior in a different way, in any shape or form, because he is a Liberal. During the five or six years that I was in charge of that land department, I never knew of a case of that kind. I have now been a member of this House for seven years and have had a good many complaints to make to the Minister of the Interior for being so absolutely strict in carrying out the regulations in such an arbitrary manner—not giving away a little, not giving little concessions to settlers that in my judgment should be given. But I can say this, that I have never in one single instance in my own constituency, in the last seven years, got one bit of consideration for any one Liberal or Conservative, or for any Liberal more than Conservative, in any shape or form, and I do not believe that any such partiality exists in the west to-day. I do not believe that any Liberal in any part of the country can get any consideration which is not coming to him fairly, because I have not been able to get anything for any of my friends, Liberal or Conservative, in the way of extension of time or any little considerations of that kind.

Mr. HUGHES. That must have been a sad disappointment.

Mr. TURRIFF. In some cases it has been, because there are cases in which I think consideration might be given to the settler and nobody would be hurt. But I can say, absolutely, that not in a single case has anything been given a Liberal in my constituency that would not be given a Conservative.

Mr. NEELY. I wish to add my endorsation to what my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has said. The hon. member for Dauphin has stated that homesteaders are treated differently, according to their political views and opinions. Well, I think I have had as much to do in the matter of corresponding with the department in behalf of homesteaders as my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) and probably somewhat more in recent years—since, at least, the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has had charge of that department. Some seven or eight years ago the Humboldt constituency had hardly any homesteaders, hardly any people at all. At present there are many thousands of homesteaders in that constituency, and I have never known one single case in which a man's political affiliations were taken into consideration, so far as his treatment by the Minister of the Interior or the Department of the Interior is concerned. I have the same complaint to make as my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), and that is that sometimes the regulations of the department are administered too strictly. I have also the complaint to make that, in my judgment, some of those regulations are in themselves too severe. In some instances they go possibly beyond the spirit and intent of the Dominion Lands Act. But I have this to say, in justice to the Minister of the Interior and his department, that I have never known one case in which a man got consideration because he was a Liberal or was refused consideration because he was a Conservative. I have written the Department of the Interior in the matter of dealing with homesteads, not about a few cases, but about hundreds of cases, and I do not know that any man from the west has had a larger correspondence along this line than I have had. That is due simply

to the fact that Humboldt constituency has been actively homesteaded during the time I have resided in it; and in all that time, in no instance, to my knowledge, has any man been given any more consideration because he was a Liberal than he would have been given if he had been a Conservative. I want to say further, that, in my opinion, it is not a fair statement to make in this House, without sufficient and positive proof, that any man is refused consideration because he is a Conservative. There may be occasions when my hon. friend thinks Conservatives were hardly dealt with by the department; but in such cases it was not because they were Conservatives but because they broke the law. My hon. friend tells us of a man who had gone to jail, but he gave himself the reason. It was because he had perjured himself.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What about the other ones? Some got off.

Mr. NEELY. The hon. member for Dauphin is a public man, he was elected as a representative of his constituency and as a representative of the people of Canada. If he knows of any case where men, who are not in jail, ought to be in jail——

Mr. STAPLES. The minister knows it and admits it.

Mr. NEELY. They were tried and acquitted.

Mr. HUGHES. Never acquitted.

Mr. NEELY. If my hon. friend knows of men who ought to be in jail and are not, who have committed crimes for which they should be in jail, it is his duty as a public man to lay that information before the department. And I will guarantee that, inside of twenty-four hours, the Minister of the Interior will institute an investigation and will carry out the spirit and the letter of the law.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. NEELY. My hon. friends opposite should not be too severe on the officials of the department or the department itself.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was not either, was I?

Mr. NEELY. It is known that my hon. friend has even taken steps himself, on certain occasions, to lead even officials to do what was not in the best interest of the country.

Mr. CAMPBELL. My hon. friend is a liar, absolutely a liar.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) will realize that that language is not allowed. It will be necessary for him to withdraw those words.

Mr. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I call him a liar, and I refuse to take it back.

Mr. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think I can hear any other point of order than the one I have raised.

Mr. CAMPBELL. He had better talk of his honesty? Where is the capital of Saskatchewan? What does it cost to vote for it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Dauphin will realize, I am sure, that he has spoken hastily, and also that his words are not parliamentary. I think that will be sufficient to cause him to withdraw them.

Mr. HUGHES. But, previous to that point of order there is one which the Chair did not raise. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), was out of order in making the statements he did concerning the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell), and it is his place first to withdraw his declaration.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What I said goes. He is absolutely a liar. But if it is not parliamentary, I take the word back. But he is absolutely a liar.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is distinctly out of order. Such a breach of order must be——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will not take a word back, he is a liar, first, last, and all the time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Inasmuch as the hon. member has refused to withdraw, unless he will, even at this moment withdraw, it will be my duty to report the matter to the House for such action as it deems proper and desirable. I will still give him an opportunity to withdraw, for he, himself, must realize very clearly how unparliamentary his expression is.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is a hard task, Mr. Chairman, to withdraw something that is absolutely true.

Mr. TURRIFF. That is no withdrawal.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member must obey the rule and withdraw the expression.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will withdraw the expression, at your order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Now, you had better make that man withdraw—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If there is a point of order with regard to any previous expression, let the hon. member state the point of order, and I will hear it.

Mr. HUGHES. I raised the point of order. The hon. member for Humboldt, in charging the hon. member for Dauphin with seeking to induce an officer of the Crown, an officer in the service of this government, to perform an illegal and criminal act, is unparliamentary.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not understand the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) to use the terms attributed to him by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes). Had I understood so, I would have called the hon. member to order myself. But, the point of order having been raised and the charge made that these words were used, I will allow the hon. member for Humboldt to state whether they were correctly understood or not, and to make his explanation.

Mr. NEELY. I did not use those words. I said, and I repeat what I said, that the hon. member for Dauphin himself—

Mr. HUGHES. Did he sell the capital of Saskatchewan?

Mr. NEELY. My hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) perhaps has something to say. I will give him an opportunity to say it. I am not cowardly enough to make insinuations—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Neely) must confine himself, at this time, to an explanation of the point of order.

Mr. NEELY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) is interrupting me while I make my statement.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Chairman, why don't you call this gentleman to order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have not realized that any breach of order has been made.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I rise to a point of order. Do you, Mr. Chairman, deem the word 'cowardly' within the rules of debate in this House?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have not heard the word 'cowardly' as attached to the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton.

Mr. NEELY. I said I was not cowardly enough to make insinuations across the floor of this House. If I have anything to say to any man, I will not be like some hon. members, but will make my statements openly and plainly. I only ask that any man in this House who has anything to say about me shall say it openly—let him make a statement and then we will be able to deal with the matter. Now I did not say my hon. friend from Dauphin had compelled any official to do any illegal act. I said that my hon. friend from Dauphin had made the admission or the statement—

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is absolutely false.

Mr. NEELY. Excuse me, you do not know what I was going to say yet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should at least wait until the statement is completed.

Mr. NEELY. That in connection with a certain transaction, a firm with which my hon. friend was identified in connection with a certain transaction by which that firm obtained a grazing lease—I will put my statement plainly—in the Northwest—that it cost that firm a certain amount in order to induce an official of the department to obtain this grazing lease from the department.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Where do I come in?

Mr. NEELY. I have a stenographic report in which the hon. member for Dauphin, in his election campaign, made that statement.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, you have just heard the statement he has made, that he has a stenographic report. I demand that here and now. I believe his statement——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to do that, but the statement is not completed. I will ask the hon. member for Humboldt to understand that a point of order was raised with regard to certain expressions that he used. He has the right to explain, but I think an elaborate discussion of some other circumstances would hardly be in order. I will ask him to make his explanation as concisely as possible.

Mr. NEELY. I am not making an elaborate explanation. I am explaining that I did not make the statement that the hon. member for Dauphin, or some other hon. gentleman said I did, and on which they raise the point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If that be the case, if the hon. member for Humboldt denies having used the words attributed to him by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, his denial must, under the rules of the House, be accepted. In that case, unless another point of order is raised, the hon. member may proceed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As I understood the remarks of this gentleman from Humboldt, they were to the effect that I had admitted

doing something that was illegal and wrong. That is what I understood. My protest was unparliamentary, and, Mr. Chairman, you know that I am always ready to express my regret to you for falling from grace. When I say that, I say all that is to be said. No man alive—that has been my religion—no man alive can come to my face and say to me: You did a mean thing or a crooked thing. That is my religion. And this member from Humboldt cannot do it anywhere outside of this House, and he can't get Jim Jeffries to do it outside of this House, but I will give them some of the fairest sport they ever had. Is it a fair thing that a creature of circumstances like the member for Humboldt—if that language is parliamentary—can get up and say here under your protection something that he cannot say anywhere else in God's wide world? What he said is absolutely, first, and all the time, false. It was the 'Free Press, the Liberal newspaper of Ottawa——

Mr. NEELY. I rise to a point of order, I have the floor.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the point of order is correct. The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell), rose to the point of order, the point of order has not been stated explicitly, and if he will explain the point of order I will listen to him.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will state it again. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) said I had admitted that I had been guilty of an infraction of some law or other. I say that is an absolute untruth—if that language is parliamentary—and he must withdraw it, and withdraw it unconditionally.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) certainly made a statement in regard to certain actions of the member for Dauphin; I did not myself hear that the words used were unparliamentary. But if the member for Dauphin denies having done the act attributed to him, by the member for Humboldt, his denial must be accepted.

Mr. NEELY. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is a very strange thing that I am called upon to deny a thing before I have said it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I again rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. member (Mr. Neely) must be allowed to complete his withdrawal. The hon. member made a statement with reference to a certain act by the member for Dauphin, the denial of the member for Dauphin must be accepted. That is the rule of parliament, irrespective of what the hon. member for Humboldt may believe. When he has once charged an act to the member for Dauphin, which that hon. gentleman denies, it is that parliamentary acceptance of the denial that the member for Humboldt is asked to give.

Mr. NEELY. Well, if the member for Dauphin says he never made the statement on the platform in his constituency in the last Dominion election, that he or his firm spent a certain amount of money in order to obtain the consent of an official of the department to obtain a grazing lease in the west, then of course I will accept the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I am quite ready to make the statement at any time, but that is not my point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is correct. The particular statement that the member for Humboldt made, not any modification or explanation of it, if the hon. member for Dauphin denies it, that denial under the rules of parliament must be accepted. It is simply a withdrawal of that particular statement in that form, and not in any other.

Mr. NEELY. I have no recollection of stating anything that the member for Dauphin did until a moment ago. I did not elaborate or make any statement, and the hon. gentleman's denial, and his emphatic language towards myself as to the truth of my statement, were altogether out of order, because I had not stated what the nature of the offence was. It is only the last time I was on my feet that I did so, that I made the explanation. The hon. gentleman cannot deny what I had not said. I made the statement the last time I was on my feet as to what the particular thing was that I charged the hon. member with. I say again that if the hon. gentleman states that he never made these statements on a public platform, I will take his word for it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has just stated that if the member for Dauphin denies having used the words attributed to him, or the statement, he, the member for Humboldt, accepts that denial.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not going to have the onus put on me. I have risen to a point of order. The member for Humboldt stated—I do not know the exact words, but the meaning was that I had admitted having committed some crime for some reason or other. I rose to that point of order. What object would I have had, if he had not made a statement of that kind, questioning my truthfulness, in rising to a point of order? I surely had some incentive to get on my feet in something that he had said. I absolutely insist

on fairplay, I expect to get it, I always do get it. I absolutely insist that the hon. gentlemen take back that statement in the form he made it, that I had admitted having done something that was not within the law, to obtain something for myself or somebody else.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is somewhat unfortunate that the question has been mixed with other questions, and that the memory of members, as well as of the Chairman, is not as clear as it was at the moment. But the general rule remains, that when a member of this House attributes a certain act to another member which that other member denies, his denial must be accepted. It is now unfortunately too late to recall the exact words; in my memory they appeared to be in this form, that the hon. member for Dauphin had admitted urging the officials of the department to do some act not in the best interests of the country.

Mr. NEELY. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. But I do not recall the word 'illegally' being used or implied. But even in that form, if the member for Dauphin denies, then the member for Humboldt must, under our parliamentary rules, accept the denial.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have not withdrawn anything yet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think that under all the circumstances the expressions of the member for Humboldt would be fairly considered a withdrawal of that statement.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I just want to say this, and say it so that you will understand it, and the House will understand it, and if it gets beyond the confines of the House, that everybody will understand it—I have never in my life made a statement that, by myself, in any way personally, as came out in the 'Free Press' article that was read by the member for Humboldt, I had bribed, or got any one to bribe, any high official of the Department of the Interior to obtain any concession, whether right or wrong. I want to say emphatically that any one, whether it is the Free Press, or any one else on its behalf, the member for Humboldt, or any one on his behalf, or on behalf of the Minister of the Interior—I am sorry to drag him into it—says a thing like that about me, he lies, and lies by the clock.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. NEELY. Well, Mr. Chairman, if my hon. friend denies ever having made any such statement I accept his denial. I am quite prepared to apply the whitewash brush and put my hon. friend on a pedestal. He tells us that he has never been guilty of doing anything wrong, and never did any harm.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I beg your pardon, I am not going to be misinterpreted, Mr. Chairman. I rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman may raise a point of order.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The member for Humboldt has just said that I claimed I have never done any wrong. I want to say again that he had better revise his text before he makes this statement. I am frail, like yourself, Mr. Chairman. I do wrong thousands of times, but I have my regrets with regard to those wrongs.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. member for Humboldt may proceed with his remarks.

Mr. NEELY. I will ask you to call it six o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

ALBERTA ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again in Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Alberta Electric Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

On section 14: right to acquire and operate coal mines,

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not see any objection to giving the company these rights. I think the Canadian Pacific railway are operating a coal mine at Bankhead in the Rocky mountains. I do not see any special reason why a railway company should not operate a coal mine or coal mines, because they are the largest consumers of coal.

Mr. OLIVER. I think my hon. friend is in error, I do not think the Canadian Pacific railway are operating the mines at Bankhead.

Mr. FIELDING. It is a subsidiary company.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think the Canadian Pacific railway are operating any coal mines anywhere, neither is the Canadian Northern, although I do not know if they have authority to do so. I wish to repeat most emphatically the objections I offered once before to this Bill. In my judgment the linking together of authority to mine coal and to transport it by rail is detrimental to the best interests of coal mining, and of the consumers of coal who would be affected by this charter. I wish on behalf of the people of Alberta to register a most emphatic protest against the granting of

these powers in this charter. What has been alleged to be a precedent is not a precedent, but if we pass this charter then we will establish a precedent which will no doubt have an injurious effect in the future.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was not aware that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior had expressed an objection to this section. Of course he speaks largely for the section of the country affected, and his views are entitled to very great respect, but it seems to me it is impossible to prevent a railway company from operating a coal mine if it wants to. What difference does it make whether the Canadian Pacific railway operate a coal mine in their own name, or through another company, the stock of which they have acquired. I understand the Canadian Northern have acquired coal fields at Brazeau, and I do not know that it makes any difference whether they operate those fields in the name of the Canadian Northern or another company. There might be advantages in having another company for financial reasons, for the raising of the money on bonds or stock of that company, but if they control the subsidiary company it is about the same thing as if they were all under the same name.

Mr. OLIVER. That point was under discussion when the Bill was up before, and while no one will pretend that the same men who constitute a railway company may not also constitute a coal company and thereby work in unison to the detriment of the public, the reason this company wants this authority to handle coal incorporated in their charter is in order that the two interests shall be interwoven so that the companies cannot be dealt with separately by controlling legislation. Everybody realizes that there must be controlling legislation as to transportation, and most people recognize that there will have to be controlling legislation in regard to coal mining. If the coal mining interest is legally a separate interest it can be dealt with by controlling legislation very much more conveniently and satisfactorily than if it is united by legislation with the transportation interests. Certain special privileges must be given to transportation companies, or they cannot carry on their business. There is no special privilege required for the carrying on of a coal mining business. But when the coal mining business is put under the same legislative authority, and given the same legislative privileges as a transportation company, then there is a danger that it will escape from future legislative control. That I am satisfied this company is seeking, and it would certainly be to the detriment of the public. It is in the interests of coal mines and of the capital invested in them that there should be an absolute separation of interest between transportation and coal mining so that the man who owns the coal mine shall get a square deal in the matter of transportation, and it is just as much in the interests of the consumer that there should be actual competition in the producing of coal that the railway company should stand in the position of a common carrier in dealing with the coal mine operator at the one end and the coal consumer at the other. No matter what the private interests of the individuals who constitute a railway company may be, we know that we have the right of legislative control which we can exercise if they are separate legal entities in a manner that we cannot exercise it if they are not separate.

Mr. HERRON. I am not positive whether or not the charters obtained by other railway companies give them the right to operate, but it is well known throughout the west that the big companies do own coal mines and I think operate them to a considerable extent. The Canadian Pacific railway are operating the Hosmer coal mine, although perhaps not very successfully. The Canadian Northern railway have acquired coal rights all along the foot-hills in fact, between my town and Calgary, and I think the Grand Trunk Pacific have been purchasing or acquiring coal mining rights, although I am not positive about that. The Minister of Railways the other evening said that in the near future parliament would have to interfere with those companies, and take from them the rights they have acquired under their charters to operate coal mines. For that reason I take it for granted that they all have these rights in their charters. In that case I do not see why we should start now to make a precedent in the case of this company and take away the rights they are asking for, and not give them a fair chance to be on a level with other railway companies operating in the western country. That is all I have to say and I do not think there is any more to be said. Other companies have this right, and I do not see why this company should not be put on an equality with the others. It would be a great accommodation to the people if this right were conferred on this company which may serve portions of the country where other larger railroads are not likely to go.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to know if this were agreed to in the Railway Committee, because if so it would influence me very much.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am instructed by the Minister of Railways that this section was agreed to as a compromse. There was a clause in the Bill allowing the railway to operate a telephone company, but that was

objected by the province of Alberta, and an arrangement was made between the province and the promoters of the Bill by which the railway company relinquished its right to the telephone clause which had been passed by the Railway Committee, and in consideration thereof the province of Alberta agreed that this section should be allowed in the Bill. A distinct arrangement was, therefore, made, and if this clause is stricken out then the railway company will have nothing in return for its abandonment of the right to operate telephones. It is pretty well understood that in matters appertaining to their particular departments the ministers in charge are supposed to know more than others and their opinion carries weight. The Minister of the Interior is assumed prima facie to know more about a matter pertaining to his department than would the Minister of Public Works, and the Minister of Railways is supposed to know more about a railway matter than would the Minister of the Interior, and in connection with this principle I quote what the Minister of Railways said this day week, 'Hansard' 5181:

Mr. GRAHAM. I think we had better let it pass. It was explained in the committee pretty fully. In the west the railway companies practically all own coal areas, and operate them in connection with their traffic. It may be that in the years to come we shall have to cancel all these rights by legislation if they are abused. If it should happen that the coal companies and the transportation companies should put their heads together so that where you reduce the freight rates they will add them to the price of coal, it might be necessary to pass legislation in Canada similar to what has been passed in the United States, prohibiting coal companies and railway companies from being one and the same people.

We, therefore, have the authority of the Minister of Railways that in his judgment this is a proper clause to pass, he being at the time perfectly aware of the arrangement made between the parties.

Mr. CARVELL. My recollection is that when the Bill left the Railway Committee it contained the telephone clause, but that the coal clause had been stricken out in the committee. It was discussed to a certain extent in the Railway Committee, and on a vote being taken the telephone clause was left in, and the coal clause rejected. I cannot understand how the Bill gets to this House in its present shape, and in the absence of so many members from Alberta who are interested in the matter it seems to me that the Bill should go back to the Railway Committee for investigation. It is a most remarkable thing that everything we did in the Railway Committee seems to be reversed. In the absence of further light I am still of opinion that the telephone clause should remain, because I do not believe in a monopoly in telephones, and as to the coal matter on general principles I would be opposed to it.

Mr. HERRON. Mr. Chairman, is there a clause (j) added to section 7 in the reprint?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is a paragraph (j) subparagraph of clause 7.

Mr. McCRANEY. My recollection is that when this Bill left the Railway Committee it contained the telephone clause, and did not contain the coal clause, and I do not understand how it now comes before us in its present shape. I am informed that subsequently there was an arrangement for an exchange of clauses, but I would like to be satisfied as to whether the matter came up again before the Railway Committee, and whether it endorsed that arrangement?

Mr. NORTHRUP. This day week the Bill was in the committee, and I quote from 'Hansard' page 5179:

On section 12,
Mr. DOUGLAS. I move that section 12 be stricken from the Bill.
Mr. GRAHAM. Does Mr. McCarthy agree to that?
Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.
Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McCRANEY. That refers to the proceedings of the Committee of the Whole House, but I have been referring to the Railway Committee. Whatever arrangement was made it appears to have been made after the Bill left the Railway Committee and under these circumstances it is proper that the Bill should go back to the Railway Committee. We are creating precedents and these precedents should be carefully considered by the Railway Committee which is responsible for railway legislation.

Mr. BARKER. I do not understand the argument that when the Committee of the Whole House has approved of a clause you have to send it upstairs to a standing committee to get that approval confirmed.

Mr. McCRANEY. I do not understand that the Committee of the Whole House passed on this.

Mr. BARKER. Yes, this day week.

Mr. NESBITT. The Committee of the Whole House ordered that the Bill was to stand over for reconsideration, and that is why we are reconsidering it to-night. In the Railway Committee we inserted the telephone clause and struck out the mining clause, but there appears to have been an arrangement made afterwards between the representatives of the province of Alberta, and the promoters of the Bill to transpose the clauses, and that is what the hon.

member (Mr. Northrup) refers to when he reads from 'Hansard' what was done in this committee the other night. I stated then that I did not like the legislation, but that I was a long distance away from where the road was going to be built, and when the parties agreed I did not see any reason why I should dissent. At the same time I am opposed to the legislation, and would prefer that this Bill went back to the Railway Committee. If the Railway Committee should agree, I personally would not object to it going through, but I think it ought to be reconsidered by that committee.

Mr. BARKER. In the Committee of the Whole House the Bill was agreed to as it now stands. Why should we send it back to the Railway Committee, which is only a portion of the House, for approval, when the whole House agreed to it?

Mr. NESBITT. For the very simple reason that this is a very material change, and that the Railway Committee did not consider it. This change was not proposed by the province of Alberta. That province did not propose to insert the coal clause and strike out the telephone clause when the Bill was before the Railway Committee. It is only because the Railway Committee did not have the opportunity to consider the Bill in the shape in which it now is, that I ask that it be sent back to them.

Mr. McCRANEY. With regard to what the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has said, this House has not yet disposed of the matter. The reason we have a Railway Committee is to have these things considered at greater length than they are likely to be considered in this House. The Railway Committee ought to have before it any arrangement made between the representatives of Alberta and the promoters of the Bill. We will only be doing justice to the promoters of the Bill if we send it back. If there were a majority in this House in favour of striking out this coal clause, the reverse of the arrangement which had been arrived at between the promoters and the representatives of Alberta, those who want to see the coal clause in, would still think that the Bill should go back to the Railway Committee. I think that the Railway Committee is the proper body to discuss these matters before they come into this House.

Mr. OLIVER. What is remarkable in connection with this Bill is that it comes from the Railway Committee in a certain form and then is altered in the Committee of the Whole House in the absence of the promoters. I want to urge upon my hon. friend that this is a matter of too serious importance to be dealt with in that way. It should be dealt with on the responsibility of those whose business it is to take the evidence and ascertain what merit there is in favour of this measure. That is the business of the Railway Committee. If that committee should see fit to insert this clause I would waive any objection, but I do not think it is fair to the country or the House that an attempt should be made to have a clause inserted in the Committee of the Whole House after the Railway Committee have struck it out. This has been alluded to as a compromise. A compromise on what? The railway company ask for telephone privileges and a coal mining right. Is it a compromise that they be allowed a coal right instead of a telephone right? What is there to show that they should have either right?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Other companies have the same right.

Mr. OLIVER. Other companies have not the same right, so far as my knowledge goes, or ought not to have been given that right if they have it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I was present in the Railway Committee the other day when a similar Bill, proposed by an hon. member on your right, Mr. Speaker, had a similar clause in it, and that clause was passed.

An hon. MEMBER. What Bill was that?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). It was a Bill proposed by the hon. member for Brant, and had coal rights in connection with a coal mine in the United States.

Mr. NESBITT. I opposed that very Bill in the committee, but it was voted on and carried.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). That is right. You are just confirming what I said.

Mr. CARVELL. I want to give the true state of affairs in connection with that Bill. That company was not authorized to mine coal or enter into the business of a coal mining company.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Yes, it was.

Mr. CARVELL. It was simply for the purpose of producing coal and distributing it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). What is the difference?

Mr. CARVELL. The reason given by the promoters of the Bill was that they were connected with a steamship line across Lake Erie, and the only way they could make the road a success was to operate the road in conjunction with that steamship line, and it could not be operated successfully unless the company had the right to produce the coal and distribute and sell it. That was a very different proposition from giving a railway company the right to mine coal and go into a general business.

The Lehigh Valley and various companies were mentioned and discussed and the distinction drawn between the Bill referred to by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) and the American companies. This Bill seeks to place this company in the same position as the Lehigh and other big American companies. It gives the right to the company to do the business of transportation and coal mining as well. That is quite different from the matter mentioned by the hon. member for North Ontario. Again the question was raised in the Railway Committee that they might create a monopoly by giving this company the right to purchase, sell and distribute coal, but it was proven to the committee that all the territory which would be covered by this proposed railway was now covered by three other railways. The railway mentioned by my hon. friend was an electric road, and the cases are not all analogous.

Mr. TURRIFF. There is no objection to this railway going into the coal mining business if it does it through a subsidiary company. That is the way other companies are doing, but you put a clause in allowing this company, which is not a steam railway company but an electric railway company, to enable it to go into the coal mining business. The main object of a clause is for promoting purposes, and the arrangement made in the way of a compromise, as I understand the matter, was not made by the Railway Committee, but by the Committee of the Whole House and between two or three members of the House. For my part I am opposed to either clause. I am opposed to giving this railway company the right to go into the telephone business in Alberta. The government of that province own the telephone business, which they purchased; and they do not want other companies to go into that same business. Just the same in the coal mining business.

A great deal of disadvantage may, and does, come to other miners of coal who have not a railway. Put this company on exactly the same footing as other coal miners. They will still have the advantage of having the railway, if they care to take the necessary steps, to go into the coal mining business. To that we can take no exception. But I do take most strenuous exception to any more railway companies being allowed to compete with the coal mine owners who have not equal privileges. This is a most unreasonable clause, and I do not see why its removal should be objected to. These parties can, if they wish, secure a charter, either from the local government or under the Dominion Companies Act, giving them all the powers they want for mining coal, but let that coal mining charter be separate from the railway charter, especially seeing that this is to be an electric railway and is not supposed to be going into the coal hauling business.

Mr. OLIVER. I have agreed with my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff), with regard to the attitude taken on this Bill, but I have to disagree with him on one point he mentions—that this company was not incorporated to go into the coal business. I had not the advantage of reading the charter before, but I find that it is certainly a very remarkable one—it is a blanket charter, covering the whole of the coal bearing area of southern Alberta. If ever there was a charter brought into this House with the deliberate intention of creating a monopoly in the mining and transportation of coal, this is that charter. The works of the company are set out in nine separate divisions.

(a) From a point at or near the city of Calgary to the town of Banff in the Rocky Mountain Park.

(b) From a point at or near the said city of Calgary south of the Bow river, through or near the Thigh Falls, to the city of Medicine Hat, crossing the Bow river at a point between Little Rolling Hills and Grand Forks.

Mr. McCRANEY. All coal lands

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, all coal lands.

(c) From the said railway between Calgary and Medicine Hat, at a point in or near Long Coulee, to the city of Lethbridge.

Everybody knows whether Lethbridge is a coal mining centre or not.

(d) From a point on the said railway between Calgary and Medicine Hat at or near Expanse Coulee to the town of Taber, thence westerly to the city of Lethbridge, thence to the said railway between Calgary and Medicine Hat, at a point on the said railway at or near Long Coulee.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). That is the route of the railway.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, that is the route of the railway. If it has any purpose, it is to gather the coal area of southern Alberta into one merger under colour of a railway charter.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Could not they do that under a separate charter?

Mr. OLIVER. Not to the same advantage..

(e) From a point on the said railway between Calgary and Medicine Hat, at or near the Thigh Hills, to the town of Macleod.

(f) From a point at or near the city of Calgary to the town of Carbon and thence to the Red Deer river at or near the junction of the Knee Hill creek.

Another coal area.

(g) From a point at or near the city of Lethbridge to the international boundary line at or near the point where the south branch

of the Milk river crosses the said international boundary line.

(h) From the city of Medicine Hat to the town of Wood Mountain, in the province of Saskatchewan.

(i) From a point at or near the city of Calgary to the town of Brooks, passing through or near Windermere, Strathmore and Bassano, with power to construct branch lines from the said lines of railway in the districts known as the Canadian Pacific irrigation blocks.

I cannot prophesy what would be the result of the passing of this charter but the Bill carries its purpose on its face, and that purpose undoubtedly is to create a monopoly in the production and transportation of coal in the whole of southern Alberta. They apply to this parliament for a charter to build these lines, which, if they were built, and not under any special privilege, would, of course, be of advantage in the development of the coal mining industry. But when to the privileges of a railway company are added the privilege of conducting a coal mining business in that country, anybody can see what advantage there is to the mine that is connected with this proposed octopus railway as compared with a mine not connected with that railway. It simply puts the men who own the transportation and a few mines in a position to put the other miners out of business. Mr. Chairman, this is a most serious consideration. When I heard the matter brought up first, I thought it was possibly a mere accident that the clause regarding the mining of coal was inserted in the Bill, but, on careful consideration of the Bill, I must say I consider this measure an attack on the welfare of the southern part of Alberta, and, that being my view, I feel bound to confess that while, if that provision were withdrawn, I would say it was a meritorious enterprise, yet, so long as that provision remains in the Bill I would say it is entitled to all the opposition that any friend of Southern Alberta can give it.

Mr. HERRON. How about the Galt Co.? They have been operating coal mines from the earliest days of that country and operating a railway also, yet I have heard no objection. I have not their charter under my hand, but I have always understood it was both a steam railway and a coal charter. What is the difference between a railway company owning a coal mine, and a coal mine company owning a railway? We have been been putting through railway charters—doing it right along—in the part of the country in which I live.

Mr. TURRIFF. The Galt railway was chartered many years ago. It was the first railway, outside of the Canadian Pacific railway, to operate in that country, and the first company in western Canada to operate a coal mine. They have done very good work in the past, and they are doing good work now.

Mr. HERRON. And there have never been any complaints.

Mr. TURRIFF. I have never heard any complaints about them. But they are in a different position there from the coal mining companies in the Crowsnest Pass, for instance. I may say also that I understand, the Galt Railway Company have sold out their railway, so that they have now only the coal mine as a separate work from the railway. Last year, I heard complaints from a mine owner and operator in the Crowsnest Pass. He pointed out that one of the mines was connected with one of the large railway companies, and that mine could always get the large, open, steel cars to load their coal, while the other mines had to take the box cars. That is not a very big matter, but it may easily mean 10, 15 or 20 cents of an addition on every ton of coal shipped, which is a profit in itself. Not only that, but if the railway company is interested in a coal mine, I do not care how the commission tries to prevent it, the railway company and their officials are bound to give the advantage to the mine in which they are interested. That is all we want to obviate. Let this company have their coal mining rights, but let it be a separate and distinct company; and if we have done wrong in the past many years ago by authorizing some company to operate railways and coal mines, the time has come when we should do it no longer, and the time will come shortly when those railway companies that now operate coal mines will have to be dealt with separately, and the interest will have to be separated. In the meantime there is no reason why we should allow this company which professes to be mainly an electric railway company, the right to operate a coal mine.

Mr. HERRON. Deal with them all alike. The minister suggested that the other evening, and I agree to that.

Mr. TURRIFF. So far as I am concerned, they all will be dealt with alike in the future. I will never support again a railway charter, in this House or any other house, that carries with it the right to operate a coal mine. Take another point in this Bill. The capitalization for the enterprise is $10,000,000. This company might very easily utilize the half of that capital, or all of it, in coal mining enterprises, that would be easy to accomplish under this charter. So there is no good reason advanced, except that it has been done in the past, why the House should authorize this company to acquire and operate coal mines; and I hope the good

sense of the company will see that that clause is not allowed to remain in the Bill.

Mr. McCRANEY. There is another consideration I would like to see discussed by this committee. I would prefer hearing the discussion carried on in the Railway Committee, but as the Bill is not being referred there, probably we have to discuss these matters in the House.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Is the hon. gentleman opposed to the clause?

Mr. McCRANEY. I will be obliged to oppose it unless it is referred back to the Railway Committee.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). And what then?

Mr. McCRANEY. Then I will probably oppose it. We are in the habit of granting railway companies other powers than those merely of building and operating a railway, powers, for instance, with regard to the acquisition of water-powers, the building of telegraph and telephone lines, all those powers which are used incidentally by a railway company. Here we have the right given to a railway company to mine coal, a purpose that is not in any sense incidental to or necessary in a carrying company. The point that strikes me is this, that if we give this company the right to mine coal, it has a right to carry its own coal as free as it has to carry gravel, that is necessary on its own road, or its necessary iron, or anything else. Some time there may be an application before the Railway Commission to fix the rates for carrying coal from one point to another. The coal which is mined and owned by this company will be carried free, the cost of carrying must be paid by some person, and I submit to this House that it is altogether likely that the cost of carrying coal belonging to this company will be put over on other coal companies, because coal must pay the cost of its carriage. If this company is allowed to mine coal and to carry its own coal, the Railway Commission may not require any separate account to be kept of the carrying charges of this company's coal, and there will be difficulty in properly apportioning the rates of carrying coal from one point to another, and as between other coal companies and this railway company.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Did not the hon. gentleman support an identical clause in the Bill presented by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris) in the Railway Committee the other day?

Mr. McCRANEY. I do not remember having expressed myself one way or the other, but as I was in the Railway Committee at that time, I am ready to take the responsibility of saying that I did support it. I have no recollection of it to-day. I remember some discussion about it, and for reasons which were given to the Railway Committee at that time, and which were considered by them as sufficient, the thing went through.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). How does the hon. gentleman reconcile that with his present position?

Mr. McCRANEY. The special circumstances, which I need not go into here, were considered by the committee, and were not the same as we find in this Bill.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I happen to have the Bill under my hand to which I referred in my question, Bill (No. 106), clause 11. The clause gives the company power, for the purposes of its undertaking of buying, selling and dealing in coal or lumber, and other commodities.

Mr. CARVELL. If my hon. friend's memory was half as good as it ought to be, he would know, and he does know, that lumber and other commodities were cut out of the Bill; and the hon. gentleman is not quoting the section that passed the Railway Committee, and he knows it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). If the hon. gentleman will have patience, I will tell him that the passage in the section referring to coal and iron was maintained in the clause, and it was on my own motion that lumber and other commodities were struck out, and the reference to coal and ore still remains in the charter. Now I simply rose to emphasize the inconsistency of the hon. gentlemen who oppose this clause in this Bill. It seems an extraordinary circumstance that if the Bill is proposed by an hon. member on the government side, it may contain a clause that is broad enough to include the purchasing and selling of coal, and which would be detrimental to the public interest, according to the arguments advanced by the member for Saskatoon; but because it is proposed by another hon. member of this House, it meets with his disapprobation.

Mr. McCRANEY. I hope my hon. friend is not suggesting that because the one Bill was proposed by a member on this side of the House, and the present Bill was proposed by an hon. member of the opposition, that that fact changes my point of view.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I asked the hon. gentleman how he reconciles his present position with his conduct the other day, and I cannot account for it on any other ground. The clause in the Bill having for its sponsor the hon. member for Brantford, is broad enough to include the purchase of coal mines and selling or dealing in coal, another clause gives the right of selling and dealing in coal or ore. That is comprehensive enough to include coal mines, the company could purchase coal mines and deal

in coal mines; if they can purchase coal, they can purchase coal mines. Consequently, it would be very entertaining and would be a matter of information to the House if the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) would explain and reconcile his two positions.

Mr. McCRANEY. I would like very much indeed to do it before the Railway Committee, but I am afraid there is not time now in two minutes to do it here.

Mr. OLIVER. What section is my hon. friend quoting from?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell), has it before him.

Mr. CARVELL. No, you had better state it; I cannot find it here.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Section 111.

Mr. CARVELL. What Bill?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Bill (No. 106).

Mr. CARVELL. Oh, I beg your pardon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What time is it now?

Mr. NESBITT. In so far as I am concerned I am not subject to the accusation that I was inconsistent. I would like to point out to my hon. friend that the two Bills are different.

Mr. CARVELL. It is only the difference between buying coal and dealing in coal.

Mr. NESBITT. Of course, the hon. member for North Ontario says that 'dealing' means that they cannot buy a coal mine as well as coal mined. Probably he is right. I would not like to dispute that. This road was running through the southern part of Ontario where every little town and village is served with railways that have as good connections as they could get with coal mines.

SUPPLY.

The hour for private Bills having expired the House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Dominion Lands and Parks—salaries of the outside service, $370,000.

Mr. OLIVER. When the committee rose at six o'clock, if the discussion then proceeding has ceased, there was some consideration of certain cases in which persons who had transgressed the law were suffering the penalty. I do not wish to enlarge on this particular side of the question more than to say that in so far as I am aware, and in so far as the intent of the department is concerned, we wish to deal even-handed justice between man and man. We do not want to give one man different treatment from another man. The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) said that there were cases in which men had transgressed the law and had not been prosecuted.

That is the fact. He said that there are cases in which men have transgressed and have been prosecuted, that in some cases men's entries have been cancelled, and they have been given no consideration, and in other cases men have been allowed to purchase at a price. Each case rests upon its individual merits. We cannot pretend to deal with all the cases alike, because if we did that, it would not be the fair way to deal with them, the merits being different under different circumstances. I had the opportunity of making inquiry regarding the cases of which my hon. friend spoke in the interval between six and eight o'clock, and I think the committee will agree with me that these are flagrant cases. One of them is the case of J. A. Cathers. This gentleman had three homesteads, and he has been sentenced, not by the Department of the Interior——

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). In what province?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say what province they were in, but the last case, that which got him into trouble, occurred in Saskatchewan. It was not in Manitoba, and was not in the constituency of the hon. member for Dauphin. John Boyd had four homesteads, and Sam Boyd had two homesteads. Another of the family, William Boyd, had four homesteads, and I understand that proceedings are now pending against him. I cannot give any information as to the details of these cases at the moment. Of course, the papers could easily be brought before the House on an order, but I think the committee will agree with me that when a man has secured his fourth homestead he is not in a position to claim very favourable consideration. He is not in the position of the man who has had one homestead, and who might in some way or another have erred as to his rights with regard to a second. I think it is fair to assume that the cases in regard to which the discussion took place were exceedingly flagrant, and it would not have been fair to the law-abiding citizen, the law-abiding settler who wanted a homestead to have overlooked such flagrant cases. In the present condition of the country where there is a demand for land, and where honest men are honestly trying to get the best homesteads they can, it is not fair to them to allow a man who is not entitled to a homestead to get one, or, if he gets one unfairly, to retain it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know the particulars with regard to all these cases. I believe that Cathers, the man spoken of first by the minister, had perfect liberty under the law to take two homesteads.

Mr. OLIVER. Very likely.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well then, it is scarcely fair to say that he had three homesteads. Having complied with the law the first and second time, he very likely was under a misapprehension when he took the third homestead. I am giving him the benefit of the doubt. It is only one homestead more than he should have taken under the law, as I understand it. I realize that it is a most difficult thing for the minister to know exactly how to get rid of this immorality with regard to the homestead law without doing some injustice to some one, but I think that probably in this case that I spoke of, owing to the family circumstances, the ignorance of the men, their illiteracy and the fact that over a thousand of the best citizens of Dauphin constituency and Tisdale, where this infraction of the law occurred, have signed a petition asking for leniency, I think the minister would not break the heart of any man in this house, and would not hurt his system of running business if he did show leniency in this case.

Mr. OLIVER. I hope the committee does not misunderstand the position. This department has not the power to put a man in jail for breaking the law; the responsibility for administering the criminal law does not rest with us, in this case it rests with the province of Saskatchewan, and if a conviction has been secured, then leniency in the case does not rest with the Department of the Interior, but with the Department of Justice.

Mr. LAKE. Did the department prosecute in his case?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say, but it it very likely did. That is one thing and the administration of the law is another.

Mr. BARKER. You could ask for leniency.

Mr. OLIVER. The department could ask for leniency, but the circumstances as laid out in the statement given to me are not such as to give good grounds for the Interior Department to ask for leniency. The punishment is awarded by an authority over which this department has absolutely no control and leniency in the case is the prerogative of another department of this government than the Department of the Interior.

Mr. CAMPBELL. When a petition is sent to the department signed by the best class of people in the district who knew this man intimately asking the Minister of Justice for leniency, does the Minister of Justice consider such a petition without referring to the Minister of the Interior?

Mr. OLIVER. It is his prerogative and his duty to do so. It is his duty and not mine.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Would it be fair to ask whether in the event of the Minister of Justice referring such a petition to the Minister of the Interior he would suggest that leniency be shown?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think it would be fair to ask me, but I have no hesitation in saying, and I take the responsibility of saying to the House that charged with the burden of administering the law in regard to homesteads in that northwest country fairly as between man and man, in the case of such apparently flagrant violation of the law, if the matter was referred to me for my opinion, I would certainly say I could not recommend leniency in that case.

Mr. LAKE. May I call attention to a case in which there appears to have been discrimination. I brought the case to the attention of the minister in 1907. An order in council is published granting a homestead on payment of $5 an acre to the man whose case I called to the attention of the minister. This man homesteaded in 1902. In 1907 charges were made that he had not been four days on his homestead during the whole time. It was charged that this was his third homestead, and I read to the House a letter in which that charge was made. I subsequently sent a similar letter to the Department of the Interior. There were many applicants for that homestead. The minister decided that cancellation should not take place and cancellation apparently did not take place. The man retained his homestead, and now I observe this notice in the 'Canada Gazette':

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL.

The Minister of the Interior submits, under date the 28th September, 1910, that Mr. John Bradley made homestead entry for the north-west ¼ of section 36, township 21, range 8, west of the 2nd meridian on the 30th October, 1902, and has made application for patent.

The minister states that a report has been made by an officer of the Department of the Interior showing that forty-two acres have been broken, of which thirty were under cultivation at the date of such report. The homesteader has also erected buildings valued at $575 and made other improvements to the extent of $65.

It is shown that Mr. Bradley was not entitled to make entry for this land, having already exhausted his homestead rights.

Thereby proving the contention I had made in the House:

The minister, however, recommends, in view of the valuable improvements which have been made, that authority be given for the sale of the quarter-section in question to Mr. Bradley at the rate of $5 per acre, payable one-fourth in cash, and the remainder in three equal annual instalments, with interest at five per cent per annum.

The committee submit the same for approval.

F. K. BENNETTS,
Asst. Clerk of the Privy Council.

It will be observed that the order in council does not say that Mr. Bradley has performed his necessary duties, it simply calls attention to the improvements which he has put upon the land and is entirely silent in regard to the residence. Therefore, we may take it for granted that the duties have not been done and he has not performed the necessary residence duties, although I have always understood from the minister that the residence duties rank first of all, and that except in the most exceptional cases they are never allowed to be waived. I have seen other orders in council in respect of men who had already exhausted their right of homestead, who had got illegal entries to homesteads, but in these cases it has generally been stated that the minister is satisfied that the second entry was made through ignorance or some such reason as that. In Mr. Bradley's case that is not stated. In all other cases I have noticed it has been stated that all the residence and other duties have been carried out, so we now have one particular case in which illegal entry was made, and in which the minister in his order in council does not even claim that the illegal entry was made in ignorance or by mistake; yet without the fulfilment of the necessary duties that man is given a patent for his land on payment of $5 per acre. It seems to me that is quite as bad a case as the others to which reference has been made, and it would appear as if there had been discrimination in this case. I shall not charge that until I have heard what the minister has to say in respect of it.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not recollect the case and certainly as my hon. friend states it it does look as if this man had got consideration to which he was not entitled. I can only say that if that is the fact I am very sorry for it, and it was not a matter of knowledge or intent on my part. I can assure my hon. friend that as he has called attention to this case I shall take more care in future that such a thing shall not occur again. I shall take the best care I can to prevent it, because I feel that the very foundation of our success—and I think the House will admit that we have won some measure of success in settling that western country—is that there be a feeling of confidence in the fair dealing of the department as between man and man. No harder blow could be struck at the success of our settlement policy than the suggestion that one man is treated differently from another.

Mr. LAKE. Upon whose recommendation would such a matter be decided?

Mr. OLIVER. Sometimes it is on the recommendation of the agent, sometimes the homestead inspector, and sometimes the inspector of agencies, and if there is any question about the case the papers come to me and I go as fully into it as possible and give it the best judgment I can on the evidence before me. If Mr. Bradley has had special consideration I have to accept the blame, but I assure my hon. friend that it was not intentional on my part and possibly the fact that residence is not specified escaped my attention. I can hardly think that the case went through without the residence being actually before me, but if it has I regret it and so far as I am able I will guard against it in future.

Mr. TURRIFF. Apparently the reason Bradley was allowed to purchase the land when possibly the homestead conditions may not have all been fulfilled, was because he was not entitled to an entry, and he was sold the land at $5 an acre so that it was a sale. When he was not entitled to an entry they may not have thought it necessary to insist on the usual homestead residence. This appears to be one of the hundreds of cases that come up, where a man has lived on land for some years, performed a lot of residence, done much improvement in the way of cultivation and buildings, and then it comes to the knowledge of the department that he is not legally entitled to an entry and the question arises what it is best for you to do. In such a case, there is nothing that the minister can do that will not work injustice to somebody, and so you have to consider what it is best to do that will inflict the least injustice. When I was commissioner I had to decide hundreds of such cases.

Mr. LAKE. Did you not decide that residence must be done in every case?

Mr. TURRIFF. To get a homestead patent, but this was a purchase at $5 an acre, and the man was not entitled to a homestead.

Mr. LAKE. He was there since 1902.

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, but the homestead entry was cancelled and he lived on it so long.

Mr. LAKE. It was never cancelled and he never lived on it.

Mr. TURRIFF. No doubt he had done so many improvements that whoever decided the case thought the minimum of injustice would be done by allowing him to purchase the land at $5 an acre. I never heard of this case before, but I can easily see that that is what actuated whoever was deciding it.

Mr. LAKE. It is a very flagrant case and it occurred in my district, and I

brought it to the attention of the House at least twice, and I think three times.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The point is: has a man who makes a false affidavit entering for a homestead and who is only a resident there for a month, any more right to be sent to the penitentiary than a man who makes the same false oath and through some influence can hold the land for a number of years, and then is allowed finally to pay $5 an acre for land which may be worth $20. This man only performed four days' residence in five years. That is a point I would like to know something about.

Mr. OLIVER. This government has no responsibility for sending any man to jail.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The department has.

Mr. OLIVER. The settlement that was made with Bradley for his land does not in any degree prevent Bradley from going to jail if any one can prove the charge against him.

Mr. BRADBURY. Who prosecuted in the other cases?

Mr. OLIVER. I presume the Department of the Interior did.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). If the department is robbed have they not the right to prosecute?

Mr. OLIVER. They have if they please, but in this case they did not apparently consider they were being robbed. I emphasize the fact that we were not compounding any felony in dealing with these men for the land they are in occupation of now.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In other cases the department thought it was necessary to prosecute and did prosecute. In this case they have known for years that Bradley committed perjury and instead of prosecuting him they have rewarded him by giving him the land at a great deal less than its value. The minister has the evidence under his own hand, it is in his power to prosecute, and he ought to prosecute and not make fish of the one and flesh of the other.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Why prosecute in the one case and not in the other?

Mr. OLIVER. Because in the estimation of the department the cases were not on all fours. I have not in my mind the very case referred to, but I presume that in the opinion of the department the cases were not similar. But whether we prosecute or not has no bearing on the liability of the man who broke the law. It was not any law of the department that he broke.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. He robbed the department.

Mr. LAKE.

Mr. OLIVER. We have nothing whatever to do with the criminal law and are not bound to enforce it in any way. Any one who thinks that the criminal law has been violated by this man is at liberty to set in motion the machinery of justice and let justice take its course.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not like to be on my feet so often and appear so pertinacious, but I would like to know why, when the minister has the evidence in his department that this man Bradley, as is affirmed by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) to-night, took at least three homesteads some four or five years ago, and did not conform with the law in any particular at all as far as residence goes, and perjured himself in making the entries—I would like to know why this man has been protected by the officers of the Interior Department and not prosecuted. Instead he gets a presentation of three-quarters of that land and gets for $600 or $800 a homestead worth $2,400 or $2,500. If the minister will say that he will inquire fully into this matter and prosecute this man, if he finds the allegations against him to be true, I have nothing more to say. But if the minister is not going to do that, I shall have a great deal more to say.

Mr. OLIVER. I would not wish to stop my friend's flow of oratory at all, and I cannot give any guarantee as to what action I shall take until I know more of the case.

Mr. CAMPBELL. All I ask is that the minister will inquire into it, and if he finds the facts as represented that he will prosecute.

Mr. OLIVER. There may be extenuating circumstances which my hon. friend is not aware of. I have told him that I shall have the case investigated and take such action as the facts may warrant me in taking, but I cannot bind myself to take any definite action at the moment.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I understand the hon. minister to say that it is not the duty of his department to prosecute in these cases.

Mr. OLIVER. It is not the responsibility of this department to prosecute, but it is the privilege of this department to do so, if it thinks the case sufficiently flagrant to warrant prosecution.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. You really put the responsibility on the province?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not put the responsibility on the province. That is where it belongs.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If it belongs there why is it not left there in every case? What I do not understand is why the Min-

ister of the Interior or the Department of Justice found it necessary to prosecute some of these men and put them in jail, and not prosecute others, but leave their cases to be dealt with by the province. Why not deal with every case or with none?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that I can give any further explanation. The cases differ in degree and we deal with each on its merits, and we do not pretend to be infallible. To suggest that we should deal with all cases in exactly the same way is not a wise suggestion.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I do not say that, but all these parties have perjured themselves, as I understand.

Mr. OLIVER. There may be extenuating circumstances in one case and not in another. The hon. member for Dauphin has been pleading extenuating circumstances in the cases of men who have been convicted, and there might be such circumstances in other cases. No doubt we commit errors, but the policy of the department is to treat all men equally and give each man what is coming to him as we understand it. It is certainly not our policy to treat men differently because of their political opinion. When I was a private member I had a great deal of business with the Interior Department on behalf of my constituency, and I never was asked what were the political views of the men for whom I was acting. I never asked the question myself of any of my constituents, nor did the department ever ask me the question. Since I have had charge of the department. my instructions to the officials have always been to deal with every man according to the merits of his case without regard to his political views. That is one of the reasons why there has been a very considerable measure of success with the administration of the department. It is because the people feel that they are getting a square deal.

Now, if I may be permitted, I wish to say a word to my hon. friends on my right who criticise the actions of the department from the opposite point of view from that of my hon. friends on the other side. The same principle applies exactly. We want to create the impression in the public mind of absolute fairplay between man and man in all the dealings of the department. Those who were members of the House when the Bill of 1908 was introduced will remember that the late Hon. Thomas Greenway, who was a member of the House at that time, criticised the Bill quite severely because it was, as he said, 'too wooden' in its operation;—that is, it did not leave enough discretion to the department to administer the law so as to meet all the variety of cases that can arise. His criticism was perfectly sound and had very good foundation. But he was dealing with conditions as he had known them in years gone by, and condtions had changed. The Bill of 1908 was framed to deal with conditions as they then were—and, even more especially, as they were going to be. When there were two or three thousand homestead entries in a year, it was possible for attention to be given to individual cases, and for all the cases to be carried, as might be said, in the heads of the officers of the department and full consideration to be given according to the actual merits of each case. But with thirty, and forty, and fifty, and sixty, and seventy thousand entries a year, that kind of treatment becomes an absolute impossibility. Under such conditions, a rule must be laid down, and that rule must be followed; otherwise, there can be but one result—confusion and dissatisfaction. Now, it must be admitted that in laying down a rule, you do work hardship in some cases. But my view is that, if we work hardship in some cases—and we alleviate hardship as much as we can—the main point we are striving for is to create confidence in the public mind that there is a square deal for every man in the transactions of the department. And the results show that we have attained it in a very remarkable degree. It is not conceivable that the occupation of the land would have gone on as rapidly as it has during the past year or two if the people had not had full confidence that they were being dealt with on the merits of their application, and without regard to any other consideration whatever. I think it is one of the greatest tributes that could have been paid to the administration of any government that, when, from time to time, we opened for occupation, townships here or there throughout the west, people came by the trainload from the United States and from various parts of Canada in order to take their places in the line to secure their turn in entering for that land. Men stood in line for twenty-four hours, for forty-eight hours,—some, I believe, for seventy hours—

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Women, too.

Mr. OLIVER. Women, too,—in order to get their choice of the land. They would not have done that if they had not thought at anyrate that when they got to the counter they would get a square deal. I think that the actual facts have justified the administration of the department to a most remarkable degree. While we have not been able to meet all possible cases that arose upon their actual merits, we have certainly been able to create in the public mind that confidence which is the very foundation of all success in administration.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Minister (Mr. Oliver) has just told you and this com-

mittee, Mr. Chairman, that his prime desire has been to create the impression in the minds of the people that fairplay is his object. He has gone on to point out that at various land agencies, as land was thrown open, the crowd stood for hours with a desire to have the pick of the land, and that every one who took his position was allowed to pass through the doorway in his turn, and, at the counter, got fairplay. There is no one on this side who would criticise that for a moment. The government, possibly, could not, even if they desired, under the present law and in the open, do otherwise than give entry to every man in his turn. We are not criticising that point. The point we are criticising is that, when the time comes for these people to apply for their patents, the same fairplay is not given by the officials of the department to one as to another. The hon. minister has expressed regret that such things had occurred as were brought to his attention by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake). I will tell the minister how he could remove from the public mind a great deal of the fear that such things can exist. If he were to cleanse his department in the west to some degree; if he would remember that the Conservatives of the west have a suspicion—or a superstition or whatever he likes to call it; it is stronger than either, it is a conviction —about certain appointees of his government that they are not inclined to show fairplay to those tainted with Conservatism, he would do something to realize the wish he has expressed. I refer to such men as Mr. Seale, one of his homestead inspectors—(I do not know that 'Inspectors' is the proper word, but the minister will know what I want to get at). Why did Mr. Seale get that appointment? For no other reason on earth that any Tory in the west can elucidate except that in 1904 he was the returning officer for Dauphin, and, at the eleventh hour he made the Dauphin election a postponed election. Immediately after that he got the appointment at $100 a month from the government. He never served the government in his life except in the way I am suggesting, and in that he was serving only a part of the people and not the people as a whole. Then, go further west, and right in the home town, I think, of my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Neely) is Mr. Duggan.

Mr. NEELY. A good man, too.

Mr. STAPLES. A handy man.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not saying anything against Mr. Duggan personally, except that my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) says he was a very handy man. He was the returning officer for Selkirk at 1904. He had never served under the government in his life. He had been previously to that a bartender in Selkirk. He served under Leach, in what is called among the Conservatives of Manitoba the Thin Red Line outrage, where hundreds of Conservatives were debarred from voting, and their franchise was stolen from them; and the Conservatives believe that was the reason he got employment under this government. I could go on and instance other cases. But this is what I want to point out to the minister, that if he wishes the people on both sides of politics in the west to believe in his good faith—as perhaps we all do, in his personal good faith—but I mean in the good faith of his department in its administration of the land laws, the sooner he gets rid of these excresences, the better for the country.

Mr. TURRIFF. In reference to the remarks of the Minister of the Interior as to complaints made by myself and others in regard to the administration of the lands, I only want to say that I for one have never suggested for a moment that there was any discrimination between man and man on the part of the minister or of the department, because I do not think there is, I never knew of any, at all events. But what I have maintained before the minister himself on many occasions is that while you may be giving all hands the same deal, that deal may be a hard one, and unnecessarily hard. In my judgment there are many cases where leniency could be shown to a settler that is not shown, and that makes it harder for him. Where you have 60,000 or 70,000 homesteaders in a year, forty-nine out of fifty of them go there for the purpose of making a home, for the purpose of fulfilling the conditions. Out of so large a number there are many who find it difficult to fulfil all the conditions of the law at the present time. Owing to the tremendous demand for land, they are forced to go away forty or fifty miles from a railway to make an entry. They go out there with a small means, and travel long distances, they have to haul their goods, their coal and provisions forty or fifty miles, may be, then a prairie fire burns up all the field. They may not be able to spend the winter there, and have to go on further. In many cases a man goes to make a homestead entry, he has a wife and children, and in my judgment great leniency should be shown to him. Where circumstances warrant it, an extension of time should be granted for going on their lands. That is not going to hurt anybody, cannot hurt anybody. In my constituency there are cases where I have applied for these little extensions of time, and for other considerations of one kind or another, many that the minister himself never sees, and the officers write me that they regret that under the regulations of the department it is impossible to grant the request. Now I do not claim that there is discrimination, I know there is not, but I

claim that some consideration might be shown with advantage to the settlers. The object of the Homestead Act is to settle up the country, we want settlers, and we want to keep them there. But there is many a good man who finds himself in a difficult situation because, especially of late years, there is a percentage of men who make homestead entries, and who are not bona fide homesteaders, and on their account bona fide homesteaders, who are at a disadvantage as to means perhaps, have to go further and have to suffer. I think the minister could well show greater leniency in many cases to the settlers than he does now, and nobody would be hurt, and nobody would have a right to complain.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Turriff) that a good deal of leniency should be shown to the homesteader in western Canada. I sympathize with him as fully as any person, because I took up a homestead in western Canada in the early days, and went through all the hardships. Now here we have two cases. One is that of a man named Carruthers, who went to work and took up two homesteads. He was entitled to these two homesteads, but he went a little further and he took up a third homestead, and he took a false affidavit in order to get this third homestead. I am told by my hon. friend from Dauphin who knows the man very well, that he is a good Tory. The department finds out that this man is a good Tory, they also find out that he has done something wrong, and they go after him and send him to jail for a year or two. My hon. friend from Saskatchewan tells us of another case under the very same circumstances. He is entitled to two homesteads, and he goes to work and takes one more homestead that he is not entitled to. This man turns out to be a good Reformer, and the department allows that man—I do not say it is because he is a Reformer, but it looks a good deal like it—allows that man to buy his homestead for $5 an acre, and he does not have to go to jail. Now the hon. minister told us that in many cases where they got mixed up in their homesteads some were charged $2, some $3, some $4, some $5 and some $6. I would like to know according to what standard the minister charges $2 to a man who should pay $3, $4 or $5 for those lands. He also says that he has no right to prosecute these men. I think if there is any man in Canada who is responsible for the land of this country it is the Minister of the Interior. If Canada is being robbed of her land, if it is not the minister's duty to go after the people who are robbing Canada, I would like to know whose duty it is. I would like the minister to tell us by what standard he charges one man only $3 and another $4 or $5 for the same land.

Mr. OLIVER. It would be hard to make a general statement that would cover the questions my hon. friend has asked. If he mentions an individual case I would be able to give the reasons by which we arrived at our conclusion in regard to that case. But to give him any general statement that would be a definite guide to the conclusions we have reached in cases which differ so tremendously in character, would be a very difficult thing to do.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). In what way will they differ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are some cases where a boy takes land and he is under age, there are some cases where a man has done a great deal of improvement, another man has done residence and not much improvement, there is another case where the department may have had reasonable grounds for believing that the man acted in ignorance; there are nearly as many differences as there are cases. In these circumstances I do not think I can give my hon. friend any very full details. He was in error in one thing. We do not sell at $3 per acre unless in cases outside of the pre-empted area, for the reason that I have already stated. Within the pre-emption area the standard price is $3. Therefore, in settling such a case outside of the area we must reasonably charge more than $3; otherwise it will be practically extending the pre-emption area over the whole country.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). The reason I mentioned $3 was that the minister had spoken of $3 before six o'clock.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but that is inside of the pre-emption area, but in cases outside of the pre-emption area we naturally have to charge more.

Mr. LAKE. I see that outside of the pre-emption area a man named Charles R. Duxbury was given his land at $3 an acre, the statement being that he had failed to perform his residence duties. There the minister recommends a sale at $3 an acre.

Mr. OLIVER. That is not the same case as that in which a man has committed perjury in order to get a homestead. I might explain to the committee that there are cases where a man has fulfilled in a reasonable measure his obligations as to residence and cultivation, but for some reason which seems to the department to be sufficient, is not able to complete his residence so as to entitle him to the patent. The committee is aware that we cannot issue a patent unless and until the man is able to swear, and to bring two other witnesses to swear, that he has completed his duties in every

particular. If a man is short of his residence and the circumstances are such that it is not possible or practicable to complete his residence and he stands in danger of losing the time he put in and the improvements he has done on his land, we cancel his entry and sell him the land, and in some cases we sell it to him at one dollar per acre.

Mr. LAKE. The reason for his failure to perform the residence should be stated in the order in council. It generally is in these cases, is it not?

Mr. OLIVER. Sometimes it is, and I suppose it should be in all cases. I want it to be understood that if we sell at $1 an acre, as we sometimes do, it is because there has been a substantial fulfilment of the requirements but not a legal fulfilment of the requirements. We sell at that minimum price because the statute absolutely prohibits the issue of a patent unless the evidence is there that the duties have been fulfilled.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word or two along general lines in support of the remarks of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). I think I would not be doing justice to the administration of this department if I did not repeat some of the things I said before six o'clock as to the impartiality with which the department is administered. I have probably written, not a few hundreds, but a few thousands of times, in behalf of homesteaders and settlers to the Department of the Interior, and my most serious criticism of that department is that to my mind there is not sufficient leniency shown to the homesteader and settler. As to discrimination between man and man or as to any consideration of political views and opinions, I have never seen anything of the kind in any single case. The only case that has ever come under my personal observation where the department held a court investigation, was the case of a warm personal friend and supporter. There was some doubt as to whether or not he had actually fulfilled all the requirements of the law as to the residence duties. There was no question about his cultivation duties, because he had broken some 140 acres out of a quarter-section and had cropped this land for a number of years. But, there were contradictory statements of the neighbours. This man, who is a good, substantial citizen, although he claimed to have performed sufficient resident duties on his homestead was not able to furnish absolutely conclusive proof thereof, with the result that what, to my mind, was a very severe sentence was passed upon him. He was asked by the department to go back upon the homestead and perform his residence duties over again. I have brought that case to the attention of the department, I do not know what their action will be, but I am free to say that it is the only case of a court investigation that has come under my personal investigation. The man is a Liberal, a supporter of mine, but that had absolutely nothing to do with the consideration of his case. The witnesses whom he called, while giving it as the best of their knowledge and belief that he had performed sufficient residence, were not able to give days and dates, with the result that he did not obtain his patent when he made application for it, and, as a result of the investigation, he is compelled to go back upon the land. But while taking this position and while defending the administration of the department in so far as the question of partiality and impartiality is concerned, I am free to say that there are some features of the Dominion Lands Act and some features of the administration of the Act, that to my mind bear somewhat heavily upon the homesteader. Mind you, that with all the authority and responsibility of the Department of the Interior and of the government in connection with the public lands of western Canada, neither the department nor the government should view or consider themselves in the light of proprietors. Neither the department nor this government are the proprietors of our western lands; they are simply the administrators. The lands belong to the people, and while a certain standard must undoubtedly be maintained, the rules and regulations of the department should be so framed as not to make the required duties too burdensome, too onerous, and too much of a hardship to the individual homesteader or settler. Men go thirty or forty miles away from the railway, and in days gone by many men have gone 150 miles, and even more, and homesteaded under our homestead regulations and laws.

These men who have to transport over those distances their furniture, the lumber with which to build their houses, their supplies from the nearest market and their produce to the nearest market, are entitled to every consideration, and the homestead conditions, instead of being such as to make it difficult for these men, the honest men, the sincere men, who desire to live on the land, ought to make his duties as light and easy as possible. Western members realize the great difficulties with which homesteaders are confronted. Men of some means who take up homesteads or purchased land can obtain for themselves even in their homestead days many of the comforts which they have enjoyed in the older parts of Canada or in other countries, but many of those who go into western Canada have but limited means and perhaps large families, and the struggle that some of these homesteaders pass through in the three years before they obtain their homestead patent has in many cases been a thing pitiable to consider. It

is this aspect of the homesteader's life that I am bringing to the attention of the minister. The officers of the department ought to be imbued with this spirit of the homesteaders' life and every rule and regulation laid down by the minister for the direction of his officers and for the administration of the Lands Act should have in consideration this feature of the settler's life.

I wish to point out one or two features of the present administration of the homestead rules and regulations which I think might fairly be considered. Take for instance the homestead year. The law says that the homestead year is a year from the date of entry or from the commencement of residence. There may be cases where men have put in their residence and where the six months does not correspond absolutely with either of these periods. To my mind the spirit and the intention of the Dominion Lands Act is that the man puts in six months' residence in each of three consecutive periods of 12 months is fulfilling the spirit of the law. I wish to call attention to the case of the man who performed his residence duties by living on purchased land. I suppose that that provision was put in the Dominion Lands Act to enable the man who wished not only to homestead but to purchase land to make his selection of which land he would live upon, whether it would be on the homestead or on the purchased land. What we want in the west is settlers, men who will settle on the land and will cultivate it, not speculators, not men who take up a homestead in order by hook or by crook to lead the department at the end of three years to believe they have performed sufficient duties to entitle them to patents. We want actual settlers and if a man resides on purchased land instead of on his homestead, and fulfils his residence and cultivation duties faithfully, even if he has only paid 50 cents an acre on that purchase land, surely he has fulfilled the requirements of the Act. The department does not hold that view. I cannot understand how it is possible to make an arbitrary decision as to what constitutes ownership of land. I do not think that the payment of 95 per cent or 99 per cent of the purchase price constitutes ownership any more than the payment of 5 per cent. So long as the man who has sold the land is content to give a contract for that land to the purchaser and is satisfied with the way in which the purchaser is living up to the conditions of that contract it would appear to me to be a fair proposition that the department would leave that question to be settled between the man who sold the land nd the man who purchased it.

I quite realize that the regulations are made fairly strict in order to prevent fraud on the part of those who would obtain patents for land without having performed sufficient residence, cultivation and other duties, but there is a possibility of leaning too far in the other direction, and, for the sake of hunting down the guilty, making the innocent man suffer. My view of the administration of the Lands Department is that it would be better to let one guilty man escape than to have 99 innocent men bear a heavy burden simply to prevent the one guilty man from getting away with a homestead quarter-section without having performed sufficient duties.

I simply wish to impress on the minister that the spirit of the administration and of the rules and regulations of the department should be one of sympathy with the homesteader, and that where it is possible to show leniency, leniency should be shown in the interpretation of the law.

Mr. OLIVER. I quite accept the criticism of my hon. friend (Mr. Neely), and I appreciate the spirit in which it is made. I would not wish to think that a department so closely affecting the life of the western country was not the subject of consideration by those who have western interests at heart, and, of course, if a thing receives consideration that consideration cannot by any possibility always be favourable. I agree with my hon. friend that it would be a mistake for the government to consider itself as proprietor of the western lands. It is only the administrator of the lands in trust for the people of Canada, and particularly for the people who are going to become the occupiers. No man in this House and few outside of it know of their own knowledge the condition of the homesteader, the difficulties he has to overcome, and what might be called the tragedy of homesteading better than I do. No one has greater sympathy for the homesteader than I have, but in administering this trust there must be consideration of its purpose which is to secure not only the cultivation but the occupation of the land. That is the principle underlying the homestead Act. It is not enough that the land shall be occupied, or cultivated temporarily; the purpose is to secure permanent residence and any administration that lost sight of that ultimate purpose would not and could not be satisfactory. There is properly an insistence upon residence on the land because that is the main condition of the ownership of the land without payment of a price. It is of little account to the people of Canada if the land once passes out of public ownership, though every acre of it were brought under cultivation, unless it becomes in fact as well as in name a land of homesteads with citizens in occupation of these home-

steads. Every consideration is given to the man who by his conduct indicates that he intends to become a permanent occupant of the land. The best evidence that the law and administration is satisfactory to the vast majority of those who are in occupation of the land is the fact that their numbers are increasing from year to year The man who makes the complaint is the man who is not willing to fulfil all the conditions that are imposed upon him, and this man is in an insignificant minority as compared with the large majority of settlers who find the regulations absolutely satisfactory to them, and who become owners of the land and establish citizenship in the country. It is essential that there shall be continuity of settlement, and the man who holds a homestead without occupation of that homestead is not doing what is fair by his neighbours, who depend upon his being on his land to keep up the good of the neighbourhood. It is because of this that the law is framed as it is, and that we have insisted more strongly in recent than in former years upon fulfilment of the actual conditions. In justice to the legitimate settler who is on the land and fulfilling his duties his neighbour must do the same thing. It is true we do extend leniency and that we consider the requirements of individual cases, but it is also true that when you do grant leniency outside the ordinary routine you at once raise the question of discrimination, and those who have not required any leniency to be extended to them are apt to consider that the man who gets it is getting an unfair advantage. The large majority of cases where men have needed leniency and have not got it are due to the objections of their neighbours. The department, of its own motion, has hardly ever cancelled a man's entry; every cancellation is made on the application of some other man who says he wants that land. The difficulties we have in administration are not difficulties between the government and the settler, but between settler and settler. What we have to guard against more than anything else is to allow the idea to get into the minds of settlers that one can get an advantage which the other cannot. I find that people will quarrel more about the trifling advantage which one man in a settlement is supposed to have got than about something of real importance to the whole community. There will be more letters written to the department complaining that some men have got a little extra advantage than there would be if a real hardship were inflicted on the whole settlement. The very complaint which my friend from Qu'Appelle has made with regard to this man Bradley is an evidence in point. Bradley paid $5 an acre for his land, he did certain duties, he paid what other people have paid, but my hon. friend thinks there has been some discrimination in his case—it could not have been a very great discrimination—and he thinks that a serious wrong has been done. I am not prepared to say that everything was right, even in that very case, but a thing of that kind will reflect more discredit on the department than possibly anything else which has occurred; and that is simply due to the fact that we dealt with that case leniently. My sympathy is absolutely with the settler. The administration of our land should be absolutely in their interest. But when leniency is asked, that means discrimination, and discrimination means a grievance in the minds of those who do not require leniency and consequently do not ask for it.

Mr. TURRIFF. In order to illustrate what I mean by a little more leniency being exercised on certain occasions, let me give one case I had to deal with. Two men, father and son, made homestead entries at a sub-agency and got their receipts. It is true that printed on the receipt in red ink were the words that the receipt was not absolute until the case was reported to the head office. But these men were foreigners, Frenchmen, who did not read English. The son could not speak English at all, and the father very slightly. The entry was made at the sub-agency of Weyburn. No doubt the sub-agent told the men they would have to wait until the papers went into Estevan before they would be absolutely certain that they would get their homestead, but these men did not understand English and they thought they had an absolute entry. The son got a homestead and the father, who had homesteaded already, purchased a pre-emption and paid $160 beside the $10 fee. They went out and broke up thirty acres and built a shanty before they became aware that one of these quarter-sections had already been entered. That quarter-section was the homestead which the son had improved. They did not speak English and consequently could not be made to understand. They came back to Weyburn and went to a lawyer, and the lawyer wrote to me. I went to the department and the case I put before the department was simply this. They said: We will give up the land if we get paid for the work done. That is usually what is done. The government in granting the re-entry, would make the man pay for the improvement, but the son said: My father and I live together, we must homestead close together, and there is no use of my going twenty miles further and taking another homestead unless my father can go there too and purchase a homestead alongside of me. The department insisted that under the regulations the $160 paid on account of the purchased homestead could not be refunded for a year, and in spite of all I could do—and

the father was a good supporter of mine—I could not get the department to allow that $160 to be refunded at once or applied on another purchased homestead. The father could not get his $160 back and could not take up another purchased homestead until he got it back, so that he and his son were prevented during a whole year from getting another entry. These are the regulations, no doubt, but it is a simple case in which the department should exercise leniency in administering these regulations. I do not think there is any regulation on earth that should compel a man to stay idle a whole year because $160 of his money is in the hands of the government and he cannot get it back. That is a case in which I claim the regulations work absolute injustice, and all I ask is a little bit of common horse sense applied to each individual case, and have each case dealt with on its merits. That man should have been allowed to have his $160 credited on the second purchased homestead even if the son and the father were both absolutely in the wrong. I am not saying that they were, for it is quite possible that the sub-agent made a mistake, but even if they were, leniency should have been exercised and the regulations should not have been allowed to interfere with a bona fide settler settling on his land.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Can the minister give offhand any information as to what extent these irregularities in making application for homesteads, to which the applicants are not entitled, have been carried on? I do not think they can have been to any great extent.

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid there has been a good deal of it, but of course all the cases we have dealt with have been published in the 'Gazette' and the number is not very large. I am afraid, however, that there are a good many which have not come to our attention. There is, I am afraid, carelessness in dealing with these matters, and a lack of consideration on the part of people in many cases which is not creditable. I introduced the purchased homestead preemption in the Land Act of 1908 in order that a person who had exhausted his homestead right could get legally another chance, and that no doubt did relieve the situation to a very great degree.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. We have been dealing so far with the applicants for homesteads whose irregularities got them into trouble, and in some cases into jail. This year I have had a number of cases similar to the one of which I intend to give as an illustration to-night. And I am not presenting this case because I have had any trouble with the officials of the department. On the contrary in everything I have had to do with the department, I have found the officials very courteous. They have never in any way refused recognition or consideration. But this is a case in which the officials to my mind have not given very satisfactory explanation to me, or to the parties for whom I have been trying to get an explanation. As I said, we have thus far been dealing with the applicant. But there seems to be in the case which I wish to put on 'Hansard' a fault on the part of the department. In the first case, the applicant is at fault, and the applicant has to suffer. But in the case to which I wish to refer, the department is at fault, and yet again, the applicant has to suffer. That does not seem fair. They call it an error. Well, let me read this case which I have referred to. Here is a letter addressed to myself and dated Cartwright, December 31, 1910.

Re S.W. 5-37—9 W. 2nd.

Mr. Elijah Owens of this place has called to see me with reference to the above lands. It appears that he went west in the early part of the year and after a great deal of trouble and expense homesteaded the above quarter. The Land Office received his money and issued their usual interim receipt, &c. Subsequently Mr. Owens was informed that the south half of this quarter was patented on the 31st of December, 1907, to the Canadian Northern railway, and advised that if he was not satisfied with the eighty acres left, his entry would be cancelled. His main grievance is that the Land Office should have known of this and prevented him from taking the land after having incurred the expense necessary to homestead. Mr. Owens advises me that his travelling expenses locating the land amounted to $50. He had five acres broken on same at $4 per acre, making $20. He paid an entry fee of $10; his whole expenses being $80. You will see that this means quite a loss to Mr. Owens, as he does not want an eighty acre farm and will have to abandon same.

Now, I claim that in this case, the department made a mistake. Mr. Owens went to a great deal of trouble to go west and homestead this quarter-section. He did his breaking and fulfilled all the requirements; but later, was informed that half of this quarter-section had been patented to the Canadian Northern railway. The minister (Mr. Oliver) being familiar with the west will know that eighty acres will be practically of no use to the man and that it will be better for him to give up the quarter, and all that he asks is that he be refunded his expenses, because of the error of the department. And here is the answer of the department.

Ottawa, January 20, 1911.

Dear Sir,—With reference to the letter to you from Mr. John D. Loughlin, in re S.W. ¼ of 5-37—9 W. 2nd, I beg to state that there is no provision in the Dominion Lands Act under which the department would have authority to grant the compensation asked for by Mr. Owens——

I think that is along the lines on which hon. gentlemen opposite have been talking. It is pretty hard to get over the explanation made by the minister that you must have some law, and hold to that law, or somebody will be saying that you have been partial. I quite understand that.

—on the ground that he was granted entry for the above described land in error, the south half of the quarter-section having been patented to the Canadian Northern Railway. Mr. Owens has been advised that if he did not wish to retain the available 80 acres as a homestead his entry would be cancelled and a refund of the entry fee would be made to him. I may state that under section 15 of the Act authority is given to cancel an entry which may have been granted through error.

With regard to compensating Mr. Owens for the breaking performed by him, I beg to state that under the practice of the department a homesteader who obtains entry for land upon which improvements have been made is called upon to pay to the department the value of such improvements, which amount the minister may in his discretion pay to the person who placed same upon the land. If, therefore, the breaking——

I call special attention to this.

—mentioned by Mr. Owens is upon that portion of the said S.W. ¼ of 5 which is available for entry, the value, if any, of the improvements would be collected should re-entry be granted.

Now, the minister (Mr. Oliver) made use of some splendid sentiments about justice between man and man, and said, as I understood him, that all cases were considered on their merits. That is the way I think they should be considered. Here is a case that, I think, should have been treated on its merits. As I said, I am not finding fault with the officials of the department; but I wish to bring this case, as I promised I would do, to the attention of the minister. Here is a case in which a man not only went to the trouble and expense of making a journey and taking up land, but also of doing some breaking on the land. And he has lost the opportunity of getting his quarter-section. I believe that Mr. Owens should receive back from the department that $80. I understand the department to say that they have no fund from which they could make such a payment. But they have all the funds there are in connection with the government; and, if the error is theirs, if, in the first place, you are going to say that the man who makes an error, has to suffer the penalty, why should not the department, when it makes an error, suffer the penalty? This is a sample of at least three or of four cases that I have had during the present session. I believe this is a case to which the minister should give some consideration; and I do believe that Mr. Owens should receive back his $80. Even then, he will have suffered a loss.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no doubt, this gentleman has suffered a hardship, and because of the error of the department. It is also a fact that provision has not been made for dealing with such a case, and, therefore, we are limited in our dealings to just exactly what has been done. We could collect the amount of the improvements from any subsequent entrant and pay them to the gentleman who made the improvements. But we should have no warrant for dealing with travelling expenses, and I think myself it would be very doubtful policy to go so far as to pay travelling expenses in such a case. It might be argued that Mr. Owens had incurred travelling expenses looking over land, but there was other land in that part of the country as well as the land he took. His expenses might be arranged in some way that, if he took another homestead we could give it to him without incurring travelling expenses or something of that kind. I am satisfied it would not be possible, under the circumstances, to meet the demand for travelling expenses.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They might be cut out.

Mr. OLIVER. We must admit that we were in fault. If it were possible to give the gentleman a consideration—as sometimes has been done—as I say, there is no fund from which to draw, but sometimes where we have wronged an individual in that way we try to make it up to him should he take a subsequent entry by some consideration in the matter of duties or something of that kind. But that is the only way that the regulations allow us to deal with it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Could not that be changed? Is it a fair regulation?

Mr. OLIVER. It may be that it would be proper to make a change to meet such cases. But there have been very, very few of them, and the loss is not a very serious loss. If the gentleman is taking land elsewhere, we might meet his wishes in some way in regard to fulfilment of duties, or in some other way that would be satisfactory to him.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Will the minister take this letter and write me as to what will be done?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before this item carries, I would like to bring to the notice of the minister some details in the Auditor General's Report of last year. I have referred to two of the employees of the department, and have suggested to the minister that if he wanted the confidence of the general public he had better let them go.

In the Auditor General's Report, K—53, I find a reference to one R. E. A. Leech. He is put down here as an inspector of agencies at Brandon, with a salary of $3,000 a year and expenses. Is that the same Leech that is famous in Manitoba, or infamous, according to the point of view, since 1904, who is called the Thin Red Line Leech?

Mr. OLIVER. I think this gentleman has been called the Red Line Leech?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Might I ask how did a gentleman with a nickname of that kind come to be appointed by a government that is desirous of getting the confidence of the public?

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman was appointed before I became minister, I found him in the position, and I must say that I have found him a very efficient and faithful servant.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am glad to know that the minister finds him efficient and faithful. But there are one or two things concerning him I wish to mention. He has a salary of $3,000 a year. Then there is an item for board, lodging and horse feed, $1,073.15. Would the minister tell me what is meant here by horse feed?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not offhand give my hon. friend the detailed information. I understand that Mr. Leech's accounts are now before the Public Accounts Committee, and I am sure that every detail possible will be arrived at by that committee. In a general way, I can answer the question about horse feed. Mr. Leech's duties require him to visit the different land agencies in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. In addition he is from time to time employed in taking evidence in questions of the fulfilment of homestead duties, and in many such cases he has to drive to the locality in which the investigation is held and requires to have a horse.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I see an item for livery, $287, which does not seem to be in harmony with an item for horse feed. Then he charges for fares, $1,350, and pullmans, $379. Besides getting a salary under which presumably he is able to board himself, he is being paid between $4 and $5 every day in the year over and above his salary. Then there are other accounts for postage, telephones, rents and so forth, a number of small items, all charged up to the government. Here is another item, material and labour on a shanty, $141. What shanty is that, might I ask the minister? That is not where you lodge him, surely, when he is at home?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not answer what the shanty was for, I will make inquiries.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It would be interesting for the committee to know whether you are going to have any more shanties built.

Mr. OLIVER. These accounts are all before the Public Accounts Committee, where there is every opportunity of threshing them out. It is possible this shanty may have been some temporary erection in connection with some land rushes that took place when special arrangements were made for taking care of arrivals.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In looking further, I find letters in regard to this same man written by the Auditor General which show that he does not have the same confidence in Mr. Leech which is now expressed by the minister. On K—126, I find a letter written from the Audit Office in Ottawa, dated February 22, 1910, signed by J. Fraser, Auditor General. Referring to Inspector Leech's travelling expenses. He says:

I have before me the expense accounts of Mr. R. A. E. Leech, inspector of agencies, for the period included between April 1 and October 31, 1909, and would ask your attention to the following remarks thereon:

1. In no instance does Mr. Leech make use of return tickets on the railways, but charges single fare in all cases. While on some of his trips, which are of a roundabout nature, return tickets could not well be made use of, still there are others on which a saving might have been made by the purchase of return tickets. For instance, there are about twenty trips between Brandon and Winnipeg for which $4 each way is charged. The return fare should be only about $6.70, which would have made a saving of $1.30 on each round trip. Again, on a trip to Ottawa and return, $33.80, the ordinary single fare, is charged each way. The regular return ticket from Winnipeg to Ottawa, however, is $59.45, so that a saving of $8.15 might have been effected on this trip. There are other trips on which, I think, return tickets might have been advantageously made use of.

I would make the suggestion to the minister that if there is any doubt in the mind of the watchdog of the treasury, the Auditor General, that any employee of this government is not absolutely honest in his accounts, a very much better method to follow than that at present followed would be to compute for a certain time the average expense and have an arrangement made with the different railways so that passes could be had and the average passenger rate paid straight from the government to the railway companies, thus removing any inducement in the way of an official who was mistrusted by the Auditor General to bring any onprobium on his name either rightly or wrongly.

3. With reference to livery hire, it appears that Mr. Leech is under a misapprehension with respect to the necessity for vouchers. He states that, according to his information,

livery vouchers are required only when the bill amounts to a considerable sum. In the November statement no single charge is for more than one day's livery hire, the highest for which is eight dollars. Eight dollars, however, would represent a very heavy day's drive, or the drive of a day and the good part of a night. I am advising Mr. Leech that sub-vouchers are required for all payments for livery hire.

4 and 5. With respect to meals on dining cars, Mr. Leech informs me that when he commenced work for the department and for some time afterwards, the price of meals was $1, which only required the keeping track of the number of meals in connection with his expenses. When these rates were changed by the railway companies it was only for the purpose of increasing their charges, and now it is a very poor meal one can get by limiting the price to $1, but as it is more convenient he has adhered to the old plan, although the meals have cost him considerably more.

To conclude, I might say that I have instructed Mr. Leech to bear your remarks very carefully in mind in future, and to make out his accounts in accordance therewith. I trust the explanations given with respect to the accounts already rendered will prove sufficient.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

W. W. CORY, D.M.

The Auditor General.

I made the suggestion to the minister that something should be done to provide that no such even indirect charge be brought against an official of the government as is contained in this letter of the Auditor General, and I would like to know how he takes my suggestion before I go on if he has anything to say.

Mr. OLIVER. No; I do not know that I have anything to say. I was rather of the opinion that this letter of the Auditor General is not a charge against Mr. Leech. It is a certain direction as to how his accounts were to be made out. I do not think it throws any implication upon Mr. Leech's honesty in regard to his accounts.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. He says that there are overcharges.

Mr. OLIVER. In that letter.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Not in that letter, but as you go along.

Mr. OLIVER. I followed the letteer and I did not find anything that would reflect on Mr. Leech's honesty. He is not considered to be as careful in the transaction of business as he should be, and the Auditor General points out how he should carry on his business so as to be less expensive, but there is no imputation of dishonesty.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Perhaps the minister will read another letter from the Auditor General, dated March 11, 1910. It is headed:

Mr. CAMPBELL.

INSPECTOR LEECH'S EXPENSES, INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN FARES CHARGED AND TRANSPORT ORDERS ISSUED.

I would like the minister's special attention to this, because I think it is very important. The letter I read a moment ago was answered in a certain way by the Deputy Minister. This one is not answered and I would like the answer to-night.

Audit Office,
Ottawa, March 11, 1910.

Sir,—I beg to call your attention to certain inconsistencies between the fares charged by Mr. R. E. A. Leech, inspector of agencies, in his expense accounts and the amounts paid the railway companies for tickets supplied to him on transportation orders.

Order No. 1036 is for a single ticket from Calgary to Edmonton, delivered Mr. Leech by the Canadian Pacific railway ticket agent at Calgary on October 15, 1908. Order No. 1361, dated October 16, 1908, is for a single ticket from Edmonton to Regina, delivered Mr. Leech by the agent of the Canadian Northern railway. This order is stamped by the Canadian Northern Railway at Edmonton on October 23, 1908. On referring to Mr. Leech's accounts for the month of October, 1908, it would appear he arrived in Calgary from Banff on October 15——

That is the day that he got the ticket from the Canadian Pacific railway agent.

—that he remained in Calgary until the 17th, on which date he left for Brandon direct, charging in his account a single fare ticket from Calgary to Brandon. He returned to Calgary again on the 19th, and on the 21st went back to Brandon. On October 23, the date on which the order was stamped at Edmonton, Mr. Leech appears to have been at Medicine Hat, on his way from Calgary to Brandon.

We, on this side of the House, recognized his capacity for taking care of personation, but we did not know that he could be in two places at one time in his own person.

Order No. 1041 is for a single ticket from Calgary to Edmonton, delivered to Mr. Leech by the Canadian Pacific railway agent at Calgary on April 27, 1909. Mr. Leech's expense account shows that while he was at Calgary on April 27, 1909, he left on that date for Regina and did not go up to Edmonton.

Surely this is something that the minister ought to take into consideration.

Order No. 425 is for a single ticket from Regina to Prince Albert, supplied Mr. Leech by the agent of the Canadian Northern railway on May 10, 1909. Mr. Leech's expense account shows that he arrived in Regina from Brandon on May 10, that he stayed in Regina until the following day, when he left for Winnipeg. He does not appear to have gone to Prince Albert at this time at all.

Surely that is something else for the minister to take into his consideration. The department was paying his way into

a different point at the same time as he had a ticket to go somewhere else, both tickets being paid for by the people.

Order No. 2152 is for a single ticket from Regina to Prince Albert, supplied to Mr. Leech by the agent of the Canadian Northern railway at Brandon on July 21, 1909. According to Mr. Leech's expense account he arrived in Brandon from Arcola on July 16 and remained at Brandon until July 23——

The ticket he had got from Regina to Prince Albert was dated July 21.

—on which date he went to Winnipeg. He does not appear to have been at Prince Albert any time during the month of July.

Another case of personation. I am glad to notice that the nod of the minister is so emphatic that he must agree with me that Mr. Leech is an adept at impersonation.

Order No. 444 is for a single ticket from Regina to Prince Albert, delivered Mr. Leech by the agent of the Canadian Northern railway at Regina on July 30, 1909. From his expense account, Mr. Leech appears to have arrived in Regina from Banff on July 30, and to have proceeded the same date to Brandon, and not to Prince Albert.

He had a ticket for Prince Albert for which the people paid at the same time as he had obtained a ticket presumably for himself to go to Brandon.

Mr. Leech should have to explain why he issued transportation orders in his own name in the above cases, when his expense accounts show that he was travelling in a totally different direction. It is probable that the tickets supplied on the transportation orders in question were not for his own use, but for the use of other officials. If such was the case the name of the official using the ticket supplied should have been endorsed on the transportation order, or still better, the transportation order should have been issued, not in Mr. Leech's name, but in the name of the official actually using the ticket. A full explanation of the circumstances under which each order was issued should be furnished by Mr. Leech.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

J. FRASER, A.G.

The Deputy Minister of the Interior.

That letter was written from the Audit Office, March 11, 1910, and as far as I can learn no answer has yet been returned to it. I would like an explanation now.

Mr. OLIVER. I notice there is no answer in the Auditor General's Report to that letter. The reason is that there was some delay in answering and the answer which should have appeared in the Auditor General's Report was too late for insertion. I have here a copy of the answer to that letter and I shall place it on 'Hansard.' It reads:

Dear Mr. Fraser,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 30th ultimo, in which you draw attention to the fact that you have never received a reply to your letter of the 11th of March last, relating to certain transportation orders issued by Mr. R. E. A. Leech, inspector of Dominion Lands agencies, which appear to conflict with his expense accounts. In reply, I beg to say that you will doubtless recall that in the year 1908, Mr. Leech was placed in charge of a general seed distribution which was conducted in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. It was originally contemplated to bring employees of this department from various Land Offices to assist Mr. Leech in his work, but owing to the unprecedented demand for seed grain of that year and the extent of the work involved in distributing it to needy settlers, it was found necessary to employ a great many temporary men to assist in various capacities. Some of them were sent out on special trips to various points and in such cases were given transportation orders by Mr. Leech in his name or the tickets were secured on Mr. Leech's order and given to them. In no instance, however, were such orders used except on government business.

I understand that Mr. Reid of your office lately called on Mr. Leech and went into this matter fully. I presume that probably you have his report ere this.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) W. W. CORY.

Deputy Minister.

John Fraser, Esq., Auditor General.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is satisfactory, except that the department had to be jogged five or six months after and asked for a statement with regard to it. I shall read another letter from Mr. Fraser with regard to the same Mr. Leech, with reference to his sleeping and parlour car charges:

Audit Office,
Ottawa, March 14, 1909.

Sir,—In my examination of the accounts of Mr. R. E. A. Leech, inspector of agencies, for the seven months included between April 1 and October 31, 1909, it appears to me that the charges made by him for accommodation on sleeping cars and on parlour cars are considerably in excess of the advertised rates for such services. I inclose herewith a statement showing the various charges made by him, the correct amounts, as nearly as I could determine them, and the apparent overcharges. In making out this statement, I have been guided, as far as possible, by the amounts advertised by the transportation companies. In other cases, however, I have been guided by the charges made by other officials for similar services. In a few cases it was difficult to determine whether the trip was made during the day or by night. In such cases I have been guided, as far as possible, by the charges for meals on the dining cars, as during the night these cars are not open. The amounts allowed by me, in the column headed 'correct charges' are subject to modification. Mr. Leech, however, should be asked to justify each charge made by him and to refund any overcharge.

When the Auditor General seriously makes a statement of this kind and absolutely says that Leech has been overcharg-

ing the department, I think it is time for the department to seriously take the matter into consideration and ascertain the facts. Either Mr. Fraser or his clerical staff is incompetent, or Mr. Leech is dishonest. In saying that I do not wish to say anything detrimental to the capacity and capability of the Auditor General and his staff.

Mr. OLIVER. That letter is replied to on the following page as follows:

Department of the Interior,
Ottawa, June 10, 1910.

Dear Mr. Fraser,—Referring to your letter of March 14 last, with reference to the accounts of Mr. R. E. A. Leech, inspector of Dominion Land agencies, relating particularly to the sleeping car charges, I beg to say that I am now in receipt of an explanation from this official. He says, in effect, that he has always found it difficult to determine whether all the charges are in accordance with the sleeping car schedules. He has only recently been able to borrow a Canadian Pacific railway official sleeping car schedule, but even from this he has not been able to determine the rates in many cases. Those which the schedule shows plainly, however, indicate that his charges are correct, except a charge made on April 7, Winnipeg to Nokomis, $4. In this case the through rate, as shown on the schedule, is $3, but if the trip had been broken or sleeper had been engaged, say from Winnipeg to Elkhorn and then from Elkhorn to Nokomis, the cost would have been $4.

I inclose you herewith a statement from Mr. Leech showing you the charges as he has been able to verify them from the schedules, but the schedules are somewhat intricate, and he has only given figures where there was no question as to what the charge should be. I trust you will find the explanation satisfactory.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
W. W. CORY, D.M.

The Auditor General.

There follows a statement of affairs made by Mr. Leech, taken from the schedule and compared with the schedule of fares and Mr. Leech makes the assertion that the correct fares have been charged.

Mr. STAPLES. What authority had Leech to issue those orders to any other individual? It seems to me that he takes a great deal of authority upon himself. In Manitoba, to our dissatisfaction and discomfort, he took on himself authority to do what he saw fit with the voters' lists. Now, I understand he takes authority to issue to other agents travelling orders which I am led to believe are simply from a little book of coupons on which the ticket agent issues tickets. It would only take an hour or two to get an order from the minister to issue these transportation orders. Mr. Leech manages to carry on things in a high handed way and apparently he has some hold on the government which enables him to do just as he pleases, and in his case the government dare not say their souls are their own. He draws a salary of $3,000 a year which he augments to $7,000 by other expenses. I believe the government could get a competent and honest man to discharge Mr. Leech's duties for a far less salary. And yet, the government goes on employing him from year to year notwithstanding that all these doings of his have been brought to their attention. It is time the minister should call a halt on Mr. Leech and investigate his transactions.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Leech was a commissioner with full responsibility to see that the seed grain got out and no technicality in regard to the issue of transportation or anything else was to stand in his way. It was a case of delivering the goods, and Leech delivered the goods in time, to the satisfaction of the people, and to the very great benefit of the country at large. He could not have done so had he been hampered by a requirement to appeal to Ottawa for issue of transportation when it was required. It is true that Mr. Leech is an expensive official. It is true he has a high salary and that his travelling expenses are very high, but I do not think they amount to more than is paid to other men in private life who are engaged in duties that are not any more responsible and that are not discharged with any greater ability. Although I did not appoint Mr. Leech I want to say on his behalf that his services as inspector of Dominion Land agencies, and in the position we have frequently placed him in as acting as a sort of court in case of dispute as to homestead duties, and particularly in the administration of the seed grain distribution, have been eminently satisfactory so far as my knowledge goes, and I take this opportunity of saying so.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. He charges a dollar fare from Brandon to Winnipeg and there is no such fare.

Mr. OLIVER. Are you complaining that he does not charge enough?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. He charges 50 cents too much each time.

Mr. LAKE. The Canadian Pacific Railway folder gives the charge from Brandon to Winnipeg at 50 cents, and every time Mr. Leech charges double the legal fare.

Mr. OLIVER. I know he is an expensive man.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. He is worse than that, he is a dishonest man.

Mr. OLIVER. That can be threshed out before the Public Accounts Committee better than here and it is open to my hon. friend to prove Mr. Leech's dishonesty if dis-

honest he is. He is certainly at their mercy to make what they can out of him in the Public Accounts Committee, and I assure them he gets no protection from me.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If he travels by night in a pullman car from Brandon to Winnipeg the fare is two dollars, but in the day time the fare is 50 cents, and he apparently charges one dollar.

Mr. STAPLES. If the department had the public interest at heart they would have asked Mr. Leech before now to supply the names of the persons he employed in this case of emergency. The minister says that Leech was able to deliver the goods, and we all know he is a pretty handy man at delivering the goods, particularly on one occasion when he delivered the goods to the electors of Manitoba.

Mr. OLIVER. That was the time he failed to deliver the goods.

Mr. STAPLES. He did not fail to erase the names of electors who were entitled to vote.

Mr. NEELY. What is the matter with your law in Manitoba?

Mr. STAPLES. The law is all right, but this Dominion official was all wrong. It is time the government took means to inquire into this man's actions more closely and that his services were dispensed with. That is my opinion of the honesty and efficiency of that gentleman no matter what the opinion of the Minister of the Interior is.

Mr. LAKE. The Auditor General's report makes out that in 83 trips during 7 months there was an overcharge made, and Mr. Leech only attempts to explain 23 of them. Until he has cleared himself of the charge that he has been systematically over-charging and putting the balance in his pocket Mr. Leech should not be allowed to act in the semi-judicial capacity he is constantly called upon to fill.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the hon. minister how it was that Mr. McLean, who is employed in Winnipeg at $5 a day, was sent out just a month before the last local election in order to distribute scrip and was paid $10 a day extra. I cannot find out where he was distributing any scrip at all, but he was supposed to be a heeler for the Liberal party at the local election. It was in October that he was out doing that work, and he should have been paid at the end of October or in November. But he was not paid until the 1st of March following. By delaying payment, the item never appeared in the Auditor General's Report until a year and a half after the work had been done. The result was that the government were paying this man $5 per day in Winnipeg while he was absent from his work, and $10 a day besides for working in the local elections of Saskatchewan and Alberta. And at the same time this man meets Leech who was travelling all over the province, and the stubs of the tickets will show that while he gave certificates say from Calgary to Edmonton, he was travelling from Calgary to Regina. The inference to be drawn is that he had a lot of political workers going around the country and paid by the department at Ottawa. It is all very fine for the minister to say to us: you can go before the Public Accounts Committee and prove what you say. But how can we prove it? Leech will swear that these men were employed to run out and examine somebody's farm or something of that kind. The Act was illegal, it was defrauding the country in an underhand way, and the Minister of the Interior must have instructed Leech and McLean to do that kind of work. Then the minister held the payments over from October until after the 1st of March. Why did he not pay the men at once? I ask the minister now to explain that transaction and clear it up if he can. Then if it should come before the Public Accounts Committee, we will have the minister's statement, and see if Leech and McLean will confirm it.

Mr. OLIVER. With regard to Leech and the tickets he issued to other people in his own name, I can only say that the case was one of urgency. A great deal of work had to be done in a short time, and it was important, not only to the individuals concerned, but the country at large, that it should be done. Mr. Leech tried to exercise his judgment in these matters, and I am prepared to stand right behind him in that transportation. I do not wish to be understood that I am going to stand behind Leech in any investigation that shall be made in the Public Accounts Committee into all his financial transactions with regard to his own expenditures. If dishonesty can be shown against him, he will have to take the consequences; but so far as the issue of special transportation was concerned at the time of the issue of seed grain, I take the full responsibility. It was a case of urgency. Leech had full authority, and I have every confidence that what was done was done in the interests of the public. With regard to W. J. McLean, whatever there may be against Leech as being a political worker, there is no such charge against McLean. Mr. McLean was an old employee of the Hudson Bay Company, over 70 years of age. On account of his knowledge of the Indian language and character and his general desire to be employed, we gave Mr. McLean this particular work of paying the Indian treaty money and taking evidence with regard to half-breed scrip in the far northern country north of Prince Albert. The ordinary time of the year for paying treaty money was in

that month. McLean was paid by the two departments because he was working for the two. He was paid by the Indian Department for his work in paying out the treaty money, and by the Interior Department for taking evidence with regard to halfbreed scrip. The idea that Mr. McLean could under any circumstances be valuable politically is utterly preposterous.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister has let the cat out of the bag. McLean is no political worker, but during the month before the local elections he was sent out with this treaty money. It was not so urgent months before to pay this treaty money, but it became very urgent within two or three weeks of the election. McLean did not go out to buy votes, but here are a lot of electors in a local election who want their claims settled, and McLean was sent out to pay them. Is it not astonishing that for months previously the minister would not settle this claim, and just a month before the elections he sent out a good honest old gentleman, whom no one would suspect of being a political leader. He sent him out to get the evidence and see who had claims. Some of the claimants he did not pay. He did not pay until after the election, and then went out to find all those people who had claims. He did not mention politics, of course, but there was a man guiding him around who was known as a political heeler. The minister knows better than that. He says it was very urgent and that they had to be settled just then. Of course it was urgent to carry the election.

Mr. CARVELL. Did the Indians have votes in the election?

Mr. REID (Grenville). What about the halfbreeds? Have they not votes? They got scrip just the same as the Indians. The minister fixed the whole scheme and sent McLean just to get votes. He sent Leech out with seed grain of course, because of course that was necessary, but Leech was sent out when the local elections were going on. The minister should get up and acknowledge that the whole thing was a political scheme from start to finish. The men delivered the goods, there is no doubt about that; but they delivered them with money taken from the people of this country, illegally as I claim. The minister can ease his conscience by saying that he did not go out himself buying votes; but it was an act he would not do in his private business, though in a public matter of this kind it is easy for him to settle his conscience if his conscience is at all pliable.

Mr. CAMPBELL. With regard to the items referred to by the Auditor General in his letter of transportation issued by Mr. Leech to some one else, I can readily understand that it might be absolutely justifiable under the circumstances the minister has just cited in the case of the distribution of seed grain, though I do not see why a man could not buy his ticket and charge it up to the department in the manner usually followed. But I have yet to learn—and I would like the minister to note this—of any part of the Northwest provinces which sow at the end of July or in October. Why, then, should grain be distributed for seed purposes at these dates? The minister will find that of these five cases only two were in April and May when seed grain possibly could have been used, and the others in July and October. The reason the minister alleged surely cannot be the correct one.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to other times of the year, of course the same justification does not exist. I do not pretend to justify Mr. Leech issuing transportation under ordinary circumstances. But, as I have already said, so far as the seed grain distribution is concerned, I must stand by him in that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not finding fault with that, but these are absolute charges brought by the Auditor General against this man Leech. One of these dates, as I have said, is October 23. There is no seed grain distributed then, unless it be winter wheat, and there was none grown in that part of the country at that time. And July 23, and July 30—you don't sow anything then.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no seed distribution at that time. I will inquire of Mr. Leech as to these. And, in the meantime, if the Public Accounts Committee are sitting on Mr. Leech, I can only advise them to go at him and find out for themselves. In the other cases, we will try to find out his explanation.

Mr. ROCHE. The minister is placing too much emphasis on the investigation about to take place before the Public Accounts Committee. I believe that all that has been done so far is to move for the papers. Whether there will be an investigation or not will depend wholly upon the character of these papers. But, with the charges contained in the Auditor General's Report, the minister should not have satisfied himself with a waiting action by the Public Accounts Committee, but should have investigated the accounts and had Mr. Leech on the carpet to make an explanation. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has referred to the fact that Mr. Leech could easily have verified the charges by looking up a Canadian Pacific railway folder. But if we are to take Mr. Leech's word for it, we must take into consideration how difficult it is for him to secure one of these folders. Here is this great transcontinental line with its immense business; and Mr. Leech is in Winnipeg——

An hon. MEMBER. In Brandon.

Mr. ROCHE. Yes, but he goes to Winnipeg sometimes in an election. And he would have us believe that it was three months before he could secure a folder, and then he had to borrow one. Mr. Cory's letter replying to the Auditor General is dated June 10, and begins 'Referring to your letter of March 14.' That is, it took until June 10, for this explanation to be forthcoming. And it proceeds:

I beg to say that I am now in receipt of an explanation from this official. He says, in effect, that he has always found it difficult to determine whether all the charges are in accordance with the sleeping car schedules. He has only recently been able to borrow a Canadian Pacific railway official sleeping car schedule, but even from this he has not been able to determine the rates in many cases.

How puerile that explanation is. It is ridiculous that we should be told, as a lot of intelligent men, that for three months he could not secure a Canadian Pacific railway folder in order to find the accuracy of these charges. I think an explanation should have been demanded of him by his superior officer, the Minister of the Interior, long ere this. In these large expenses, in addition to a large salary of $3,000 per annum, there is a chance, with a gentleman who does not bear the most enviable reputation, to get in small graft, and even large graft, by overcharging his expenses, unless the vouchers are forthcoming for everything expended. Mr. Leech's head office is in Brandon, but he appears periodically in Winnipeg, and usually at the time of an election. In the last provincial election he had business that kept him almost constantly, I am informed, in the city of Winnipeg. He used to be the provincial organizer for the Liberal party in the province of Manitoba, and it was understood that because of his services in that capacity that he was given his present position. No doubt, his knowledge of political affairs in that province was valuable to his party. I believe that in the provincial election in Saskatchewan, his services were needed, espcially in Regina. But he is not the only official who interests himself in that way. At page K-56 of the Auditor General's Report, we find the name of Mr. Ostrosky, who receives $100 a month and expenses, and who is a most active political agent. He came into my constituency during the late election and went through securing naturalization papers for the Galicians at no expense to them, of course, the money, no doubt, coming from the political party in whose interest he was acting. Now possibly the Minister of the Interior may be entirely ignorant of those circumstances. But whoever is responsible, this gentleman at any rate, who is an official of the Interior Department, has been very active during election time. I draw this to the attention of the minister so that he may make inquiry into the circumstances himself. He has expressed himself more than once in this House as being opposed to his officials taking part in elections. But in regard to Mr. Leech's expenses, I hold that the Minister of the Interior should long ere this have made a personal investigation into the charges made against Mr. Leech, in view of the correspondence that we read in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not for a moment throw responsibility on the Public Accounts Committee for the proper conduct of the affairs of the Interior Department. It is quite proper, as the hon. gentleman has said, that the accounts which are investigated by the Auditor General should be investigated by the department, and I propose to see that that is done. I merely offered the suggestion to hon. gentlemen that by the Public Accounts Committee they had an independent means of arriving at all the facts in regard to these accounts.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is now midnight, and it will take us hours to get through with Mr. Leech. I would ask, therefore, that the government allow us to adjourn.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.52 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 20, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. W. D. STAPLES (Macdonald) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 146) to amend the Interest Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to remedy certain grievances which at present exist, more particularly in the western provinces, where there is a great deal of buying and selling of land. For instance, if a farmer wishes to increase the amount of a loan on his land, he is at the mercy of the company which has made the existing loan, and if he desires to pay off the loan, he has to pay the bonus stipulated in the mortgage, which is sometimes very excessive. This measure is proposed for the purpose of remedying these grievances, and making it easier to conduct business in the buying and selling of land in the west.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 138) for the relief of Gertrude Maud Grant.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 140) for the relief of Mary Hamilton Johnston.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 141) for the relief of Dalton Mabel Stapleton.—Mr. Tolmie.

ANGLO-AMERICAN ARBITRATION TREATY.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Orders of the Day are taken up, I notice that a good deal of interest is being exhibited at the present time in the suggestion of Sir Edward Grey as to the desirability and the possibility of obtaining an arbitration treaty between England and the United States. As this would appear to be a matter of very great and far-reaching importance, in which I have no doubt Canada as well as the mother country and the United States is interested, equally with all other civilized countries in the world, I would like to ask the government if they have had any communication with the Imperial government or with the United States government on this subject, and if so, if they have anything which they can communicate to the House and through the House to the country?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The government has received no communication whatever, either from the Imperial authorities or from the United States on this very important subject; but I have no hesitation in adding that if it were in the power of Canada in any way to help towards such a laudable object, we would be only too glad to do so.

THE GOVERNMENT'S TRADE POLICY.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I asked the Prime Minister a question which you, Sir, cut off, so that he could not answer. It was in connection with a matter brought up by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell), that is, a speech made by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), in regard to which the Prime Minister said:

> The statement made by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) was quite consistent with our policy, it was nothing new, and he had perfect authority, not only he but every member of the Liberal side, to make that statement.

I asked the right hon. the Prime Minister, what I would like to repeat now, whether his remarks also applied to the British preference?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think, Mr. Speaker, that our policy is generally well known; but if it needs to be further explained, it will be in the Budget speech of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. STAPLES.

Mr. BLAIN. If I understood correctly the Prime Minister's statement in reply to the hon. member for Dauphin, it was that every Liberal member had the liberty of making the statement, it being the policy of the government. Would not the members of the opposition have the same liberty?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes; and I would hope they would avail themselves of it.

Mr. FOSTER. This suggests the question: About what time may we expect the Budget speech to be delivered?

Mr. FIELDING. The House has been occupied so long in a discussion which has taken the form of a Budget debate that we have not been able to reach the Budget proper. It will be brought down, however, at an early date.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. NEELY.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt). Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the patience of the House for a few moments on a question of privilege. In a somewhat heated incident which occurred in the House on Friday afternoon, of which the member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) and myself were among the chief actors, a statement was made by the member for Dauphin which I did not catch at the time, but which I find reported in the public press of the country, and also in the Unrevised 'Hansard. As this statement, or insinuation, contained in a certain question asked by the member for Dauphin, reflects very seriously on my honour as a member of this House, and has been sent broadcast throughout the country, I think it only fair that it should be taken into consideration. On page 5669 of 'Hansard' appears the following statement:

> Mr. CAMPBELL. He had better talk of his honesty? Where is the capital of Saskatchewan? What does it cost to vote for it?

And on the next page the member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes), referring to some remarks which I had made in reference to the member for Dauphin, made this statement:

> Did he sell the capital of Saskatchewan?

At the moment there was so much confusion in the House that I did not catch the words of the member for Dauphin, and I did not know that he had made use of such words until I saw them in the columns of the public press on the following day. I did catch the word 'honesty' but the rest of the statement I did not catch; and as it reflects very seriously upon me, as a member of this House, I rise to a question of personal explanation and privilege. If the House will pardon me a moment, I should find it necessary to explain to some

extent what my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) referred to. As many hon. members know, it was my good or ill fortune to be a member of the first legislature of the province of Saskatchewan; and one of the first important questions that came before that legislature was the question of the location of the capital. It so happened that the majority of the supporters of the government of that province came from the northern part of Saskatchewan; and in the west it is well known that the two chief competitors or rivals for the honour of being the capital were the cities of Saskatoon in the north and Regina in the south. I am free to say that, on the part of many of us, our personal inclinations were in favour of Saskatoon; but when we came to Regina and the question came to be decided, we discovered that the government intended to deal with it as a government measure and had decided to make the capital where it had been for many years, in the old city of Regina. Some of us had even gone so far as to express publicly I was not one of them—our preference for the selection of Saskatoon, but as the government had made the choice of Regina a government measure, we decided to support the government rather than insist on our personal preference, and I personally have no regret for the action I then took. In the debate in the provincial legislature a certain member of the opposition twitted government supporters with having supported the government measure against their own sentiment and suggested that coercion had been used by the First Minister of Saskatchewan in order to compel them to do so. He also went so far as to make the insinuation that possibly the first minister, or some one on his behalf, had used other means to induce his followers to support it. But upon being challenged by the first minister to make good his insinuation, he refused to make any charge against any supporter of the government and the incident closed so far as the House was concerned and no reference was made to it afterwards. The opposition press of the province, however, took up the insinuation and published it broadcast. That insinuation was to the effect that the government of Saskatchewan or its prime minister, or some one on his behalf, had used other means than persuasion to influence certain members to support the government in its location of the capital. In the general election which followed, these insinuations were not believed by the people, and the men who were subjected to them were returned to parliament. It would appear that a lie has sometimes a long life, and these slanderous insinuations were again brought to life in the debate on Friday last by the hon. members for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) and Dauphin (Mr. Campbell). It has been my privilege to serve the constituency of Humboldt not only in this House, the short time I have been here, but during the first term of the legislature of Saskatchewan, and I want to say to my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell), who has repeated the insinuation, that, so far as I am personally concerned, if he can adduce one particle of proof that, in my public capacity as a representative of the constituency of Humboldt, either in the local legislature or this House, I have ever done anything or cast a single vote for financial reward or hope of financial reward or from any other motive than a sense of public duty, I shall forfeit my seat in this House. I want to go further and say that if, as the representative of the people, he can find one single instance in which I have rendered a service to a constituent of mine, as a public man, for financial reward or hope of financial reward, my seat is vacant in this House. I did make a certain statement with reference to the hon. member for Dauphin on Friday last, which he denied. That statement was that he had said a certain thing in the last local election in the province of Manitoba. He denied having made that statement and I accepted his denial. I accepted it as an acceptance due from one hon. member to another. And to-day I appeal to the hon. gentleman, as an appeal from man to man, that he should either withdraw the insinuation he made or let me know—and I think it is only fair that I should know—what foundation he had for making it. As I have done him the credit of accepting his denial, just as I would accept the statement of any member of this House, I appeal to him either to accept the denial that I make of the insinuation he cast upon me or furnish some proof of it.

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL (Dauphin). I have listened very carefully to what has been said by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely). There is no man in this House who regrets an incident such as that which occurred on Friday night more than I do. But while I say that, I wish the House to understand that I do not consider myself in the least degree responsible. We all regret instances of that kind. We all at times, under provocation, are apt to forget what is due from one to the other, and are apt to make statements off the bat which are perhaps too emphatic and not capable perhaps of being proven to our satisfaction. The speech just made by my hon. friend from Humboldt gives the answer to the question that he propounded to me. What I said on the floor of this House contained no specific charge against the hon. member, but of course he is at liberty to put on it what interpretation he chooses. He has himself admitted—and I do not propose to

adduce any other evidence than what he has himself given with regard to the innuendo—that it was stated on the floor of the Saskatchewan legislature that other means had been used to persuade members from the north of the province to vote for the choice of Regina as a location for the capital of that province instead of Saskatoon. That was my authority for making the remarks I did. It was stated, under flaring headlines, in the newspapers in the northwest, that some influences had been brought to bear, not party or political influences, but others, to induce members to deviate from their loyalty to the town in their own part of the country, Saskatoon, to which they were pledged to give their support in the question of whether Regina or Saskatoon should—

Mr. NEELY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) is wrong. No man was pledged.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What pledges a man, Mr. Speaker? Is a promise given to a friend not a pledge? I leave it to 'Hansard' to say whether the hon. member (Mr. Neely), in his remarks a few moments ago, did not state that some had made a promise to their friends, and, for my part, I consider a promise made is a debt unpaid.

Mr. NEELY. I did not say anything of the kind; I said they had expressed sentiments in favour.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was careful not to interrupt the hon. member when he was speaking. I have the desire that every member of this House has, to have every member, regardless of his party politics, appear at his best; and that is the reason I did not interrupt him. But we have from him now an interruption of my words. I do not desire this House to ask for me, and I do not intend to give them, an interpretation of my words. I am quite willing to accept the interpretation put upon my words by the hon. member for Humboldt. At the same time, I want to tell him, when he gets up in this House and says that the facts of the case do not bear out the interpretation that he himself put on my words, I am quite willing, as a member of this House, to accept his word frankly and freely. I think that that is all that is necessary to settle the matter.

PRIVILEGE—VALUATION OF THE YACHT 'WANDA.'

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). It is not often that I rise in this House to a question of privilege,—I do not know that I ever have done it before. I would wait for the motion which is expected within a short time to bring forward the matter to which I wish to speak, but, as I have to refer to a past debate, I might be ruled out of order. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) on Thursday last, as will be seen by referring to page 5584 of 'Hansard,' speaking when I was not in the House, spoke of a matter that had taken place in the Customs. I have the return before me, but if hon. members will refer to 'Hansard,' they can trace the whole transaction showing that it was carried out in the ordinary course of the business of the department. Yet it was placed before this House in a light that is unfair,—I need not use a stronger word—unjust, very unfair and very unjust, to the officers of my department. I, therefore, on their behalf, wish to bring the matter before the House. The case referred to was that of a yacht that had been bought by Mr. Travers—or, rather, not bought, but received by him as a gift, and, as a gift, of course, unaccompanied by an invoice. The usual course was followed. There had to be a valuation by one of our appraisers duly qualified for that purpose and that was done. Mr. Travers wrote to Mr. Calvert to ask him if he would bring the matter before the commissioner. He had a conversation with the commissioner, and, subsequently, he wrote a letter to the commissioner. I will not take up the time of the House by reading the whole correspondence, as it is given in 'Hansard,' at the page already referred to, but I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as hon. members on this side, to go through the whole matter so that they may see how very, very unfair and unjust the hon. gentleman was in the remarks he made at that time and the conclusions he sought to draw from the facts he gave. This was an ordinary transaction. The hon. member (Mr. Sharpe, Ontario) makes the point: Why did not Mr. Travers write to the Customs Department himself? Why did he ask Mr. Calvert, the Liberal whip, to do it? There is not a week passes but members of parliament bring matters before my department with reference to their constituents, and sometimes with reference to those who are not their constituents. The hon. member (Mr. Sharpe, Ontario) is surrounded by those who have done the same thing. They bring these matters to our department, and they are examined into, their representations are heard, and then the department does what it considers to be right in the matter. That was what was done, and that is all that was done in this case. The hon. gentleman from North Ontario omitted reading the letter from Mr. Travers to Mr. Calvert in which he asked Mr. Calvert to have the departmental machinery to be used in making valuations put in motion, at least that letter is not in 'Hansard.'

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Was that letter in the return brought down?

Mr. PATERSON. I think it was. It is in the papers before me which purport to be a copy of that return.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I think I read the whole correspondence.

Mr. PATERSON. I refer hon. members' to show that that letter is not there. The hon. member (Mr. Sharpe, Ontario) said:

Not only did Mr. Calvert exercise his influence with the Finance Department in connection with the passing of this certificate through the Treasury Board, but he exercised his influence with the Customs Department on behalf of Mr. Travers. I moved for a return the other day in connection with a pleasure yacht which Travers had transferred from the register at Detroit to Brockville. Mr. Calvert seems to have been under some obligation and Mr. Travers wrote to him, August 18, 1909, just when everybody was clamouring for an investigation, when the insurance department of New York State was asking for an investigation into the affairs of the bank. Mr. Travers was doing everything he could to stave off that investigation. Instead of writing direct to the Customs Department we find him writing to Mr. Calvert as follows:

Then, after reading that letter, the hon. gentleman comments as follows:

That is about a month after the loan to Mr. Calvert. Travers writes to him asking him to get his boat passed at a low valuation. Mr. Calvert writes to Mr. McDougald, Commissioner of Customs, on the 19th of August, after having a personal conversation with that gentleman. His letter reads:

Then he reads the letter sent by Mr. Calvert and comments further in the following words:

So you see Mr. Calvert, the Liberal whip, had personally interviewed the Commissioner of Customs with a view to getting the boat through the Customs at a low valuation, and actually suggested the valuation. If the Minister of Customs were here I would ask if that is the way the Customs Department is managed. This transaction came to light by accident, and I would ask how many entries are made through the Customs Department on the advice of the Liberal whip. It is an extraordinary circumstance and the Prime Minister should take cognizance of the matter.

It was not necessary to appeal to the Prime Minister to take cognizance of a matter passing in the Customs Department. Any charges made or insinuations thrown out the minister of the department is quite competent and willing to deal with.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) was not in his place. That was the reason I appealed to the Prime Minister.

Mr. PATERSON. It was not necessary to appeal to the Prime Minister. The matter came to my notice the next morning in a paragraph in the newspaper. I was asked if I had seen the very extraordinary charge made—very unjust.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I rise to a point of order. When an hon. member rises to a question of privilege, is he not confined to a personal explanation? I do not think he has the right to use a question of privilege to make an attack on another member of the House. I want an opportunity to reply, to justify what I have said.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has sat long enough in this House to know the custom of the House in relation to questions of privilege I assume that he will observe the rules of the House.

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly. As I explained, had it not been that it was necessary for me to refer to a past debate, I should have waited for the motion that is soon to be presented to the House. Then he reads another letter. Then we have a letter from Mr. Farrow. The commissioner wrote that the only way to have a valuation of the boat made would be for one of our special officers, appointed as an appraiser, whose duty it is to make valuations in all parts of the west of machinery to go there and make an examination. I have to ask my hon. friend a question. He says the boat was valued at $1,600, by our Dominion appraiser Mr. Boughney. I have here a communication from the collector of customs at Brockville, whose duty it would have been in the absence of the special appraiser to make this appraisement. The collector at Brockville says that he was aware of the valuation that he approved of it, and that the boat was not worth any more. The hon. member says:

The valuation is interesting. I am informed that the boilers and engine alone for scrap iron would be worth several thousand dollars. It is a most expensive yacht, and it is valued on the suggestion of Mr. Calvert at the low sum of $1,600. Mr. Calvert suggested $1,000 or so,——

And that is not an ingenuous statement.

—and the Customs Department being in an accommodating mood split the difference and made it $1,600. That matter should be taken cognizance of by the leader of the government. Mr. Calvert had been the instrument in securing the passing of the Farmers' Bank certificate; he was the instrument in having the yacht 'Wanda' passed the customs at one-twentieth of its true value. Why did not Mr. Travers deal direct with the Customs Department instead of using the Liberal whip to secure the valuation of a boat worth thousands and thousands of dollars at $1,600. The Customs Department through the influence of the Liberal whip was defrauded out of hundreds of dollars in duty.

One of my deputies has sent me the following extract, within the last two or three minutes:

The former Liberal Whip, Mr. W. S. Calvert, now a member of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, had introduced Mr. Travers to the Minister of Finance. He had also used his influence with Hon. Wm. Paterson, Minister of Customs, to have Mr. Travers' yacht 'Wanda' passed through the customs at the low valuation of $1,600.

I need scarcely say that I knew nothing of the transaction whatever as my officer writes me. He says:

Dear Mr. Paterson,—I wish to call your attention to above quoted extract from the 'Mail and Empire' of Friday last re Travers' yacht.

Yours respectfully,
R. R. FARROW.

I find from reference to correspondence that you were not in Ottawa until the 26th August 1909, upon which date you returned to the city. Departmental letters re yacht are dated 24th August, 1909.

Of course I have not to deal with this comment from a newspaper. This paper has often in the past and will probably in the future make comments which would not be called complimentary to me, and which in this case are absolutely unjust, but I have to do with an hon. member of this House making charges so serious as this which involves the reputation, and as you can see, absolutely the position of an officer of the Department of Customs. The hon. member says he does that on information. The officer cannot question a member of parliament whose statement is privileged, but I have a right to ask, and I do ask on behalf of my officer that that hon. gentleman be just enough to these men to give me the name of his informant. Then we will trace it out. It needs no royal commission, it will be attended to, but I ask him and I think the House will agree with me that in justice to these men if not to myself he should give the name of this informant who can be talked to outside of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the minister give us the particulars of the yacht, her size, dimensions and engines?

Mr. MADDIN. If the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) gives the name of his informant will the minister deal with him as diligently and expeditiously as he did with those officers of the Customs Department in Cape Breton who broke the regulations of the Customs Department by taking part in municipal elections and which I have brought to his attention time and time again?

Mr. PATERSON. In reply to the leader of the opposition this memorandum is handed to me signed by John McDougald, commissioner of customs and R. R. Farrow, assistant commissioner. An insinuation was made because Mr. McDougald was addressed by Mr. Calvert and the letter was written by Mr. Farrow. I am informed that Mr. McDougald had gone on his holidays and in the regular course of correspondence the letter came to Mr. Farrow and he answered it. The memorandum which has been handed to me reads:

This appraisement was made by J. C. Boughner in the usual course.

Mr. Boughner is a Dominion appraiser appointed under the Customs Act especially for appraisement of machinery, for which purpose he visits from time to time ports in eastern Canada where there are no regular appraisers.

There is no appraiser at Brockville. The collector acts there as appraising officer in the absence of a regular appraiser.

In this instance, Mr. Boughner conferred with the collector in making the appraisement. The collector states that he considers the appraisement of $1,600 a proper valuation, and that the vessel is not worth any more.

Mr. Boughner received no instructions whatever, directly or indirectly, from the officers of the Customs Department as to making a low appraisement.

There was no invoice, and the valuation was left to the appraiser's judgment. He maintains that his appraisement was fair and reasonable.

The yacht is 25 tons gross register, 17 tons net register; built of wood in 1892; with steam engines of 13 horse power. At the time of appraisement in 1909 the hull and engines were 17 years old; boilers 14 years old.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Any person who listened to my remarks the other night would know I was not reflecting at all upon the personal integrity of the Minister of Customs. Every one who has the acquaintance of the Minister of Customs knows perfectly well that he would not be a party to this, but I do reflect upon his department, and until there is an investigation granted, that reflection stands. My information, and I have it from a good source, which I am willing to disclose at a proper investigation——

Mr. PATERSON. No, but I want it now.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). And if the minister will grant a royal commission to investigate this I will disclose the names and circumstances connected with the whole discreditable transaction. In my opinion the whole affair shows a most improper and discreditable state of affairs in the Department of Customs, and I am willing to stand by what I said, and to give the information in detail if a royal commission is granted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to observe that my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) does not impute any wrong action to the

minister, whose perfect integrity he acknowledges. He says that if anything wrong has been done it has been on the part of the officers of the department, Mr. McDougald to whom Mr. Calvert's communication was addressed, or Mr. Farrow. All the members who were in the House years ago, and hon. gentlemen who have been in the House for some time know that while the government is blessed with a very good civil service the government has no better officers than Mr. McDougald and Mr. Farrow and that their integrity is absolutely above reproach.

Mr. PATERSON. The position of the appraiser is at stake on this point. He has taken an oath to do his duty. He is charged with having placed a valuation upon a boat which is one-twentieth its value. The hon. gentleman says that he has information to that effect. I say that this officer has the right, through me, to say to the hon. gentleman who makes this statement that he must give the name of the informant, and give it now if he wishes to be fair.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). In reply to the Minister of Customs, I know of no authority which says that I must give it now, and I shall refuse to give it now. I will give it at any proper session of a royal commission that may be appointed to investigate this whole transaction.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MADDIN. I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) how soon I may expect an answer to an order for a return passed by this House a month ago in regard to the appointment of fish wardens in Victoria county in 1906-7 and in 1909-10. Also, I would like to learn when I may expect the return of the amount of fish bounties paid in the south riding of Cape Breton that I inquired about at the same time.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember exactly the returns for which my hon. friend is asking. I was under the impression that they had been brought down. I will take a note of them, and I will give my hon. friend an answer to-morrow.

Mr. MADDIN. I might say to the minister that the whole work in connection with the Victoria county return would not take two hours of any clerk's time, and it is now a month since the order passed this House. I hope the minister will realize that it may greatly facilitate the passage of his estimates to have questions of this kind answered promptly.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when we will be able to get the return to the order of the House in reference to United States cruisers on Great Lakes. That was asked for about a year and a half ago.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will make inquiry.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) when we may expect the report of the North West Fishing Commission.

Mr. BRODEUR. I expect it to be brought down to-morrow. I made inquiries this morning about the printing of it, and I was told that the printing was so far advanced that we may be able to get it to-morrow. As soon as we get it I will be very glad to lay it on the table.

PRIVATE BILLS.

ALBERTA ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Alberta Electric Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have been informed that the promoter of the Bill has agreed that the clause relating to the company doing business in coal shall be stricken out. Am I correct in that?

Mr. HERRON. On behalf of the promoters of the Bill I am authorized to say that they are prepared to have clause 14 as it now stands in the Bill removed.

Clause 14 dropped.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals, if the department has any policy with reference to these coal clauses in railway charters. Is it the disposition of the minister to oppose coal clauses in railway charters? I think the committee is entitled to an announcement of some principle or policy from the department with reference to that question.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult sometimes to lay down a policy which is applicable to all conditions, for the reason that members from various parts of the country where the interests are so diverse always imagine that they make out a special case if they wish any special clause inserted. I believe that the larger railway companies have the right to deal in coal. Up to the present time in Canada it has not had any effect in so far as I know, but, as I have pointed out in the committee, as our coal mines are taken up we might very well find ourselves in the position of the United States where they have a combination of coal mining and transportation companies which might be a menace, and which might have to be removed. On principle, I may say, unless a strong case is made out or there is some special reason,

I think it is better not to have the two combined.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

LA BANQUE DU CANADA.

On the order for the House to go into committee on Bill (No. 123) to incorporate La Banque du Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Mr. FIELDING. I would suggest that the Bill stand over. The hon. gentleman who is in charge of the Bill is not here at the present time, and there may be some discussion about it.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 133) to incorporate the Alberta-Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Rutan.

Bill (No. 108) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 134) to incorporate the Canadian Inter-Mountain Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 139) for the relief of George Addison Brown.—Mr. Thornton.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ST. JOHN HARBOUR DREDGING.

Mr. DANIEL:

1. How many cubic yards of material has the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company removed under their Beacon Bar contract in St. John harbour, and at what cost?
2. What quantity has been removed since March 31, 1910, to the present time and at what cost?
3. How many square feet of area under this contract has been dredged to a depth of 32 feet, L.W.S.T.?
4. How long at present rate of progress will it take to finish contract?
5. Is it the intention of the department to require employment of more dredges of capacity of 'Cynthia,' or greater, to hasten completion of this work?
6. Is the dredging work being done at outer berth in Rodney Slip done as part of Beacon Bar contract, and at same prices?
7. If not done as part of Beacon Bar contract and at the prices of that contract, at what prices is the work being done?
8. Were tenders called for the dredging at Rodney Slip? If not, why not?
9. How many cubic yards of material has been removed from this locality, Rodney Slip, and how many more have to be removed to complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. 1,573,604 cubic yards; cost, $621,585.69 to date.

Mr. GRAHAM.

2. 979,263 cubic yards; cost, $386,819.84.
3. 240,000 square feet.
4. This will depend upon the rapidity with which it is decided to proceed with the work, and the amount of the appropriation which may be granted by parliament. This must necessarily depend also upon the completion of negotiations now pending between the city of St. John and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for an exchange of lands where the improvements are being carried on. An unexpected and regrettable disagreement has arisen between the city and the company which may retard the progress of the work.
5. Not at present.
6. Yes.
7. Answered by No. 6.
8. Not for this special work, it being considered that it could properly be done at the price mentioned in the existing contract with the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company for dredging on the western side of the harbour.
9. (a) 27,785 cubic yards removed, (b) 67,980 cubic yards to complete.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON ALCOHOLISM.

Mr. AMES:

1. Is it the intention of the government to send, or assist in sending, delegates to represent the Dominion of Canada at the International Congress on Alcoholism, to be held in London this summer?
2. If so, how are representatives to this congress to be named?

Mr. KING:

1 and 2. No.

PROSECUTIONS UNDER THE BANK ACT.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. On the Synoptical report, dated March 21, 1905, from the curator of the Yarmouth Bank, what action was taken by the government and with what results?
2. What are the names of the directors of the bank, the parties prosecuted, the charges, the penalties and punishments in each case?
3. What action was taken and what prosecutions were made, if any, in the case of the Banque St. Jean, the Banque St. Hyacinthe and the St. Stephen Bank?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. Following the synoptical report of March 21, 1905, the Department of Justice instructed counsel to institute proceedings against the cashier, who was found guilty and sentenced to a term of imprisonment of sixty days.
2. John Lovitt, president; S. A. Crowell, vice-president; Augustus Cann, N. B. Cann and J. Leslie Lovitt. In addition to the case against the cashier criminal proceedings were instituted on the information of a shareholder against the president and

vice-president for the making of false returns. A conviction was obtained against the president, which was set aside by the Supreme Court (en banc) of Nova Scotia. As a result of the proceedings, in the case of the president, the attorney general of the province discontinued proceedings against the vice-president.

3. In the case of the Banque St. Jean, prosecutions were entered into against P. H. Roy, president; P. I. L'Heureux, and P. Beaudoin, for the making of false returns. The president was found guilty and sentenced to five years imprisonment. On the report of Colonel F. W. Hibbard, K.C., who represented the Department of Justice; the cases against Messrs. Beaudoin and L'Heureux were dropped. In the cases of the Banque St. Hyacinthe and the St. Stephens Bank no criminal prosecutions were entered, there being no allegation of criminality in these instances.

IMPORTS BY PROVINCES.

Mr. RUTAN:

What have been the total amounts of dutiable imports (consumption), by provinces, from the United States into Canada for the years 1908, 1909, 1910, respectively, of wheat, barley, flax, oats, beef eggs, butter, sheep, swine, potatoes and fruit?

Mr. PATERSON. The importations for consumption of the undermentioned articles from the United States into Canada, by provinces, during the fiscal years 1908, 1909 and 1910, were as follows:

Articles.	Provinces.	1908.		1909.		1910.	
		Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
		Bush.	$	Bush.	$	Bush.	$
Wheat	Ontario	7,865	5,987	269	354	6,462	5,859
	Quebec	17	30	49	58	2	2
	Nova Scotia						
	New Brunswick						
	Manitoba	265	227	22	34	61	65
	British Columbia	81,852	69,468	45,838	40,317	48,295	49,088
	Alberta	86	123	89	88	111	88
	Saskatchewan	105	105	41	75		
	Yukon	65	113	21	25	33	37
	Total	90,255	76,053	46,329	40,951	54,964	55,139
Barley	Ontario	549	492	79,706	46,691	164,202	99,516
	Quebec	154	164			62	61
	Nova Scotia	4	6				
	New Brunswick					20	25
	Manitoba	68	63	43	49	23	21
	British Columbia	8,029	5,630	7,482	5,162	145	139
	Alberta	33	24	10,091	7,245	34	42
	Saskatchewan			67	31	16	6
	Yukon	6	4	10	6		
	Total	8,843	6,383	97,399	59,184	164,532	99,810
Flax seed	Ontario	46,432	59,500	103	275	1,225	2,976
	Quebec	379,736	466,372	36	53		
	Manitoba	243	301	185	218	536	1,061
	B. Columbia	11	17			17	38
	P. E. Island	85	104	28	36	28	49
	Saskatchewan	9	16	40	40		
	Yukon						
	Total	426,516	526,310	392	622	1,806	4,124
Oats	Alberta	499	219	123	68	418	151
	Ontario	3,406	1,625	4,621	2,789	4,768	2,847
	Quebec	40	20	188	94	20	45
	N. Scotia					15,000	8,850
	Manitoba	477	240	362	310	65	68
	B. Columbia	32,868	13,932	18,368	7,847	2,163	1,338
	P. E. Island					17	16
	Saskatchewan	193	101	129	165	185	113
	Yukon	748	412	34,837	18,004	725	405
		38,231	16 549	58,628	29,277	23,361	13,833

Articles.	Provinces.	1908.		1909.		1910.	
		Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
		Lbs.	$	Lbs.	$	Lbs.	$
Beef	Ontario	8,595	647	29,643	2,264	4,487	284
	Quebec	84,400	4,124	68,646	3,840	11,900	565
	Nova Scotia	1,096,420	48,931	678,100	38,288	851,351	43,004
	New Brunswick	793,600	38,251	491,770	29,478	567,307	31,280
	British Columbia	14,779	897	10,883	679	10,027	665
	P. E. Island	22,600	943	21,465	1,093	.....	.....
	Yukon	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	17
	Total	2,020,394	93,793	1,300,507	75,642	1,445,272	75,815
		Doz.		Doz.		Doz.	
Eggs	Ontario	154,583	27,509	73,203	12,359	109,740	24,628
	Quebec	198,456	36,507	212,710	35,122	80,869	18,645
	Nova Scotia	3	1	660	165	.....	.....
	New Brunswick	32	25	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Manitoba	303,959	52,818	184,279	39,956	120,859	26,978
	British Columbia	305,569	60,455	508,547	118,728	366,364	86,586
	Alberta	4,987	1,279	14,132	3,480	192	294
	Saskatchewan	17	10	98	65	647	251
	Yukon	129,160	32,104	98,704	26,429	71,805	20,195
	Total	1,096,766	210,708	1,092,333	236,304	750,476	177,577
		Lbs.		Lbs.		Lbs.	
Butter	Ontario	8,890	2,091	48,356	9,365	12,545	2,610
	Quebec	16,329	3,099	60,211	10,987	160	20
	Nova Scotia	500	100	.....	.....	53	5
	Manitoba	509	132	1,550	403	168	36
	British Columbia	241,920	61,877	334,570	92,990	33,376	8,690
	Alberta	31	7	610	185	.....	.....
	Saskatchewan	363	117	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Yukon	26,105	7,251	28,508	8,289	14,779	4,802
	Total	294,647	74,674	473,805	112,219	61,081	16,163
		No.		No.		No.	
Sheep	Ontario	172	1,205	70	1,882	57	1,100
	Nova Scotia	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	30
	Manitoba	5	20	81	339	249	1,331
	British Columbia	45,668	183,256	42,567	173,739	33,176	121,457
	Alberta	5,548	15,794	203	509	2,151	6,174
	Yukon	859	2,917	54	373	209	1,400
	Total	52,252	203,192	42,975	176,842	35,844	131,492
		Lbs.		Lbs.		Lbs.	
Swine	Ontario	200	10	.....	.....	2,700	2,125
	Manitoba	520	39	.....	.....	.....	.....
	British Columbia	4,090	251	60	25	60	15
	Yukon	1,782	115	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Total	6,592	415	60	25	2,760	2,140
		Bush.		Bush.		Bush.	
Potatoes	Ontario	121,060	90,199	64,257	69,728	96,991	81,027
	Quebec	14,463	12,374	10,753	12,462	18,548	18,061
	Nova Scotia	2,391	1,434	209	260	946	922
	New Brunswick	29,104	10,129	48	67	193	245
	Manitoba	32,269	21,670	11,540	11,544	17,754	13,391
	British Columbia	16,552	15,274	18,313	11,193	57,091	43,390
	P. E. Island	44	49	13	17	2	3
	Alberta	326	338	1,393	1,089	8,047	4,981
	Saskatchewan	1,191	779	718	688	389	205
	Yukon	25,592	39,050	19,088	21,919	15,267	17,624
	Total	242,992	191,296	126,282	128,967	215,228	179,849

Articles.	Provinces.	1908.		1909.		1910.	
		Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
			$		$		$
reen fruit	Ontario		261,565		182,508		173,737
	Quebec		190,088		182,124		155,233
	Nova Scotia		27,542		33,780		30,587
	New Brunswick		27,710		28,742		37,365
	Manitoba		232,211		218,473		268,514
	British Columbia		166,561		222,560		307,534
	P. E. Island		4,531		2,839		1,807
	Alberta		108,679		125,547		146,016
	Saskatchewan		16,634		42,729		74,207
	Yukon		14,473		12,534		10,588
	Total		1,049,848		1,051,836		1,205,588

MASTERS' CERTIFICATES.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe):

1. On what dates did Captains N. L. Morrison, H. A. Pocock and H. J. Stevens secure masters' certificates on the inland lakes?
2. Were these gentlemen Canadian citizens or British subjects?
3. When and where did they serve the time required by law as mates before being granted their masters' certificates?
4. When did Captain H. J. Stevens serve the necessary time as mate on a passenger steamer to acquire a master's certificate on a passenger steamer?
5. Who was the examiner in each case, and what were the fees?
6. Have the said fees been turned over to the department.

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. N. L. Morrison, Windsor, February 18, 1908. H. A. Pocock, St. Catharines, March 4, 1905, H. J. Stevens, Windsor, December 7, 1907.

2. H. J. Stevens, British subject naturalization paper, April 11, 1908; H. A. Pocock, British subject sworn declaration dated March 6, 1905; N. L. Morrison, British subject (born).

3. N. L. Morrison: Canadian ss. 'Hiawatha' and American ss. 'I. C. Ford', April 10, 1898 to December 11, 1900. H. A. Pocock, all American vessels, December 9, 1890 to December 9, 1899. H. J. Stevens, all American vessels, December 18, 1904 to October 21, 1907.

4. H. J. Stevens, according to records in department, performed the necessary service as mate during seasons of 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907, averaging seven months each.

5. N. L. Morrison, H. J. Stevens, H. A. Pocock; Captain McGregor, W. McIlwain; fee, $15.

6. Yes.

PORT CREDIT PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. BLAIN:

1. What amount of money was expended during 1909 and 1910 by the Public Works Department at Port Credit?
2. Was the money expended in dredging and improving the harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. $1,668.94.
2. Yes, being cost of maintenance of government dredge 'Sir Richard' for months of September and October.

CANADA—JAPAN TRADE TREATY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

Has the trade treaty between Canada and Japan expired? If so, what action has the government taken in regard to same?

Mr. FIELDING. The treaty has not expired, but will terminate on the 17th July, 1911. The question of a new treaty is under consideration.

THE CANADIAN NAVY.

Mr. MONK:

What is the total amount spent since the 31st October, 1910, up to date, out of the sum voted by the House in connection with the new navy?

Mr. BRODEUR. $213,676.91.

Mr. MONK:

1. What is the full complement of the 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' respectively, when in active service?
2. What is the cost per diem of each of the above-named ships, including necessary supplies and men?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. The 'Niobe', 705; the 'Rainbow', 273.
2. Estimated approximate cost per day: 'Niobe', $1,726; 'Rainbow', $809.

Mr. MONK:

1. What is the amount paid per ton for coal for the ss. 'Rainbow' by the department?

2. What amount of coal per day is required for the 'Rainbow' when at sea?

3. What amount is required for the 'Rainbow,' when in port, for its dynamos, motors, heating, &c.?

4. What is the cost per ton for coal to supply the 'Niobe' on the Atlantic coast?

5. From whom does the department purchase coal for the two above-mentioned ships, respectively?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. $4.50 per ton, f. o. b., Comox.

2. Average amount at ordinary cruising speed is about 45 tons.

3. The average amount for December (the latest information available) was three and a half tons.

4. $4.10 per ton. Alongside. Halifax.

5. 'Rainbow', Hall, Walker & Co., Victoria, B. C.; 'Niobe', Dominion Coal Company, Ltd., Montreal.

GREAT NORTHWESTERN TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

Mr. MONK:

1. Has the request of the Great Northwestern Telegraph operators for a board of conciliation been received by the government?

2. Has said request been granted? If not, why not?

Mr. KING:

1. An application on behalf of the telegraph operators of the company named has been received.

2. This application is under consideration at the present time.

NETHERLANDS LOAN AND LAND COMPANY.

Mr. MONK:

Has there been, subsequent to the adoption of the resolution by this House of the 6th of February, any further correspondence between any department of the government and Mr. W. T. R. Preston, or between the government and any other persons, on matters connected with the Netherlands Mortgage or Loan Company, and will the government issue instructions that the papers referred to, if any, shall form part of the return asked for in the said resolution of the 6th February?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. MONK:

Has the government received from the trade agent in Holland a report about the failure recently of a proposed Canadian Land Company to get its capital subscribed when placed on the Netherlands Stock Exchange, as reported in the 'Monetary Times' on the 4th of February? If not, will the department ask Mr. Preston for a report at an early date, and will the report when received be published in the usual way for the information of the public?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, it is not considered necessary to seek additional information.

ADULTERATION OF MAPLE SYRUP.

Mr. SPROULE:

Is it the intention of the government to amend the Adulteration of Foods Act, or introduce a new Bill during the present session to prevent the adulteration of maple syrup, as suggested by the maple sugar and syrup industry of Canada?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

MOTION AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all orders in council, contracts, reports, declarations, profiles, plans, correspondence and other documents and papers touching the claims of McDonald and McLellan, or of Ronald R. McDonald, for construction of the Intercolonial railway, from about the eighteenth mile east of Grand Narrows to the twenty-second mile east of Grand Narrows aforesaid—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

GRAND FALLS—ST. JOHN RAILWAY.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that, whereas by legislation enacted at the session thereof held in the year A.D. 1910, the legislature of the province of New Brunswick authorized and empowered the Lieutenant Governor in Council for the said province to guarantee the principal and interest of the bonds of any railway company which would build a line of railway from a point on the line of the National Transcontinental railway at Grand Falls, in the county of Victoria, to the city of St. John, in the said province of New Brunswick, a distance of about two hundred and twenty miles, to the extent of twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) per mile upon certain conditions therein set forth, one of such conditions being that no such agreement should be entered into with any company or corporation for the construction of the said line of railway or for the guaranteeing of the said bonds unless and until the parliament of Canada should enact legislation authorizing the entering by the government of Canada into an agreement with such company or with the government of the province of New Brunswick, for the leasing of the said line of railway when completed, with its appurtenances and rolling stock, and for the operation, maintenance, upkeep and repair by the said government of Canada, as a part of the government railway system of Canada, for a period of ninety-nine years, and for the payment by the government of Canada to the said province of New Brunswick, or the government thereof, each year during the said term of ninety-nine years of forty per centum per annum of the gross earnings of the said railway, as or in the nature of rental therefor; the amount of such

rental to be applied in payment of the interest of the bonds so to be guaranteed and the surplus, if any, to be paid to the said company.

Now, therefore, it is expedient that His Excellency the Governor in Council be authorized to enter into a contract with any such railroad company and the government of the province of New Brunswick as aforesaid, for the leasing of the said line of railway with its appurtenances and rolling stock, when completed and equipped with rolling stock, and for the operation, maintenance, upkeep and repair by the said government of Canada, as a part of the government railway system of Canada, for a period of ninety-nine years, and for the payment by the government of Canada to the said province of New Brunswick, or the said company, each year during the said term of ninety-nine years, of the forty per centum per annum of the gross earnings of the said railway, as or in the nature of rental therefor;

Provided, however, that the said contract shall be entered into only upon the condition that the said railway be constructed upon plans and specifications to be approved of by the Governor in Council upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and shall be up to the general standard of the said National Transcontinental railway through the said province;

Provided further, that His Excellency the Governor in Council shall be authorized to enter into a contract as aforesaid for the operation of the said road in sections, when completed and equipped as follows:

1. From Fredericton to Woodstock.
2. From Fredericton south a distance of fifty miles.
3. Each twenty-five miles thereafter, until the line be completed and equipped from Grand Falls to St. John.—Mr. Graham.

Mr. GRAHAM. This resolution refers to a proposed line of railway 207 miles long running from the city of St. John to Grand Falls. I may say that one of the first deputations that I listened to after becoming a member of the government was a large deputation from this part of the Dominion urging that steps be taken to secure the construction of a line of railway through the rich St. John valley. If I remember correctly, what was promised at that date was the granting of the usual subsidy, which I think was done at the following session of parliament. Although this is one of the oldest sections of the Dominion, and said to be one of the richest, it seems to have had difficulty in getting railway facilities. Several attempts have been made, but they have not hitherto been brought to a successful conclusion. So urgent is the necessity for this line, and so much has its need impressed the minds of legislators, both in the Dominion and in the province, that they are desirous of arriving at an agreement to provide the long sought for accommodation. The provincial government has passed an Act, which is referred to in the resolution, providing to grant a guarantee of the bonds to the extent of $25,000 a mile for the construction of the road if the Dominion government will undertake its operation. That seemed to be a fairly equal distribution of labour. This resolution is to provide that the Railway Department may have power to enter into negotiations for the operations of this railway on its completion under the terms outlined in the provincial legislation. I understand that a company has already offered to undertake the construction of this line on the terms indicated in the provincial legislation and outlined in this resolution. If the committee will allow me, I have some details, which I propose to give. The line will extend from St. John to Grand Falls to connect with the National Transcontinental a distance of about 207 miles. It will follow the River St. John to Fredericton a distance of 74 miles, and thence go to Woodstock a distance of 62 miles. From that point to a short distance below Andover it leaves the river, going between that and the International boundary line, a distance of 45 miles. Then it is proposed to cross the river going on the eastern side from Andover to Grand Falls, a distance of about 25 miles.

I need not point out that in this section there is a lot of agricultural production. It has been noticed in this House on one or two occasions that the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) takes great interest in potatoes, an interest accounted for by the fact that the section through which this road is to run, including the constituency he represents, is a great producer of potatoes. Last year along that line, there were something like 150,000 barrels carried out of that territory, and carried under conditions which compelled the farmers to draw them from five to fifteen miles. After better railway facilities are offered, this production no doubt will be doubled and perhaps trebled or quadrupled.

This matter is not new. It has been discussed already on several occasions when the subsidies were granted. The necessity for the line is acknowledged by everybody, but the question is how to work the line practically. It is proposed that the government should have power to enter into an agreement to operate this line, retaining sixty per cent and handing over forty per cent to the provincial government or the company. It is assumed that a certain standard of road will be required. That standard is outlined in the resolution as the general standard of the National Transcontinental through New Brunswick. That might mean a great deal and it might not mean very much. One part of New Brunswick might be very difficult for railway construction and another very easy. At one point I believe the construction of this line will not be very heavy. I am told that surveys have been made recently, and the

estimate runs from $31,000 per mile to $49,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that include bridges?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. We must lay down some standard, and as this might form part of a through line before many years, it ought to be built to a fairly good standard at least. In the first place we are offering to operate it at sixty per cent of the gross revenue; and in order to keep the cost of operation down to a reasonable point, it is necessary that we should have a fairly good standard of road. I think there will be no difficulty working out that part of the problem. While, owing to physical difficulty, it may be found very expensive to arrive at a very high standard, I think there will be no difficulty in coming to terms for a standard to be adopted for that particular section. Although there is a grade of four-tenths of one per cent on eastbound and six-tenths of one per cent on westbound trains, it might be necessary to have a grade of one per cent or more than one per cent on some parts of this line. When we say, therefore, the standard of the Transcontinental, it does not mean that we must adhere strictly to a four-tenths of one per cent on the eastbound traffic or six-tenths of one per cent on the westbound, because the physical conditions might make that impracticable if not impossible.

The other point is the initial equipment. It will be necessary to put in the contract something as to initial equipment, but the initial equipment in a road of that kind need not be such an extravagant item. For the first two or three years, the traffic will not be so heavy that it will require an extraordinary amount of rolling stock, and the company or the government offering to operate it and supplying rolling stock after the initial equipment will come in for a larger share of expense as the years go by. But the initial equipment—I do not wish to be held to these figures—roughly speaking, will cost probably a quarter of a million dollars. This amount will probably supply all that will be necessary for this line during the first year or two.

There is another point in this connection. There is a road now recently constructed through a territory that ought to produce good traffic. I refer to the Interntaional railway, which runs from St. John to St. Leonards on the St. John river, twelve miles from Grand Falls. This International line now being completed running from the Intercolonial at Campbellton, will be within twelve miles of the St. John Valley road when completed. It might be assumed that running rights could be secured over this line from the Grand Trunk Pacific for that twelve miles. The question is being considered also of the International railway being operated as a government railway. I am not sure that that will be done; but if it should be, the government railway would have a line from Campbellton through to St. John in addition to the other. The government railway would then have one loop line all around New Brunswick. I am not sure if our New Brunswick friends would consider that as a good thing, but it would be a good thing for the government railways. These are the main features. I am not proposing this as a great money maker, but rather as a means of providing the people of St. John valley with the railway communication for which they have been asking for so many years.

Mr. CROCKET. It must be apparent to any one familiar with the facts in connection with these proposals that the adoption of this resolution in the terms here stated will simply amount to a refusal on the part of this government to co-operate with the government of New Brunswick in the effort it is making to provide the people of St. John valley with this much-needed railway. To any one who is not aware of what has occurred, it might be otherwise. A brief recital of the facts, however, will expose the real meaning of this resolution.

I need not refer to the great public necessity which exists for and demands the immediate construction of this railway, because that is admitted by the First Minister, the Minister of Railways, the Minister of Public Works and by the unanimous vote of the legislature of New Brunswick. It is sufficient for this discussion to mention the recent agitation which has stirred the people of the St. John River valley from the county of Madawaska to the city of St. John. That agitation broke out spontaneously so soon as it was learned that this government had committed the crime—if I may be permitted to quote the language used by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) in this connection—of ignoring the claims of St. John valley in connection with the location of the National Transcontinental in New Brunswick, and carrying that railway across the province from Grand Falls to Moncton through a wilderness and unsettled country, which the officers of this government in official reports have described as unsuited for agricultural development.

That agitation culminated in a large and influential delegation, representing every settlement, town, village and city in the St. John valley, waiting upon the government of the province of New Brunswick in the spring of 1909, and seeking its assistance for the building of a railway for the people of the St. John river. That delegation asked the New Brunswick government to undertake to promote legislation

to guarantee bonds to the extent of $25,000 a mile for the construction of this line of railway. It was suggested that, if the government would give its undertaking in that behalf, the Dominion government could be induced to agree to take the road over on completion and operate it as part of the Intercolonial railway system upon the basis of the Dominion government paying forty per cent of the gross earnings as rental of the railway. The premier of the province of New Brunswick, Hon. Mr. Hazen, at once assured the delegation that he and his government were prepared to engage to promote legislation along these lines, and would do so, if the consent of this government could be procured to taking over and operating the road under a long lease upon the terms stated. A delegation shortly afterwards came to Ottawa, I think, on the 16th of April, 1909, and waited upon a committee of the Executive Council, composed of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). I had the privilege of being present at the hearing of the delegation. I heard the case as it was presented to that subcommittee of the Council, and I heard the Prime Minister's reply. I may say that the principal spokesman on behalf of the application was Mr. J. H. Barry, K.C., now Mr Justice Barry, of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick. There were other speakers, including Hon. Mr. Fleming, Provincial Secretary of New Brunswick, the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) and Mr. Foster, president of the Board of Trade of St. John. Others also urged the government to the acceptance of the proposition. The Prime Minister, in replying to that delegation, stated that the government were very much interested in this matter, that they had heard, before the delegation proceeded to Ottawa, of what had taken place in the province of New Brunswick, had considered it to some extent, and had appointed the committee I have already named, for the purpose of receiving the delegation and hearing their representations. He stated that the proposition was a definite proposition which the government would have to consider. He stated, with regard to the subcommittee, that they had themselves, talked the matter over, and intimated that all three, himself, the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Public Works, were favourable to the acceptance of the proposition, but that it would be necessary for them to submit the matter to Council. Mr. Barry, in presenting the case, urged upon the government the necessity of a very early reply, setting forth as a reason the fact that the New Brunswick legislature was then nearing prorogation, and if legislation were to be passed at the session it would be necessary to have the reply at a very early date, within a day or two. In fact it was suggested that the delegation should return with the reply that day. The Prime Minister spoke in very favourable terms, and, while he stated that it was impossible to give a reply that day, he intimated that a reply would be given within a few days, and went so far as to suggest that if the delegation could wait over a few days, the reply of the government would be forthcoming. Every member of that delegation returned to the province of New Brunswick, feeling asssured that the decision of the government would be favourable. The people of the province waited patiently for several weeks without any intimation being received from the Dominion government. Not until the 28th of April was a word of any kind received. On that day an intimation came from the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell); the government seems to have chosen that extraordinary medium to communicate with the provincial government with respect to a definite proposition that the provincial government had submitted to them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman pardon me? My recollection is that the provincial government never, except through the delegation, communicated with the Dominion government.

Mr. CROCKET. The proposition submitted was the proposition of the provincial government, submitted by the delegation of which I have spoken, one of whose members was the provincial secretary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I believe I am right in saying that the Dominion government never had a communication directly from the provincial government on this subject.

Mr. CARVELL. And perhaps, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) would allow me to correct him before he reads the telegram, by saying that that was sent by me not to the provincial government—I never wrote or telegraphed to them in my life—but to J. J. F. Winslow, secretary of the St. John Valley Railway Company, and in reply to a telegram from him.

Mr. CROCKET. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) states that there was no communication between the provincial government and the federal government on this subject. The provincial government's proposition was submitted by the delegation to which I have referred, and in the way in which I have stated.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman will pardon me again—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rise to correct my hon. friend. He says that I stated that no communication passed between the federal government and the provincial government. What I said was that the provincial government had not communicated any proposition to the federal government.

Mr. CROCKET. I understood what the Minister of Public Works stated. I have said two or three times that this proposition was the proposition of the provincial government and was communicated to the federal government through the medium of this delegation, one of whose members was the provincial secretary, Mr. Fleming. However, this government did not do the provincial government, or the St. John Valley Railway Company, or the delegation, the courtesy to communicate with them in any way from the 16th of April—notwithstanding the statement made by the Prime Minister—until the 28th of April, when the following telegram was received by Mr. Winslow, secretary of the St. John Valley Railway Company, from the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell).

Before the Dominion government can give a positive answer, they require information as to details of proposition. They suggest the local government pass legislation authorizing guarantee, subject to condition that Dominion government make satisfactory agreement to operate.

Now, the committee will observe the suggestion of the hon. member for Carleton—and I suppose, the suggestion of the Dominion government—communicated to the provincial government in this extraordinary way, through the medium of a private member of the House, a bitter opponent of the provincial government, was that this government required further details. Now, I happened to be present, not only at the hearing of the delegation to which I have referred, but at the meeting of the delegation in the Russell House before the case was presented to the committee of Council. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) was present. The mode of procedure was fully discussed by the delegation. The advice of the hon. member for Carleton and of others was asked; and the case was presented precisely as had been advised by the hon. member and others, the hon. member for Carleton himself joining in the presentation of the case.

Notwithstanding the statement of the Prime Minister that this committee was aware before the delegation came here of what had taken place, and had appointed a committee to receive the representations of that delegation, I did not hear the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Railways, or the Prime Minister, ask any member of that delegation one single question with respect to standard of construction or anything of that nature. All information was vouchsafed to the committee of council that was asked for by the members of the government at that time, and it was not until April 28, several days after this delegation had been here that information was conveyed to those interested in the construction of this railway, that any further details were required. The legislature at that time had arranged for prorogation on the following day, and the suggestion that the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick should pass legislation before any intimation of any kind was received from the Dominion government as to whether they would entertain this proposition at all, being so crude and thoroughly unreasonable, was, of course, not acted upon. The matter then stood in abeyance six or seven weeks. No further communication was received by the provincial government or the St. John Valley Railway company from this government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend remember the date of the prorogation of the provincial legislature of that year?

Mr. CROCKET. The legislature prorogued the day after the message was received, April 29. Then, on June 9, Premier Hazen addressed a letter to the president of the St. John Valley Railway Company, who had acted as chairman of the delegation, asking if he had received any word from the premier or any member of the government in regard to the matter, and intimating the desire to know at as early a date as possible if the Dominion government was willing to accept the proposals made by the delegation. Referring to the request submitted through a private member, Mr. Hazen stated that his government concluding, in the light of this communication, that a conference was desirable, had appointed a committee to take the matter up with a committee of the St. John Valley Railway Company and of the Dominion government, at such time as might be mutually convenient. The president of the St. John Valley Railway Company thereupon wrote the Minister of Public Works, and the latter replied on June 19. With the minister's usual politeness, he expressed his exceeding regret that this invaluable suggestion of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) had not been acted upon, and as to the New Brunswick Premier's intimation that a committee of the executive council——

Mr. PUGSLEY. How would it do to read the letter?

Mr. CROCKET. I shall do so. It contains many choice and characteristic passages which the minister and his friends will recognize. It reads:

Office of the Minister of Public Works,
Canada,
Ottawa, June 19, 1909.

Dear Mr. Winslow,—
Re St. John Valley Railway.

I am in receipt of your favour of the 15th inst. inclosing copy of letter from Mr. Hazen to the mayor of Fredericton, dated 9th inst.

You ask if it is possible for me to inform you if the government of Canada 'is willing to accept the proposition made by Mr. Hazen, as Premier of the province, to the effect that the New Brunswick government would guarantee the bonds of the road if the government of Canada would undertake, on its construction, to operate it as part of the government railway of Canada and to pay to the province 40 per cent of the gross earnings.'

So far as I understand the matter, no denite proposition has yet been made by the provincial government.

Altlhough I myself heard the Prime Minister state in the presence of the Minister of Public Works that was a definite proposition which the government would have to consider.

And I think it is a matter for regret that the suggestion contained in the telegram of Mr. Carvell, M.P., quoted in Mr. Hazen's letter was not acted upon. In that telegram Mr. Carvell stated——

And he quotes the telegram which I have just read.

If the requisite legislation had been passed, the provincial government would not have been in a position to submit a definite proposition to the federal government which, from the reception given to the delegates by the Prime Minister would, I think, you will readily believe, have received most sympathetic consideration. By omitting to do this a year's time has been lost.

However, that was not done, and the important question now to consider is how best to facilitate the early commencement of this most important undertaking. As to the holding of a conference with the Dominion government at present, I would point out to you that the Finance Minister is in England and several of the other ministers are also absent, so that there will be no opportunity of having a full meeting of government for some time. The suggestion contained in Mr. Carvell's telegram not having been acted upon, the matter has not been further considered by the federal cabinet.

As if it were necessary that there should be a full meeting of the Dominion cabinet in order to consider the standard of construction of the railway. The Minister of Public Works stated that the Finance Minister and several other members of the cabinet were absent; but the Minister of Railways was here, the Minister of Public Works was here, and other members of the cabinet. The Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Railways, had they been so disposed, could, either of them, surely, have conferred with a sub-committee of the New Brunswick government with reference to the standard of construction of this railway. The suggestion that there should be a full meeting of the cabinet in order to consider a matter of this kind seems to me utterly absurd. The minister continues:

Being sincerely desirous of assisting the construction of the railway by every means in my power, I venture to make a personal suggestion for the consideration of your company and that of the provincial government. It is this—that the government make a definite proposition engaging to obtain legislation authorizing the guaranteeing of bonds for such amount as will be necessary to ensure the construction and equipment of the railway from Grand Falls to St. John on condition that the Dominion government shall agree to operate it as part of the government railway system on a long lease, and to pay to the province 40 per cent of the gross earnings.

The proposition, of course, should contain a description of the character of the road to be built. For instance, as to the grade, which should not exceed four-tenths of 1 per cent; as to the bridges, which should be of steel; the culverts, of masonry; the rails to be at least 80 pounds per yard; and generally, as to the road being up to the standard of a first class trunk line.

You will readily understand that the railway must be built to a high standard with the most favourable grades obtainable, so as to reduce the operating expenses as much as possible, in order to warrant the government asking the approval of parliament of the operation of the road for 60 per cent of the gross earnings in view of the fact that it takes, upon an average, all of the earnings of the Intercolonial to pay the operating expenses.

Of course, if the operating lease were made, the Intercolonial would have to engage to keep the roadbed and rolling stock in proper repair and to make necessary renewals from time to time.

I think you will agree with me that the quickest and best way to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the question is for the provincial government to make a definite proposition along these lines. Then the responsibility will be upon the federal government of either accepting or rejecting it, or if it is thought advisable, suggesting modifications in the proposal.

Again assuring you of my earnest desire to co-operate in every way possible to secure the early construction of the long talked of St. John Valley railway,

I am, yours very truly,
(Sgd.) WILLIAM PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the matter with the letter?

Mr. CROCKET. I will proceed to point out what is the matter with the letter. It sounds very nicely, there is no question about that, and runs very smoothly, but it is also very transparent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the way we want the Valley railway to run. We want it well built.

Mr. CROCKET. The House will observe the requirements which the Minister of Public Works insisted upon for the construction of this railway which he was so anxious to facilitate. He laid down there a specification which he must have known it was simply impossible for any railway contractor or company to comply with with a $25,000 per mile guarantee and the usual federal subsidy of $6,400 per mile. This specification which was suggested by the minister is a higher specification than was ever demanded for the construction of any railway in Canada except the Transcontinental railway. He actually prescribed for the construction of this railway, which was to be a branch of the Intercolonial railway, a specification equal to that of the Transcontinental railway, insisting on a four-tenths of one per cent grade.

Mr. DANIEL. Both ways.

Mr. CROCKET. Six-tenths running west and four-tenths running east. He insisted that the rails be eighty pounds to the yard. The specification, as I have said, is higher than that for any other railway in this country with the one exception that I have stated. It is a higher grade than the grade of the Canadian Pacific railway between Montreal and St. John. It is a much higher grade than the Intercolonial railway of Canada of which this was to be a branch. Does anybody who knows the Minister of Public Works suppose that he perceived that such a specification as this was necessary for the operation of this railway as a branch of the Intercolonial railway or for the purposes of Transcontinental traffic? Let me answer out of the mouth of the Minister of Public Works himself. The minister was at one time premier and attorney general of the province of New Brunswick. He occupied that position in the month of March, 1907. While the legislature was in session at that time, as a result of the insistent demands which were made by members representing the various districts along the St. John valley, and in anticipation, no doubt, of an early general election, the minister got into very speedy communication with Mr. D. D. Mann of the firm of Mackenzie and Mann and he produced and read with characteristic earnestness and optimism to the legislature of New Brunswick a telegram which he had received from Mr. Mann and which will be found in the debates of the New Brunswick legislature for the session of 1907. This is Mr. Mann's telegram which was read by the Minister of Public Works on that occasion:

Ottawa, Ont., March 20, 1907.

Hon. Wm. Pugsley, L.L.D.,
Premier of New Brunswick,
Fredericton, N.B.

Would suggest you take legislative authority to make arrangements guaranteeing our bonds not to exceed fifteen thousand dollars per mile. Will promise to have matter thoroughly investigated by our engineers and will enter into contract, providing we find route satisfactory from engineer's and traffic standpoint. The contents of this message can be used at your discretion.

(Sgd.) D. D. MANN.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

A few days afterwards an Act was passed authorizing the Governor in Council to guarantee payment of principal and interest of first mortgage bonds of the Canadian Northern railway or such one of the companies controlled by Mackenzie and Mann, Limited, and forming or intended to form part of their transcontinental system, as may be authorized to construct and operate a line of railway from Woodstock or from Woodstock to Centreville and down the valley of the St. John to a point at or near Westfield to the extent of $15,000. That railway was intended to be operated as part of the Transcontinental Railway system, and yet by the terms of the Act drafted by the minister himself the only specification laid down was that of a first-class line of railway to be ironed with rails weighing not less than 67 pounds to the yard with bridges of steel and superstructures of stone and concrete. That provision is found in section 16 of the Act. Sixty-seven pound rails with no specification as to gradients or curves was considered sufficient by the Minister of Public Works as the specification of a Transcontinental railway in 1907, but a specification of four-tenths of one per cent was requisite in the minister's mind in 1910 for a railway which was to be operated as a branch of the Intercolonial railway. Why, Mr. Chairman, did the minister conceive and insist upon such a specification as that in connection with the St. John Valley railway? I cannot help but think that the minister concluded that such a specification would render impossible the construction of that line of railway upon the terms proposed by the New Brunswick government, and that he would thus block the government of New Brunswick in the efforts which they were making to bring about the construction of that railway. The cost of such a railway as that specified by the minister and later by the government was so great that no company could possibly build it with a guarantee of $25,000 a mile plus the usual federal subsidy of $6,400 per mile. Did the minister know that? I think the minister was possessed of that information at the time. It was certainly available to him on the records of this House. In the 'Hansard' of 1907-8, page 12,664, will be found a statement made by the Minister of Railways and Canals of the cost of the Transcontinental railway through the province of New Brunswick. The statement which the minister then made is as follows:

Location.	Miles let.	Estimated cost per mile.
Moncton to near Chipman..	50.00	$ 41,995
At Chipman..	8.55	83,570
Chipman to Intercolonial railway crossing..	39.05	32,573
Intercolonial railway crossing to mile 164..	66.40	45,341
Mile 164 to Grand Falls.. ..	31.80	110,172
Grand Falls to New Brunswick boundary..	60.88	51,130

Mr. PUGSLEY. That $110,000 a mile section includes a tremendous viaduct?

Mr. CROCKET. I think there was some extraordinary expenditure in connection with a portion of this section. That was the estimated cost as submitted to the House by the Minister of Railways in the session of 1908. There are 256·68 miles from the New Brunswick boundary to Moncton and the average cost per mile estimated by the minister in 1908 was $60,830, while the average estimated cost of the line from Grand Falls to Chipman was $62,695. During the present session I put a question on the Order Paper which was answered by the Minister of Railways on the 22nd February last as to the present estimated cost of these sections. The reply of the minister was as follows:

The present estimated total cost per mile by construction contract divisions is as follows:

Contract No. 1, extending from the city of Moncton westerly for a distance of about 50 miles is estimated to cost $49,190 per mile.

Contract No. 2 from the west end of contract No. 1 to Chipman, a distance of about 8 miles is estimated to cost $89,710 per mile.

Contract No. 3, from Chipman westerly to crossing of the Intercolonial railway, a distance of about 39·7 miles is estimated to cost $35,333 per mile.

Contract No. 4, from the Intercolonial railway crossing westerly to Tobique river, a distance of about 67 miles is estimated to cost $46,920 per mile.

Contract No. 5 from the Tobique river westerly to about 2½ miles west of Grand Falls, a distance of about 31·5 miles is estimated to cost $133,518 per mile.

Contract No. 6, from 2½ miles west of Grand Falls to boundary between New Brunswick and Quebec, a distance of about 67 miles is estimated to cost $46,484 per mile.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does that prove what a road down the St. John Valley will cost?

Mr. CROCKET. We will come to that right away. The average estimated cost under the statement of the Minister of Railways in 1908 of the Transcontinental railway in New Brunswick was $62,695 per mile, while under his statement given on February 22, 1911, the average estimated cost was $71,923 per mile. The Minister of Public Works asks if that will show the cost of a railway down the St. John Valley, and my answer is, not necessarily. But I want to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the position this government took with respect to the location of the Transcontinental railway through New Brunswick. One of the reasons assigned for turning down the St. John Valley route and accepting the central or back route so called, was that the construction of a railway down the St. John valley would be very much more expensive than by the route selected by this government. It may be quite true as the Minister of Public Works suggests that the cost of a railway down the St. John valley would not be shown by the cost of a railway across the province of New Brunswick, but if we are to rely upon the official statements of this government the St John Valley route was a more expensive route when built up to the standard of the National Transcontinental railway than the route which was chosen by this government.

Mr. CARVELL. What is the object and what is the value of these statements in view of the fact that there is a bona fide offer now to build this road for the bond bearing guarantee and subsidy?

Mr. CROCKET. We will discuss the question of the bona fides of that offer which has again brought my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) into the limelight in a rather unenviable aspect. There is the fact. If the St. John Valley river route is or was a cheaper route than the route selected by the government for the National Transcontinental railway, then this government has been guilty of grossly misleading the people of New Brunswick.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I dislike interrupting my hon. friend, but I have no doubt my hon. friend is in close communication with the government at Fredericton, and I would ask him if he has observed the report of that survey that has been laid on the table of the local House. Has the hon. member got the estimated cost as made up by the provincial engineer?

Mr. CROCKET. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY That will be of great value to us.

Mr FOSTER Has the minister not seen it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have seen the newspaper report but not the original.

Mr. CROCKET. I have here a return brought down by the government in the session of 1906 on a motion of mine for the correspondence and report upon the two proposed routes in the province of New Brunswick. The return states, dealing with the question of relative cost of the two routes:

The section between Grand Falls and Edmundston being common to both routes. On the back route the final location line will be shorter than the preliminary by at least six miles, whereas the location will lengthen the river route say five miles, making the back route some 28 miles shorter than the river route. The difference in bridgings and minor structures will be very great. The river route crosses the St. John river twice, calling for 3,000 feet of bridge, and as it also crosses all the lateral drainage of the country close to the St. John river, all the minor structures will be larger and more costly than on the back line. The earth work on the back route will be considerably lighter than on the river route. On the whole, I am of the opinion that the difference in cost between the two lines will not be less than $1.500,000.

That is the statement made in the report of Mr. Lumsden to the government with respect to the location of the Transcontinental railway in New Brunswick, and if that report is to be relied upon, the St. John river route was stated by this government to be more expensive than the central route. Yet the specifications which the Minister of Public Works prescribed for the construction of this railway in which he was so sincerely and earnestly interested was a specification equal to that of the National Transcontinental. Aside however, from this comparative statement of the cost of these alternative routes there is further evidence of knowledge on the part of the Minister of Public Works that the specification which he was prescribing was an impossible specification. In the New Brunswick legislature in 1907 the Minister of Public Works referred to a telegram which he had received from Mr. Parent chairman of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, stating the cost of the St. John Valley railway as shown by the surveys which had been made by the Transcontinental Commission, and this statement will be found on page 104 of the debates of the legislature of New Brunswick of that year. He said:

> This will not be a cheap route or easy to build, for I have in my hands a telegram from the chairman of the National Transcontinental Commission who states the cost of a railway down the St. John river valley from Woodstock to Chipman will be $44,500 a mile.

So that the Minister of Public Works had that knowledge at the time he prescribed this specification as to the survey between these two points.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a long way below $62,000.

Mr. CARVELL. Is the hon. member (Mr. Crocket) aware that his own engineer said it would be only $40,000.

Mr. CROCKET. My hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) need not be impatient; I intend to refer to that. If that was a correct estimate which was referred to by the Minister of Public Works in the New Brunswick legislature, then it was a cheaper line than the route which was selected for the Transcontinental railway; and if that was so, this government grossly deceived the people of the province of New Brunswick when they selected the back route for the reason—the untrue reason—that it was a cheaper route than the St. John Valley route. But, taking the figure which I have just quoted, $44,500 a mile, that is between $13,000 and $14,000 a mile more than the Minister of Public Works knew to be available to any company undertaking the construction of his line under the New Brunswick legislation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend suggest that the company has not put any of its own money into it, and is to build it entirely with the government guarantee and the Dominion subsidy?

Mr. CROCKET. Will the Minister of Public Works explain to me how any company which is required to give a first mortgage to the provincial government to secure it with respect to a guarantee of $25,000 a mile is to make up the difference between the amount available from the guarantee and subsidy and the cost of the construction of the railway?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will tell my hon. friend very quickly Under the lease to the Intercolonial railway it is agreed that no matter what the operating expenses may be there shall be from year to year 40 per cent of the gross earnings paid over to the company, and I say you cannot have a better financial basis on which to raise money.

Mr. CROCKET. Well, I think that will surprise some of the financiers of the country—that a company, which has no more interest in this proposition than a contract to construct the line and hand it over to the Intercolonial railway for a rental equal to 40 per cent of the gross earnings and to apply that rental to the payment of interest on the government bonds, can find it possible to turn three or four million dollars of private money into the enterprise.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, only to the amount of $1,000 a mile. All above that goes to the company.

Mr. CROCKET. The company has to pay sufficient of its rental money over to the provincial government in order to keep down the interest on the bonds.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And that is limited to $1,000 a mile.

Mr. CROCKET. And what about the earnings per mile? If the Minister of Public Works can find financiers who will ac-

cept a proposition like that, to raise sufficient money to pay the difference between the cost of construction and the moneys that will be available under the guarantee and the federal subsidy, he will be doing the people of the province a great service. It will be surprising, I think, to the financiers of the country if such a proposition can be made to go in this country. I have referred also to the proposition which the Minister of Public Works put through the New Brunswick legislature in the session of 1907. After the passage of that Act, the firm of Mackenzie & Mann sent engineers over this route, and they communicated to the Minister of Public Works the fact that that railway could not be built for the amount of the guarantee plus the federal subsidy, estimating the cost of the line at $40,000 a mile at least exclusive of bridging; and they informed the Minister of Public Works that they could not entertain the proposition at all unless the guarantee were increased to $30,000 a mile. Will the hon. minister deny that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think they wanted some other conditions imposed, which were met by the government operation. For instance, they wanted interest provided for during the first few years of operation. But fortunately this government saves the company from that and from loss in respect of that.

Mr. CROCKET. I am quite correct in the statement I have made, that they estimated the cost as at least $40,000 per mile, exclusive of bridging the St. John river, and asked that the guarantee of the bonds be increased from $15,000 to $30,000 a mile, and furthermore, that for the first seven years of the operation of the road, the province should pay any deficiency which might arise in the earnings of the road necessary to pay the interest on the bonds, which does not look as if that firm at least looked for much surplus over and above the amount required to pay the interest on the bonds. For the next three years any deficiency paid by the province would remain a debt by the company to be repaid by the issue of further bonds.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Now, the government has to pay 40 per cent of the earnings over to the company, no matter what the operating expenses may be.

Mr. CROCKET. The Minister of Public Works had the statement of Mr. Mann that the road could not be built for less than $40,000 per mile exclusive of bridging, and that it was necessary that there should be a guarantee of $30,000 a mile. That estimate was based, not on the specification of the Transcontinental railway system, which called for a grade of four-tenths of one per cent, with 80-pound rails, but on the specification prescribed by the Minister of Public Works in the Act which he had passed by the New Brunswick legislature in the session of 1907, namely, 67-pound rails, with no specification whatever as to grade further than that it should be up to the standard of a first class trunk line. Now, my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) and the Minister of Public Works are very anxious to hear something about a recent proposition which has been made to the government of New Brunswick for the construction of this line. I suppose they refer to the proposition of their good and useful friend, Mr. Thomas Malcolm.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The proposition I referred to was that of Mr. Malcolm on behalf of the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.

Mr. CROCKET. There is something rather peculiar in the manner in which this communication became known. A member of the provincial opposition speaking the other day at Fredericton was the first to give it to the world. It seems that he had in some way received a copy of this letter which had been addressed by Mr. Malcolm to Mr. Hazen, the Premier of New Brunswick. The letter was marked 'private'.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, not the letter. There was no word 'private' on the letter.

Mr. CARVELL. Only the envelope was marked 'private.'

Mr. CROCKET. I will read the letter as it appears in the official report of the New Brunswick legislature:

Campbellton, N.B.,
Feb. 25, 1911.

Dear Sir,—On behalf of the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company, the charter of which has been granted by parliament with power to construct and equip a railway from Quebec to St. John, I hereby offer to enter into a contract to construct the portion from Grand Falls to St. John, the line when so constructed and equipped to be leased to the government of Canada and operated as part of the Intercolonial system, pursuant to the proposed legislation which the Dominion government has submitted to parliament.

The provincial legislation would, of course, have to be modified so as to conform to the proposed Dominion legislation as to lease, &c.

As I understand it, the bonds would be guaranteed as each ten miles are completed.

I am prepared to give the necessary security for payment of interest on the bonds during construction of each section until completed, and its operation assumed by the Intercolonial.

As you know, I have just completed the International railway, and my plant is now available to enable me to commence work at once, and complete the various sections with all possible speed.

If your government is disposed to enter into

a contract with my company, I shall be pleased to meet with you and discuss the details of the agreement.

Awaiting a reply, I am yours truly,

(Sgd.) THOS. MALCOLM.

The Premier, Mr. Hazen, replied as follows:

Fredericton, N.B.,
March 2, 1911.

Thomas Malcolm, Esq.,
Campbellton, N.B.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your favour of the 25th ult., marked 'private,' which has been forwarded to me from St. John.

As soon as the Act of last session authorizing the government of New Brunswick to give aid to the construction of the St. John Valley railway has been proclaimed and the resolutions, of which notice has been given in the House of Commons at Ottawa, have been discussed and disposed of, I will be very glad to meet you and discuss the details of any proposition which you have to make. I am,

Yours very truly,
J. D. HAZEN.

Does the Minister of Public Works now say that that letter was not marked 'private?'

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will say exactly what Mr. Malcolm tells me. He addressed a public official letter, of which that is a copy, and which was not marked 'private,' to Mr. Hazen at St. John; that, as Mr. Hazen might be at Fredericton when the letter arrived, he wanted it to reach him personally, and therefore he wrote the word 'private' on the envelope, not on the letter; that Mr. Hazen, in replying to the letter as marked 'private,' referred to the envelope; and that Mr. Malcolm at once notified Mr. Hazen that the letter was not intended to be private and that he could make public use of it.

Mr. CROCKET. We have heard the minister's statement, and we have also heard the first paragraph of Mr. Hazen's letter in reply to Mr. Malcolm, in which he states that the letter was marked 'private.' I cannot see that it makes very much difference whether it was marked 'private' in the way the minister states or on the letter itself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would make this difference. A charge has been made against Mr. Tweeddale, of Victoria county, that he read a private letter in the legislature. The letter itself was not marked 'private,' a copy of which he says was sent to him by the hon. member for Carleton to use in connection with the Bill of the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company, but was a public document. Therefore it would not it seems to me, be objectionable for the hon. member for Carleton to send a copy of that letter to a member of the legislature of New Brunswick.

Mr. CROCKET.

Mr. CROCKET. We have the statement of the premier of New Brunswick that the letter was marked 'private.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. The premier of New Brunswick will not tell you that the letter was marked 'private.'

Mr. CROCKET. The premier's letter says, 'Your letter marked 'private' which has been forwarded to me from St. John.' And furthermore, we have this,—a letter written by Mr. Malcolm, under date of March 6 to Mr. Hazen, acknowledging receipt of Mr. Hazen's letter:

Dear Sir,—Please accept my thanks for your favour to my letter of the 25th ult. Although marked 'private' it was intended for you to use in council if you wished to do so.

So, if the Minister of Public Works has correctly repeated what Mr. Malcolm stated, then Mr. Malcolm's statement is at variance with what Mr. Malcolm himself wrote in his reply to the New Brunswick premier. There is another statement from Mr. Malcolm, which, is perhaps, later than the statement the Minister of Public Works has made in regard to the making public of this communication. Mr. Hazen telegraphed to Mr. Malcolm on the date on which Mr. Tweeddale made use of this letter in the legislature, and this is Mr. Malcolm's reply to Mr. Hazen's telegram. It is dated Montreal. I suppose Mr. Malcolm had been in Ottawa, and, no doubt, was in close conference again with his friend the Minister of Public Works—

Montreal, March 17.

Mr. J. D. Hazen, Premier.

Message received. I furnished Mr. Carvell with a copy of my offer, he having charge of Bill now before parliament, to amend Act relating to the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company. I know nothing about its being circulated in New Brunswick, your telegram being first intimation I had of it.

THOS. MALCOLM.

The statement has been made in the New Brunswick legislature that this letter which Mr. Malcolm had addressed to Mr. Hazen had been circulated throughout the county of Carleton before it was read in the New Brunswick legislature. I think this correspondence disposes of the question whether this was intended as a private communication or not.

Now, Mr. Malcolm's offer he says, was made on behalf of the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company. The Minister of Public Works states, and so does the hon. member for Carleton, that it was a bona fide proposition. But it is pretty difficult for me to believe—and I think it will be pretty difficult for most people in New Brunswick to believe—in view of the facts, that this is a bona fide proposition. Here is Mr. Malcolm, on the 25th of February, before the New Brunswick Act is pro-

claimed submitting to the New Brunswick government a proposition to construct for a bond guarantee of $25,000 a mile and the federal subsidy of $6,400 a line of railway which surveys then showed would cost from $43,000 to $48,000 a mile without seeing or applying to see the plans and profiles or the estimates. So far as Mr. Malcolm's proposition is concerned, it is to build from Grand Falls to St. John. The estimate of the New Brunswick government engineers is $43,000 a mile by one route, and $48,000 a mile by the other route. It it rather singular, to say the least of it, that Mr. Malcolm, before the Act of the New Brunswick legislature, authorizing the guarantee of bonds for this railway had been proclaimed, while this resolution was standing on the Order Paper of this House, which resolution, I propose to show, was a rejection of the New Brunswick offer as embodied in the New Brunswick Act—should have communicated such a proposition as that before any of these things had occurred without even waiting to learn the result of the surveys. He says he does so on behalf of the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company. That company was incorporated by Act of this parliament in the session of 1900, that is eleven years ago. The company was authorized to construct a line of railway from Connors station on the Temiscouata railway to a point on the Intercolonial railway at or near St. Charles Junction, or a point on the Quebec Central railway at or near St. Anselme, or a point on the Grand Trunk at or near Chaudière Junction, a distance of 130 miles. It was incorporated with a capital of $900,000. Eleven years have elapsed and, up to the present time, not one tap has been struck on the construction of that railway—

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman is in error.

Mr. CROCKET. I examined the railway report. With the exception of a mile or two reported as under construction at the present time. With that exception the company has done absolutely nothing except get its charter amended and enlarged. The company came back in 1903 and got an extension of time. In 1908, having made another default, they came back, and, as a premium for their default, I suppose, obtained power to add another alternative to their original route and build another new line from one of these termini to a point in the State of Maine. They obtained another extension of time in that year. In the session of 1909, having done nothing, the company came to this parliament again and obtained power to build another line, from Connors station down the River St. John to the city of St. John—a further premium, I suppose, for their further default. The Act of 1909 required them to spend 15 per cent of their capital stock within two years after the passage of the Act, which was passed on the 16th of June, if I remember the date correctly, and to have the entire railway completed—all of these several lines being treated as one—within five years. Now, they come, having nothing done, asking for a further extension of two years. And, notwithstanding that they have received these added powers, their capital stock remains at the original figure of $900,000, which would require the expenditure of but $135,000 on all these three lines in the next two years to save their charter under the 15 per cent clause.

I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works and the member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) how that company can fairly be expected to undertake the construction of this line under the terms quoted. They have bonding privileges to the extent of $35,000 per mile; they must give a first mortgage to the government of New Brunswick to the extent of $25,000 a mile. I cannot see how it is possible that they should undertake the construction of that line on these terms with any possibility of carrying it to a successful completion, involving, as it does, the raising of nearly $4,000,000 in addition to the amount realizable from the government guarantee and the federal subsidy—this company with a capital stock of $900,000.

Furthermore, I understand that they have given notice of legislation to obtain extension of time and an increase of capital stock. The Bill submitted to this House contains no reference to capital stock, so that they expect, with capital stock standing at $900,000, to build such a line of railway as this mentioned in this resolution. It seems to me an entirely novel thing in railway construction in this country for a railway company, without having plans or profiles or taking any trouble to consult the estimates, to submit a proposition to build a $48,000 per mile road for $30,000 or $31,000 per mile.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Malcolm said he had been over the ground himself, and he had sent an engineer over the entire route and examined it with the view of constructing the railway.

Mr. CROCKET. That may be like other statements which the Minister of Public Works has made with regard to Mr. Malcolm. But Mr. Malcolm knew that the government of New Brunswick were conducting a survey of this line, that the survey was complete and available to any who choose to apply for the information, yet, as I understand it, Mr. Malcolm submits this proposition before that Act is proclaimed, while this legislation is standing on the Order Paper—which I will show is a rejection of the New Brunswick legislation—without having ex-

amined the plans or profiles or even applying for any information respecting them.

If the people of New Brunswick can be induced to think that Mr. Malcolm was acting in good faith when he made that proposition, they are very easily persuaded. For my part I believe that it is a pure bluff made for the purpose of enabling the Minister of Public Works to give some excuse for the terms of this resolution, and in anticipation of this debate.

Mr. CARVELL. Why do you not call the bluff?

Mr. CROCKET. The government of New Brunswick is not in the bluff business. In addition to this extraordinary standard, the Minister of Public Works has taken care to insist that the government of New Brunswick or the contracting company must also provide the rolling stock. I submit that that is most unreasonable.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only the initial rolling stock.

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Malcolm is in this position with respect to his offer that—if these estimates are to be relied on which have been made up by Mr. Maxwell and his associates appointed by the New Brunswick government, according to which the road is estimated to cost $48,800 a mile from Grand Falls to St. John—his company is in the position of having to build a line of railway which will cost over $10,000,000 out of a fund which will not exceed $6,000,000, so that the company would require to raise $4,000,000 aside from the bond guarantee and subsidy.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How does the hon. gentleman arrive at these figures?

Mr. CROCKET. I took them from the report Mr. Maxwell submitted to the New Brunswick legislature, I took them from the official report of the survey made to the New Brunswick government which was tabled in the legislature the other day. That statement shows that the cost of the railway from Grand Falls to St. John, including all bridges, 207 miles at $48,830 per mile would be $10,107,626; from Grand Falls via Perry Point to St. John, 210 miles at $43,980 per mile, $9,237,390; at $25,000 per mile under the New Brunswick bond guarantee plus $6,410 per mile, would not give more than $30,000 per mile, when you deduct the commission and the discount on the bonds, so that we have $10,000,000 by one route and $9,250,000 by another route, with a little over $6,000,000 available in this way, and yet this good friend of the Minister of Public Works desires to raise the difference of nearly $4,000,000 for the purpose of constructing this line and passing it over to the Intercolonial to be operated under a 99 year lease. If that is a proposition which the Minister of Public Works expects the people of New Brunswick to take seriously, he will be mistaken.

With regard to the rolling stock, why should this government insist upon the New Brunswick government or the construction company providing the rolling stock? Has that ever been done before?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the provincial statute that is provided for.

Mr. CROCKET. The Canadian Pacific railway has taken many railways over under long leases, and I understand it is their invariable practice to provide the rolling stock and equipment upon a basis of 60 per cent to 40 per cent similar to the terms in this resolution. What has this government itself done with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific? Hon. members are aware that under the terms of that contract, the government leases that road to the Grand Trunk Pacific for a period of 50 years. What was the provision in that Act. It was that the lessees, the Grand Trunk Pacific, should provide the rolling stock? Did the government say, after building the line and passing it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific to operate under a 50 year lease, that the lessor should provide all of the rolling stock? No, the lessees are required to provide it. Yet when they come to consider this proposition from the New Brunswick government, the government which is to take this road over and become lessee insists that the New Brunswick government shall provide the rolling stock in addition to providing the railway, and that this government shall simply take it over and operate it It seems to me that that is a proposition which could not have been made for the purpose of expediting the construction of this railway. Why should this government refuse? I understood the Minister of Railways this afternoon to say that the initial equipment was a matter of small concern, probably not more than a quarter of a million dollars. If it is such a bagatelle as that surely the Minister of Public Works and the members of this government would not allow this proposition to fail by refusing to contribute even so small an amount as that towards the securing of this railway which they have stated is a matter of such urgent importance to the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the hon. member will read section 10 of the New Brunswick Act he will see that the New Brunswick government demands from the company just what we have included in this, that is they must provide the initial rolling stock before they can bond the road.

Mr. CROCKET. I shall refer to that, and perhaps the minister will get more light on it than he seems to have at the present time. In addition to what I have said with respect to the rolling stock, the In-

tercolonial railway have now rolling stock valued at $19,000,000 or over $13,000 per mile upon a mileage of upwards of 1,400 miles. Then they have railway workshops erected at a cost of millions of dollars to this country, where locomotives and cars are manufactured. What objection could there be, if this government are really desirous to construct this railway, to their equipping it with rolling stock to the extent of $250,000? If the road is operated as part of the government railway system it will become an important branch. Can not the Intercolonial railway run their rolling stock from Moncton on the St. John Valley railway just as easily as they do upon the Canada Eastern railway? I am going to ask that this resolution be altered so that the government of Canada will at least do some little part besides paying the subsidy in the effort that is being made to secure the construction of this line?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has the attention of the hon. gentleman been called to section 10 of the Act passed by the New Brunswick legislature at the instance of the New Brunswick government?

Before any of the company's bonds shall be guaranteed, the company shall provide in a manner satisfactory to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, by a deposit in money or other sufficient security, or by a deposit of part money and part security, in addition to such mortgage, for the payment of the interest on such bonds during the construction of the said line of railway, and until the same shall have been fully completed and provided with the initial equipment passed and approved by the government engineer.

Mr. CROCKET. My attention has been called to it, and I propose calling the attention of the minister to that and other sections of the Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the meaning of that?

Mr. CROCKET. Those were the terms that the Minister of Public Works deemed it to be his duty to insist on as the condition of this government entering into the consideration of this project. I think I have shown that there were conditions, which the minister must have known would have rendered impossible the construction of this railway, but he did not find the New Brunswick government quite so easy as he thought. They pushed the matter to the extent of passing an Act at the last session of the legislature. My friend from Carleton found that the matter was getting so warm in his constituency and the Minister of Public Works found it so warm along the St. John river that it was necessary that something further should be done in the matter. So a letter was procured from the Prime Minister to the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) which my hon. friend read at a meeting in the constituency of Carleton. The Prime Minister's letter simply stated that he would stand by the specification as prescribed in the letter of the Minister of Public Works, and insist upon the equipment of this road being made by the government of New Brunswick or by the railway company. Then the New Brunswick legislature took that proposal for what it was worth, they had the Act of last session passed in the terms prescribed by this government, except with respect to the rolling stock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And tied their own hands, did'nt they?

Mr. CROCKET. I am going to show that this resolution misquotes the legislation that was passed in New Brunswick, and is an attempt to deceive the members of this House and the people of the province of New Brunswick. Section 11 reads:

No such agreement shall be entered into with any company or corporation for the construction of the said line of railway or for the guaranteeing of the said bonds, and no such bonds or debentures shall be guaranteed, unless and until the parliament of Canada shall enact legislation authorizing the granting of a subsidy in aid of the construction of the said railway, to the amount of not less than $6,400 per mile, and authorizing the entering, by the said government of Canada into an agreement with such company or corporation and with the government of New Brunswick aforesaid, for the leasing of the said line of railway, when completed, with its appurtenances and rolling stock and for the operation, equipment, maintenance, upkeep, and repair by such government of Canada as part of the government railway system of Canada for a period of 99 years and for the payment by the government of Canada to the said province of New Brunswick or the government thereof, each year, during the said term of 99 years of 40 per cent per annum of the gross earnings of said railway.

The committee will observe that the condition as there set out requires an agreement on the part of this government to lease that road for a period of 99 years, not only to lease it upon completion, but to operate, equip, maintain, upkeep and repair. This resolution which the Minister of Railways has read deliberately omits the word 'equipment' and is a false statement of the legislation as passed by the legislature of the province of New Brunswick. It is simply impossible that the construction of this road can be advanced if this legislation passes the House in its present form, because the government of New Brunswick has prescribed as one of the conditions of the guarantee that there must be an agreement for the leasing and for the equipment and operation of the railway.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It says maintenance, operation, upkeep and repair.

Mr. CROCKET. There is another section No. 16 setting forth the specification in the terms of the minister's letter. That section concludes with this proviso:

And such contracts——

That is the contract for the construction and operation of the road.

Provided that such railways shall be equipped by the said company or by the government of Canada with proper and sufficient rolling stock.

So there can be no question as to what the position of the New Brunswick government was upon this matter. Then Mr. Hazen in his speech in the House in introducing this legislation stated that it was most unfair to call upon the province of New Brunswick not only to guarantee bonds to the extent of $25,000 a mile for the construction of the line, but to insist that it should equip this road with rolling stock for operation by the Intercolonial railway. The position of the government was made clear in that respect. Yet this legislation, which purports to be an acceptance of this proposition, is actually a rejection of the offer of the New Brunswick government as embodied in that legislation. I am going to move, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the resolution be amended, and I cannot see what possible objection can be made by any member of this government to the insertion of a word in the preamble of this resolution which will convert it from an untruthful into a truthful preamble. I am going to move:

That the proposed resolution be amended by inserting the word 'equipment' between the words 'operation' and 'maintenance' in the fifteenth line of the preamble and by striking out the words 'with its appurtenances and rolling stock when completed and equipped with rolling stock and for the operation' in the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh lines and substituting in lieu therefor the words, 'when completed with its appurtenances and rolling stock and for the operation and equipment.'

So that the resolution will truthfully set forth the legislation passed by the New Brunswick legislature and conform to the provisions of the New Brunswick Act.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does my hon. friend think it possible, in view of section 10 of their Act, which says in so many words that they will not guarantee the bonds unless the company provide the initial equipment——

Mr. CARVELL. They cannot guarantee the bonds.

Mr. GRAHAM. They cannot guarantee them now under the Act. Does not my hon. friend think that he will be absolutely preventing this government from doing anything if he introduces these words?

Mr. CROCKET. I have read section 11 of this Act.

Mr. GRAHAM. Read section 10.

Mr. CROCKET. Section 11 of this Act contains the condition set forth in the resolution before the House, and I ask any member of this committee to follow the reading of the preamble of this resolution with the reading of this section.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Read section 10, which provides for guaranteeing the bonds.

Mr. GRAHAM. It simply nullifies the whole thing if you do that.

Mr. CROCKET. This is section 11.

Mr. GRAHAM. Read section 10.

Mr. CROCKET (reading):

No such agreement shall be entered into with any company or corporation for the construction of the said line of railway or for the guaranteeing of the said bonds, and no such bonds or debentures shall be guaranteed unless and until the parliament of Canada shall enact legislation authorizing the granting of a subsidy in aid of the construction of the said railway——

——that has already been done.

—to the amount of not less than $6,400 per mile, and authorizing the entering by the said government of Canada into an agreement with such company or corporation and with the government of New Brunswick aforesaid, for the leasing of the said line of railway, when completed, with its appurtenances and rolling stock and for the operation, equipment, maintenance, upkeep and repair——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not that provide—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CROCKET. How can the government of New Brunswick under that legislation guarantee the bonds of this company unless that agreement is entered into with this government under the terms which are there stated, one of the terms being that the government shall undertake to enter into this lease and provide for the operation and equipment of the railway? The preamble states the conditions untruthfully and insists that the government will take it over only when the road is equipped with rolling stock, which is contrary to the terms of the New Brunswick legislation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has intimated that he wishes to close before six o'clock.

Mr. CROCKET. I think that I have been pretty indulgent to the Minister of Public Works this afternoon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All right.

Mr. CROCKET. I propose, therefore, to move the amendment which I have already read that the word 'equipment' be inserted in that way, and that the other words that I have read be substituted for the words that appear in lines 26 and 27. Then that resolution will conform precisely with the legislation as it has been passed by the New Brunswick legislature. If the government do not accept that legislation then the whole matter is off, because the legislation of this parliament and the legislation of New Brunswick are at variance. and no work can be gone on with. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) seconds the motion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am quite sure that the words of the resolution which provide that the government shall maintain, operate and keep up the railway under this lease for ninety-nine years means the providing of the necessary equipment. All that has to be provided by the company is the ini tial equipment. My hon. friend has called attention to section 10 of the New Brunswick Act and also to section 11. I say they both provide very clearly that the company must provide the initial equipment. If the company does not do that the provincial government cannot guarantee the bonds. Take section 10, which provides that:

Before any of the company's bonds shall be guaranteed, the company shall provide, in a manner satisfactory to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, by a deposit in money or other sufficient security, or of a deposit of part money and part security, in addition to such mortgage, for the payment of interest on such bonds during the construction of the said line of railway, and until the same shall have been fully completed and provided with the initial equipment passed and approved by the government engineer.

When that condition is fulfilled, and not until then, has the provincial government any power to guarantee the bonds, and, Sir, these are the words, not of this government, not of the member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), or myself, but they are the words of the government of New Brunswick which they have introduced into the statute and asked the legislature to enact. Then, section 11, which my hon. friend relied upon, provides that:

No such agreement shall be entered into with any company or corporation for the construction of the said line of railway for the guaranteeing of the said bonds, and no such bonds or debentures shall be guaranteed unless and until the parliament of Canada shall enact legislation authorizing the granting of a subsidy in aid of the construction of the said railway to the amount of not less than $6,400 per mile, and authorizing the entering, by the said government of Canada into an agreement with such company or corporation and with the government of New Brunswick aforesaid, for the leasing of the said line of railway when completed with its appurtenances and rolling stock——

Mr. CROCKET. Read the next word.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So, Sir, the legislature has provided——

Mr. GRAHAM. They have tied it up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They have tied their hands. Perhaps they did it because they thought they would prevent the government operation of this St. John Valley railway, which is the last thing in the world that the government of New Brunswick wants.

Mr. CROCKET. Does not this resolution omit the word 'equipment' from the preamble?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not the point. We are speaking now of the initial equipment.

Mr. CROCKET. Is not the condition set forth in the preamble of the resolution taken from section 11, and is not the word 'equipment' omitted?

Mr. PUGSLEY No, it provides in the first place just as the legislature of New Brunswick, at the instance of the provincial government, has provided: that the company must provide the initial equipment. Then, when the initial equipment is provided the company becomes the lessee; it agrees to operate the road for 99 years, and after the initial equipment is once provided by the company the company has nothing more to do with it. The company must provide the initial rolling stock and the government must provide for the upkeep of the road and the rolling stock during the whole term of 99 years.

Mr. CROCKET. Then, what is the object of omitting the word 'equipment?'

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no object.

Mr. CROCKET. Then why not accept the amendment?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The thing is so plain that any man who wishes to understand it can understand it. What the government ask the company to do is to provide for the initial equipment. My hon. friend says it is unfair for this government to require the company to provide the initial equipment, but the provincial government is requiring the same thing. The provincial government has tied its hands and provided by statute that it cannot guarantee one of these bonds until the company provides the initial equipment, and then it is the railway and the rolling stock which are to be leased to the government of Canada. Whatever rolling stock the government of Canada puts on the road after the initial equipment is its own rolling stock, but section 11 provides that the company is to

lease its rolling stock with the road to the government, and that is of course the initial rolling stock which is to be provided by the company. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) said that the provincial legislature has required certain things, and has excused itself for making these stipulations because of a letter which I wrote to the president of the railway company and which was afterwards confirmed by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. But, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) should have called attention to the fact that in the letter which I wrote to the president of the company I stated that if these terms cannot be agreed upon by the provincial government, then a conference should be held and a modification considered. I held out a hand to the provincial government and gave them an opportunity to say that if they thought these terms too onerous, if they thought it would not be possible to get the company to build and provide the initial equipment for the road, then let them come to the federal government and suggest such modifications as they might require. I have here a letter which I addressed to Mr. Chestnut, who was the president of the railway company, and I have a letter which Mr. Chestnut addressed to Mr. Hazen, premier of New Brunswick, in which he referred to an interview he had with me, and in which I told him that if the provincial government regarded these conditions as too hard, then the proper thing for the provincial government to do was to ask the legislature to provide that the specifications and conditions should be left to the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I left a way open there for negotiations, and after recess I will read that letter. The provincial government was so anxious to prevent government operation of the St. John Valley railway that they had asked the legislature to absolutely tie their hands so that no matter what modification the Minister of Railways might be willing to make, no matter what change in the situation he might be willing to agree to, the provincial government would not be able to act. It is the most extraordinary action I ever knew a government to take, they being one party to a proposed bargain, we being another, and we suggesting certain terms, they declined to ask the legislature to leave it to them to negotiate; they declined to ask the legislature to allow reconsideration of the conditions, but they asked the legislature to tie their hands so that unless the conditions were complied with in the minutest particular they could not guarantee the bonds. But, Sir, they will be obliged, if they want this road built (as they know now from the report of their own engineer), they will be obliged to go back to the legislature and ask that modifications be enacted, or they will never get a road such as the people of the province of New Brunswick are demanding, and which is necessary for the progress, prosperity and development of that beautiful St. John river valley.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before recess I was speaking of the equipment of this railway. I would like to understand clearly what my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) desires by his amendment. Is it that it may be made more clear that the Intercolonial railway is to provide for all equipment after the initial equipment?

Mr. DANIEL. I expect my hon. friend from York, to be here in a moment; but I understand that in wishing to insert the word 'equipment' in the resolution, his idea is that it will then devolve upon the Intercolonial railway to provide the rolling stock and to operate the railway after its construction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If that is what my hon. friend desires by the amendment, I may say that the provincial statute will not permit that to be done. But that, as I understand, was not the substance of the amendment. I understood that he wanted it to appear clearly by the resolution that after the initial equipment, which will probably cost not more than $1,000 a mile, making the total cost about $200,000, or, as the Minister of Railways said, about $250,000, the Intercolonial railway should be bound to furnish the additional equipment that should be required from time to time. I may say to my hon. friend that that is the intention of the government in using the words, 'operation, maintenance, upkeep and repair.' The Minister of Railways intended that that should include all repairs to the rolling stock, all additions to the rolling stock, the furnishing of the cars, locomotives and equipment necessary to operate the road during the whole term of the lease. This, of course, would be increased from time to time as the business of the road increased.

Mr. DANIEL. What is meant by initial equipment?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To enable it to pass the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the province of New Brunswick. Under section 10 of the New Brunswick statute it is provided that before any of the bonds shall be guaranteed, the road shall be fully completed and provided with the initial equipment, and that is to be passed and approved by the government engineer. After that is provided satisfactory to the Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, the In-

tercolonial railway takes charge, operates, and provides all the equipment, all the renewals, all the repairs to the rolling stock and everything, including maintenance, which shall be required during the term of the lease.

Mr. CROCKET. The last clause of section 10 is: 'and until the same shall have been fully completed and provided with the initial equipment passed and approved by the government engineer.' Then, the minister lost sight of the last clause of section 16: 'and such contract (for the construction of the railway) shall also provide that such railway shall be equipped by the said company or by the government of Canada with proper and sufficient rolling stock.' So that while section 10 has this provision with respect to equipment, section 16 provides that that must be provided either by the company or by the government of Canada. That is the position of the provincial government. The position of this government, as I understand it, is that the rolling stock must be provided out of the provincial guarantee either by the company or by the provincial government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; that the initial rolling stock shall be provided by the company; then, by the lease to which the Dominion of Canada will be a party, the Intercolonial railway shall provide all the rolling stock which shall be required after that during the whole term of the lease.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister will see that the company, having available only the $30,000 provincial guarantee and the federal subsidy, must not only build the road, but equip it if this government does not accept the offer of the New Brunswick government as embodied in the statute.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not necessarily. I understand that they will have available $35,000 of a bond issue, of which $25,000 shall be secured by a first mortgage and $10,000 by a second mortgage; also $6,400 a mile of Dominion subsidy; also capital stock to the amount of $900,000. If they can finance the undertaking, they have plenty of securities to place with capitalists for the purpose of raising the necessary money to provide the initial rolling stock.

Mr. CROCKET. That would require the company to raise at least $2,000,000 of their own funds in addition to the guarantee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all. I do not see why they could not furnish the initial equipment under such a favourable lease as the Dominion government propose to enter into with them. The provincial government absolutely requires that this initial rolling stock shall be provided by the company, because it has to be provided before the bonds are guaranteed. The provincial government is to guarantee the bonds as each ten miles are finished. The Intercolonial railway is not to begin the operation until certain sections of the road are provided with the initial rolling stock by the company. I was asking my hon. friend what he desired by his amendment.

Mr. CROCKET. The purpose of the amendment is to make this resolution conform with section 11 of the New Brunswick Act, which provides that the provincial government can guarantee no bonds until this government agrees to lease the road upon completion, and makes an agreement for its equipment, operation, maintenance, upkeep and repair. This preamble leaves out the word 'equipment,' which is in the New Brunswick Act, and which must be in the agreement before the Lieutenant Governor in Council would have authority under this section to guarantee the bonds. I certainly think that this government ought to undertake to provide the initial equipment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is absolutely clear that the provincial Act does not admit that, because it provides that the initial equipment must be furnished before the bonds are guaranteed.

Mr. CROCKET. The hon. minister says that the Act will not let him. I can give him the assurance that if this government will undertake to provide the initial equipment and the rolling stock, the New Brunswick Act will be very quickly amended if it is necessary. The New Brunswick legislature is now in session.

Mr. GRAHAM. Then the hon. gentleman admits that under the New Brunswick Act, as it now stands, we cannot provide the initial equipment. In that Act the provincial legislature says that they cannot guarantee the bonds unless the company provides the initial equipment. That is the statute we are trying to confirm.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why leave out the word 'equipment.'

Mr. GRAHAM. It will conflict, because they say the company will provide the initial equipment, and that the New Brunswick government will only guarantee the bonds on that condition. I am quite willing to amend the resolution so as to provide that after the company has furnished the initial equipment, the lessee will provide all the equipment necessary from that date on. That will hurt no one.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The word 'equipment' has some meaning as it is in the New Brunswick Act. When you recite

the New Brunswick Act, I do not see the justification for leaving it out.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do not profess to give the exact words of the Act, but only its effect. Take for instance, section 9. It says: The guarantee is to be a guarantee bonds secured upon the railway franchise, stations, right of way and all rolling stock.

Mr. CROCKET. There would be some rolling stock in connection with the construction of the road.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all, because the construction is done by a contractor.

Mr. CROCKET. But there must always be some rolling stock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not owned by the company. That would be the contractors' rolling stock. What I asked my hon. friend was to make clear what it was he wanted by his amendment. If he wants the Intercolonial railway to provide the initial rolling stock, I say that that is not contemplated by the provincial statute. I say also it would not be fair. The hon. gentleman has quoted the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company leasing the National Transcontinental railway, and he says that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company is required to furnish the rolling stock. So it is, but the government leases its road to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for fifty years at a rental of 3 per cent on the cost and gives the road the seven first years of operation absolutely free of rental.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Longer if they do not make a rental.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, three years longer if they do not earn the rental. Is that the case here? No. From the very day the road is finished, from the time each section is finished, the government is authorized to enter upon its operation and not have it free of rent. No, whether the company's road earns the rent or not, whether the operating expenses are cleared or not, out of the total gross earnings the government is bound to pay to the province of New Brunswick, for the purpose of providing interest on the bonds the very large percentage of 40 per cent of the gross earnings of the road. So far from any criticism being made on this government or myself or on my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell), and the other Liberal members from New Brunswick, who induced my hon. colleague the Minister of Railways to make this agreement we ought to receive the thanks of every man interested in the construction of the railway along the valley of the St. John. This government only agreed to this liberal arrangement because we realize that we have in that portion of the province of New Brunswick a section of country which, I do not hesitate to say, for richness and fertility of the soil, for the opportunities it affords for supporting a large population, is not surpassed by any part of the Dominion. It is only because the government felt that that section of country, which had been settled so many years, and was absolutely without railway accommodation, was entitled to that accommodation—it was only because of the strong feeling which my right hon. friend, the First Minister, and the other members of the government have with respect to the claims of the people of that section, that the government considered itself justified in making this most liberal arrangement. To show you that we made a most liberal arrangement, let me say that in Ontario where the Grand Trunk have many lines leased, they have scarcely ever paid more than thirty or thirty-five per cent of the gross earnings. I asked Mr. Hays of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway if, in case an arrangement could be made with the provincial government, his company would undertake to operate the road. He said that they would consider its operation, but only on the basis of seventy per cent and thirty per cent. Here however, we have an agreement by this government undertaking that from the very first day the various sections are open to traffic, the government will pay over the large proportion of forty per cent of the gross earnings. I am almost afraid to mention what is the liability this government is undertaking. It is impossible to state that accurately, but I am rather inclined to the view that in addition to the subsidy of $6,400 per mile, the government, during the first five years operation of the St. John Valley road, will be obliged to incur a liability of at least $1,000,000. That means an expenditure for the benefit of the people along the St. John valley of at least $200,000 a year. After five years something will begin to come in, the increased earnings will be large, and no doubt the government will then be able to pay over this amount, and probably sixty per cent will cover all the operating expenses of the railway, but the offer is a most generous one on the part of this government. When it was announced that we had agreed to pay forty per cent of the gross earnings, my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), who was formerly Minister of Railways told me, that he was utterly surprised that we had made such a liberal arrangement. I explained to him that it was only by reason of the great importance of the road, and of the very strong desire the government had to give the people of St. John valley this railway accommodation that we agreed to this most liberal treatment.

I want to go back a little over the history

of this St. John Valley railway. I am not going back beyond the year 1909. The hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) referred to what took place when I was premier of New Brunswick, and sought to secure the construction of this road through Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann. But that is ancient history. The people of St. John valley have waited so long for this road, they are so vitally interested in securing its early completion that they do not care what any public man of New Brunswick did or said even four years ago. They are tired and sick of political and party squabbles, and to a man they are united in a demand that all political differences shall be sunk, all party spirit voted down, and that all public men of the province shall unite in securing the early construction of this railway. What they want is that we on both sides shall earnestly strive and bring to bear our best judgment and ability in order to secure the early construction of the road. I shall begin, not in 1907, but in 1909, when a delegation composed of the directors and principal stockholders of the St. John Valley railway and other people interested in that line came to Ottawa.

They interviewed my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and a number of his colleagues, of whom I was one. And I remember the president of the company was Mr. C. Fred. Chestnut, then mayor of the city of Fredericton. They submitted their proposal and said that the government of New Brunswick had stated to them through the Premier that that government would be willing to get authority from the legislature to guarantee the bonds to the extent of $25,000 per mile, provided this government would, through the Intercolonial railway, operate the road upon the basis of paying to the company, or to the government of New Brunswick, 40 per cent of the gross earnings. It is true, as stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) that the Prime Minister expressed himself in the most sympathetic manner when they got through their presentation of the case, and stated that his answer would be given to them at as early a date as possible. My hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) says that the Prime Minister stated that this was a definite proposal. I was present, and have to take issue with my hon. friend on that point; and I am satisfied that his memory does not serve him rightly with regard to what took place on that occasion. My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) was there also. I can only say that I have no recollection of the Prime Minister having made that statement.

Mr. CARVELL. How could he?

Mr. PUGSLEY. And, as my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) says, how could he?

Mr. CROCKET. If the minister will allow me—is he not aware that the St. John 'Telegraph' contained a report of the proceedings before the government on that occasion, telegraphed from Ottawa by their Ottawa correspondent in the course of which it was stated that the Prime Minister described the proposition as a definite proposition.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All I can say is that I have not seen any such report so far as I now recollect, and I have no recollection of the Prime Minister making the statement attributed to him. And he could not make the statement, because there was no definiteness in the proposition; there was only the broad statement that the provincial government would guarantee bonds at $25,000 a mile, provided the government would agree to operate the road as part of the Intercolonial. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) as a reasonable man, not see that the question of operating and of the percentage which would be paid would, in justice to the people of Canada for whom this government speaks and acts, necessarily be the most important question? Could the government afford to have the road built with rails of 40 pounds to the yard? Could it afford to have the road built with wooden bridges, with curves shorter than are suitable for profitable railroad operation, with grades unsuitable for a first-class road? Surely, the hon. gentleman must see from his own statement that there was no definiteness whatever in their proposition. This interview took place on the 12th of April, and he said that this government actually waited until the 18th of April before giving a reply.

Mr. CROCKET. I see that nothing was done until the 28th of April.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, the 28th: That is just sixteen days after the interview. Surely my hon. friend cannot be serious when he suggests that sixteen days was a long time for the government to take to consider a question of such enormous importance as this, one which may involve this country in a liability of at least a million dollars in the first five years of the operation of the road, before the traffic reaches the proportions to which we hope it will grow in the not distant future? I think that every reasonable man will see that if the government waited sixteen days, that was not an unduly long time to wait. Now, what took place then? My hon. friend from Carleton, as I understand, in response to a request from the secretary of the company, Mr. Winslow, wired that he had seen the Prime Minister—if I remember correctly—and that the Prime Minister suggested that the provincial government should have legislation passed, and then submit their definite proposition to this government, and the government would be

prepared at a very early day to give them an answer. I understand that, upon that telegram being received, a delegation of the people from the St. John valley waited upon the premier of the province, Mr. Hazen, and he promised to introduce legislation in the session of 1909, leading the people to believe that he was going to introduce the legislation providing for the guarantee. But, at the last moment, he declined to do so, for reasons, as I suppose, best known to himself.

The matter then went over. Later on, a communication was made from the president of the company to me, and I wrote the letter of June 19, 1909, to which my hon. friend has referred. I would ask any hon. member of this House, I would ask the people of New Brunswick, and especially those in the St. John valley, to read that letter and see whether it was a proper letter for me, as Minister of Public Works, to have written. I suggest that a definite proposition should be made: I suggest that the road should be built to a high standard—I said in a general way that it should be built up to the standard of the Transcontinental, making it a first-class trunk line; I indicated a four-tenths per cent grade and rails of 80 pounds to the yard, bridges of steel and the roadbed of a first-class line. I did that because I was not then prepared, and am not now prepared to advocate the countenance by this government of the granting of any aid to this road, or entering into any contract with the company which may engage in the construction of the road, which does not provide not merely for a local railway, but for one which, in the future, may be part of a Transcontinental line which will bear the traffic of the fertile west to the great port of St. John for shipment to the markets of the old world. That is the ideal I had before me, and that is the reason I was anxious to have the road built to a high standard. In that letter, I suggested that if the provincial government made their proposition and we did not accept it, then I would suggest that a conference be held so that modifications might be agreed upon. The provincial government did not act upon that suggestion, and I desire to say now, and to make a statement, which, I am sure, will strike the House as extraordinary, that the government of New Brunswick which has professed to be so anxious to secure the construction of this St. John valley railway has never directly communicated with the Prime Minister, the Minister of Railways or myself, the member of the government representing the province of New Brunswick, with regard to its construction: every communication has been made through third parties, either officers of the St. John Valley Railway Company or the members of a delegation. Later on, when it came to the winter of 1910, Mr. Chestnut, the president of the St. John Valley Railway Company, who had been taking a very great interest in the line, and had done everything possible to secure its early construction, came to see me in Ottawa. And just a few days ago, I received a letter from Mr. Chestnut which is marked 'personal'. Mr. Chestnut speaks as a man who was mayor of Fredericton. He was, and I believe he is to-day, president of the St. John Valley Railway Company. He, as much at all events as any other man, has taken a hearty interest in this project. He has been several times to Ottawa with reference to it, and has done everything he could to facilitate the undertaking and secure the construction of the road. And, allow me to say, Mr. Chairman, I go into this matter somewhat in detail, because there is a determined effort on the part of certain public men in the province of New Brunswick—I am afraid on the part of the government for which my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) presumes to speak to-night when he ventures to give the assurance to the Minister of Railways that the government will amend its Act upon his suggestion, and on receiving word from him, to place the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) and myself and this government in a false position with regard to this matter.

Therefore it is that I venture, even although I may weary the House, to go somewhat into detail in connection with what took place.

On March 13 of this year Mr. Chestnut wrote me as follows:

Hon. William Pugsley,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Possibly you may remember that the St. John Valley Railway Company sent me to Ottawa, in February of last year, to see you in connection with the possibility of bringing about a modification of the standard, of the proposed road, which would be acceptable to the provincial government. Also to discuss other matters bearing upon the same project. This, of course, was before Mr. Hazen brought down his legislation.

Let my hon. friend mark that Mr. Chestnut came to Ottawa as the president of this company for the purpose of interviewing me in regard to modifications with reference to the standard, and this was before the provincial government had brought down their legislation of last year. Mr. Chestnut says:

This, of course, was before Mr. Hazen brought down his legislation.

You presented your views to me so frankly, and fairly, that I asked for and obtained, your consent to communicate the substance of my interview with you to Premier Hazen, which I did upon my return to this city.

At Mr. Hazen's request I left with him a

memorandum, setting forth what I understood your views to be, in regard to the points then under discussion.

I am now inclosing herewith a copy of said memorandum with the thought that it may, even at this date, be of some interest to you. Especially so perhaps when it is considered that this information was in Mr. Hazen's hands before his Bill re the St. John Valley Railway (section 16, part 2, fixes the standard) was introduced. Also in view of the fact that the local government press now try to make it appear that the federal government fixed an impossible standard. Which of course is ridiculous.

Yours respectfully,
C. FRED. CHESTNUT.

There is the letter from the President of the St. John Valley Railway Company which was organized by leading citizens from all the counties along the valley of the St. John from almost its upper waters down to the city of St. John.

Mr. CROCKET. Can the minister state whether Mr. Chestnut interviewed him at Ottawa before Mr. Carvell read the letter the Prime Minister gave him? I think it was on the 25th of January.

Mr. CARVELL. No, this would be after.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is on February 14, 1910, that he writes to Mr. Hazen. Let me read this letter which Mr. Chestnut, as President of the St. John Valley Railway Company, wrote to Mr. Hazen.

February 14, 1910.

Hon. J. D. Hazen,
Premier,
Fredericton, N.B.

Dear Sir,—Having recently had an interview with the Hon. Mr. Pugsley at Ottawa concerning the St. John Valley Railway project, the local directors of the company suggested that I lay the substance of the same before you, which I will now do.

I said it had been intimated to me that you thought the standard outlined by him in his letter of June 19, 1909, was unnecessarily high and if adhered to might have the effect of holding up the proposition. As a consequence you would not care to incorporate such a standard in the local legislation as it might be charged that you were more or less responsible for such a result if it occurred.

He stated he had no such fear, but to meet your objections he suggested that it could be provided in your legislation that the standard should be subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

The minister's evident desire is to bring about the construction of a road of a high standard so as to enable it to successfully compete for transcontinental traffic and handle the same economically. He apparently has not the slightest doubt as to the possibility of obtaining a satisfactory road for the proposed guarantee of bonds and the double subsidy. His idea is that when the necessary legislation is secured the company would advertise for proposals. If this is done he is confident that a reliable concern will easily be found willing to undertake the work and complete it, up to the required standard, for the guarantee and subsidy. Further he stated that the federal government was prepared to get authority at this session of parliament to lease and operate the proposed road under the terms which have already been suggested by yourself, if the provincial government would bring down the necessary legislation at the approaching session of the local House.

Finally he stated that if the local government passed legislation guaranteeing bonds to the extent of $25,000 per mile under the proposed terms, he was willing to accept the responsibility if it was then found impossible to bring about the building of the road.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) C. FRED. CHESTNUT.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the minister on that occasion inform Mr. Chestnut that the government would be prepared to modify the conditions as laid down in his letter of June 19, and not to insist on a Transcontinental railway standard?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I told Mr. Chestnut was that if the standard was objectionable to the local government, then let the provincial government ask the legislature to pass a law giving them authority to guarantee the bonds, but to leave it to the Governor in Council to determine as to the conditions. That would leave the way open, as I explained to him, for negotiations between the two governments. I told him that all this government wanted was to secure the construction of a road up to a high standard. If it was found impossible to do that we were prepared, as the Minister of Railways had told me, to discuss the subject of modifications. The point I want to make is that on February 15, before Mr. Hazen had brought down the legislation in the provincial legislature, he was informed by Mr. Chestnut, the President of the St. John Valley Railway Company, that I had stated that in order to get over the objection which the premier of the province was making, it would be better that he should ask the legislature to provide in the Act that the specification should be subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. That would leave the matter open.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the minister at that time intimate to Mr. Chestnut that the government would be prepared to modify the conditions as laid down in the letter of June 19?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. I said to Mr. Chestnut that we had in mind, just as Mr. Chestnut says in his letter, to secure the building of a road up to a high standard, up to the general standard of the Transcontinental railway in New Brunswick, but that if in any part there were physical difficulties which made it reasonably necessary to depart from that standard, I was sure the Minister of Rail-

ways would give favourable consideration to any request the provincial government might make.

Mr. CROCKET. Anything in writing to that effect?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nothing in writing, but I have Mr. Chestnut's statement to Mr. Hazen of what I suggested to him and Mr. Chestnut conveyed that information to Mr. Hazen. Although they had that intimation from me, what does the provincial government do? They ask the legislature to pass a law, to be found in the statutes of 1910, consisting of three parts. The first part provides for the making of a survey. That has only been completed and the report filed with the provincial legislature in the last few days. Part 2 provides that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may guarantee the bonds of the railway company up to the amount of $25,000 a mile, but it provides by section 16 that:

The specifications for said railway and the contract between the Lieutenant Governor in Council and such company, for the building of the same, shall require and call for the construction of a first-class trunk line of railway with grades not to exceed four-tenths of one per cent and to be ironed with steel rails weighing not less than 80 pounds to the yard, and shall provide that the bridges shall be of steel superstructure with substructure of stone or cement, culverts to be of masonry or concrete, being the description of the character of the road as set forth in a letter from the Hon. Wm. Pugsley, Minister of Public Works of the Dominion of Canada, to the secretary of the St. John Valley Railway Company, dated the 19th June, 1909, and approved by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Prime Minister of Canada, in a letter addressed to Mr. F. B. Carvell, M.P., dated January 28, 1910, and the said line of railway shall be built up to the before mentioned specifications and standard and shall be constructed subject to the inspection by and shall be built to the satisfaction of the provincial engineer or such other engineer or engineers as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may from time to time appoint to inspect the same.

The point I wish to make is that although I told the president of the St. John Valley Railway Company to say to Mr. Hazen that if they objected to the standard they should leave it to the Lieutenant Governor in Council to decide before entering into a contract to guarantee the bonds, and that he should then come to us and suggest what modifications he desired, but with that knowledge the provincial government asks the legislators not to leave that opportunity to determine afterwards as to the specifications, but to tie their hands, to tie themselves hand and foot so that they could not assist any railway unless it was built up to this very high standard. That, Sir, is the legislation that was brought down. They provided under it, that the company must give a guarantee for the payment of interest upon the bonds for the whole line of road until the whole line is completed. They imposed upon them the very hardest possible conditions.

Mr. CARVELL. And pay it in money too.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And they had to pay that in money. Then they passed part 3, and part 3 provides for a road not up to this high standard, but it provides for a road which may have the Intercolonial grades, which may begin at a point on the Canadian Pacific railway up the St. John river and which may end at another point on the Canadian Pacific railway, this being simply a connecting link between one point on the Canadian Pacific railway and another point. They provide that it may be an electric road, they do not provide for any security in so far as the bonds are concerned, except what may be the security of the company itself, and they provide that all they would be obliged to do, in so far as interest is concerned, is to make provision for the payment of interest until certain sections of the road are completed.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, when you find a government having legislation enacted with respect to a road that is to be built up to the high standard, that is to be followed by operation by the Intercolonial railway and therefore with behind it all the credit that belongs to the government and the people of Canada in connection with the operation of this road, when you find that they impose stricter and harsher conditions upon the company even than they do with respect to the building of what may be termed a second class road as railways are to-day, considered, and when you find that it may even be an electric railway, what inference would you draw from their conduct? Would it not be that they were determined, by hook or by crook, to prevent Intercolonial operation in the St. John Valley? Would you not infer that they were doing this in the interest of the Canadian Pacific railway or some electrical company which was desirous of developing electrical energy? That is the inference which everyone must draw. That is the inference which the people in that part of the valley of the St. John are drawing to-day and, having drawn that inference, I believe that when the opportunity comes of expressing their opinion they will express it in no uncertain terms.

Now, as I have said, the provincial government have tied themselves hand and foot in so far as this legislation is concerned in connection with Intercolonial operation, they have refused to ask the legislature to give them power to negotiate, they have

refused to give themselves the power to ask for any modification of the terms, but they have passed the hard and fast, cast iron provision that is contained in part 2 of the Act. They themselves appointed an engineer to make a survey, a very competent, a very experienced engineer—Mr. David F. Maxwell. The hon. gentleman has not read Mr. Maxwell's report to the committee. I do not believe that either my hon. friend or the provincial government would have derived much comfort from the report, because I see that this report, made by a gentleman of their own selection, made by a gentleman whom they themselves had appointed, confirms to the fullest extent, the wisdom of the course which I and my colleagues took, in insisting that this road should be built up to a high standard. That report shows that a road to the Transcontinental railway standard between Grand Falls and St. John with the exception of a comparatively short distance where there would be a grade of one per cent, like the single pusher grade at the Tobique upon the Transcontinental railway, would only cost a little over $3,000 per mile more than the second-class road which the government provided for by part 3 of this statute. In other words, the report of Mr. Maxwell shows that the people will be able to secure a road having practically all the grades up to the standard of the Transcontinental railway for a little over $3,000 per mile more than they would have to pay for a second-class road with grades equal to the grades on the Intercolonial railway as proposed by part 3 of this Act, passed by the legislature at this last session.

Mr. CROCKET. That is on the proposed road to St. John?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the minister aware that Mr. Maxwell in his report states that if connection is made with the Canadian Pacific railway at Westfield or Welsford a transcontinental grade is absoluetly out of the question?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I might say to my hon. friend, and I say it with all sincerity, that in so far as the people of the St. John Valley are concerned, they are determined to have a railway extending right down to the city of St. John. They are determined that the road shall not be a mere branch, a mere appendage of the Canadian Pacific railway. They want competition and they are clamouring for government ownership and government operation.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister, in 1907, provided for connection at Westfield and Welsford.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is true, because that was the suggestion of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. But things have moved a long way ahead since 1907. I have learned a great deal also with regard to the necessity of extending the Transcontinental railway down the valley of the St. John, more than I knew in 1907, and speaking with the knowledge that I have of the city and the people of St. John and of the people along the valley of the St. John and having in view the great developments which have already taken place during the last two or three years and which are going to take place in the near future at the port of St. John, the people of St. John and the people of the St. John valley will not be contented with any line up and down that magnificent valley that is to be a mere branch or appendage of the Canadian Pacific railway. They want a line that will be a part of a through Transcontinental railway, that they are determined to have and that they will have unless their efforts are thwarted by the provincial government, my hon. friend, and those who may be acting with them. Let me read what the chief engineer appointed by the provincial government says in this report which were tabled only two or three days ago and which my hon. friend has not thought necessary to favour the House with. Speaking as to the section from Fredericton to St. John he says:

> Having in mind the shortest route by which the city of St. John and the great developments for transportation purposes likely to be undertaken at Courtenay bay could be reached, and as in order to reach such point involved the crossing of the St. John river at some point, it was thought desirable to deflect the line here—that is at Evandale—and cross over to the left bank at the head of the 'Mistake,' so called; thence the line crosses Gorham creek and enters the valley of Kingston creek, passing through the village of Kingston, Kings county, to the Kennebecasis river, crossing same near the Gondola Point ferry; thence by the left bank of the latter river through Rothesay, Renforth and Torryburn, and enters the city of St. John at the head of Courtenay bay, a distance from Fredericton of 71 miles, which in final location might be slightly reduced and make the total distance from Grand Falls to St. John, 207 miles, the shortest possible route for a railway line that can be got for a continuous low grade between Grand Falls and the city of St. John.

Then he says:

> On the division of this line between Fredericton and St. John, at no point has it been found necessary to rise with a grade to so great an elevation as 100 feet above the sea level in the distance of 71 miles, so that the question of grades here does not seriously affect the cost.

I may say that the line by way of Westfield would be 85 miles from Fredericton to

St. John or 14 miles longer than the line which the engineer of the provincial government favours. In closing the report Mr. Maxwell says:

Section 37 of the Act authorizes the Lieutenant Governor in Council in case of the construction of this road either under part 2 or part 3 to make provision for running rights over the same or any part thereof, for any through line of railway making connection with the port of St. John or the port of L'Etang, St. Andrews or other port in the county of Charlotte.

Let my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) listen to these words of the chief engineer appointed by his friends the government of New Brunswick to make this survey:

In view of this important provision in the Act it would not be advisable to construct a railway along the valley of the St. John river, and particularly below Woodstock, except as specified in part 2 of the Act——

And part 2, as my hon. friend knows, is that which provided for the transcontinental standard.

—as the difference in cost of construction of two lines of railway, one built to the standard Transcontinental four-tenths of one per cent grade and the other built to the standard Intercolonial grade of one per cent, would not be at all proportional to the real value of the respective roads for transportation purposes.

And yet, in the face of the report made by this engineer appointed by the provincial government, my hon. friend says that because we are insisting on the same standard as that approved by the provincial government's own engineer, we are, therefore, endeavouring to block this undertaking. The engineer goes on:

A glance at the map of eastern Canada and the northern part of the state of Maine shows that only one divide exists between the St. Lawrence and the St. John rivers, and that when that divide or summit has been once overcome, the way to the seaboard for a railway, so far as grades are concerned, is made easy.

The National Transcontinental railway on its way from Quebec city to Moncton has already surmounted this St. Lawrence divide and has entered the watershed of the St. John river before reaching the New Brunswick boundary, and continues to follow the same for some miles east of Grand Falls or until it leaves it and climbs over into the watershed of the Miramichi river by what is known as the pusher grade.

The importance, therefore, of the St. John valley as a road for a great highway cannot be over-estimated, and the proposition to build a railway along it is not merely local, but national in both scope and character, and the time is now within reasonable distance when more than one transcontinental railway entering this valley, either by the National road now building, or by what may be a shorter route across the state of Maine and making an ocean terminus at St. John, must of necessity traverse some portion of the line now under consideration, as it is the existence of this peculiar physical feature of this country that makes possible a railway of this character, and what must eventually make of the port of St. John one of the few great shipping ports of the world.

I need nothing more than the report of their own engineer in which he advises that no other standard but the standard of the National Transcontinental railway shall be adopted down the valley of the St. John, to entirely justify the position we took when we insisted that the road should be built to that high standard so that it would be capable of forming a part of a transcontinental line. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) says that this road cannot be built to the standard of the National Transcontinental railway. Let me call his attention to what Mr. Maxwell says in the summary report published in the 'Gleaner' which is the accredited organ of the provincial government. He says:

Grand Falls via Perry Point to St. John, including all bridges, 210 miles, $9,237,390, equals $43,980 per mile.

Now, what is it going to cost to build from Andover to St. John, not up to this standard, but up to the standard of the Intercolonial? He says:

Andover village via Centreville, Lakeville, Woodstock, Fredericton, Gagetown and Perry Point to St. John, 185 miles (Intercolonial grade), approximate, including all bridges, $7,467,319, equals $40,370 per mile.

Therefore, the only difference per mile of getting a road all the way from the point of connection with the Transcontinental line at Grand Falls down to the port of St. John, by way of Perry Point, including the bridge across the St. John, another across the Belisle, and another across the Kennebecasis at Perry Point; the difference between this road built up to that standard, except for a short distance up in Victoria county, and a road built according to the inferior standard is only $3,600 per mile. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if in view of what their own engineer says, and in view of the fact that there is only a comparatively small difference in cost, whether or not this government has been wise in insisting upon the road being built up to the standard of the Transcontinental railway? My hon. friend refers to an offer made in 1907 to guarantee the bonds for $15,000 per mile. At that time when I was premier of the province we insisted upon a road which would be first-class and capable of forming a part of a trunk line, but the province to-day has agreed to guarantee bonds for $10,000 per mile more than we agreed to guarantee then and

with that guarantee of $25,000 per mile, and with the Dominion subsidy of $6,400 per mile I say that the people of New Brunswick are entitled to more than a second-class road; they are entitled to a road of a high standard, a road which would be capable of forming part of a transcontinental system. But, we have something more definite than that before the people of New Brunswick. We have a proposition made in clear and express terms by Mr. Thomas Malcolm, on behalf of the Quebec & New Brunswick Railway Company, to enter into a contract with the provincial government provided they will guarantee the bonds as each ten miles are completed. He asks nothing beforehand; he does not ask one dollar from the provincial government until he has built the road section by section; he does not ask for progress estimates in respect of each section, but he is willing to wait until each section of ten miles is fully completed and its proper proportion of rolling stock installed before he will ask the provincial government to guarantee one cent of the bonds that the legislature has authorized them to guarantee. He offers them to build and equip this road for the guarantee of $25,000 per mile with the addition of the Dominion subsidy of $6,400. My hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) says he does not believe that is a sincere offer. And why does he say so? He says, that Mr. Malcolm should have waited until the provincial government proclaimed the Act. Well, I am unable to see that there is any reason in that, because the Act is upon the statute-books for any one to read, and Mr. Malcolm had the right to presume that when the survey was completed the Act would be proclaimed. Anyhow, the proclamation of the Act would not alter its language. But, says the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) Mr. Malcolm did not wait to see the surveys and the reports. Well, I have it from Mr. Malcolm that not only himself but the chief engineer of the International railway went over the St. John Valley route, and an experienced railroad man can tell with reasonable certainty what a line of road would cost. We find that Mackenzie & Mann simply made a flying survey in 1907 and their estimate of cost is substantially the estimate that Mr. Maxwell, the engineer of the provincial government, made after a most careful examination of the route.

My hon. friend says there is another reason, that is, that the offer of Mr. Malcolm was circulated in the province of New Brunswick, and was read publicly by Mr. Tweeddale, the member for the county of Victoria, which he says shows that the offer was not bona fide. Mr. Malcolm has explained that that letter was in no sense private, but that it was a public offer, which could have been and should have been brought down to the legislature; which the provincial government had no right to conceal from the legislature. That offer was dated the 25th of February, and it was not until three weeks later, or more, that Mr. Tweeddale read a copy of it in the House. Mr. Malcolm has explained how Mr. Tweeddale came to get it. There is an application now pending before the Railway Committee of this parliament to amend the charter of the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company. That Bill is in the hands of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), and Mr. Malcolm thought it would be desirable to show to the committee as a reason for getting the time extended, that the company was prepared to build the St. John Valley road, and he sent a copy of the letter to the hon. member for Carleton. Now, the hon. member for Carleton had a perfect right, if he chose, to send a copy of a public letter to any member of the provincial legislature, especially on a subject in which the people of New Brunswick are intensely interested. It seems to me that there is nothing in that which should impugn the bona fides of Mr. Malcolm. But my hon. friend says that the charter of the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company was granted in 1900, and nothing has been done upon it. My hon. friend did not tell the House that it was only during this last year, a comparatively few months ago, that Mr. Malcolm acquired a controlling interest in this charter; so he has informed me.

Mr. CROCKET. He was a member of the original company, was he not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If he was, he was only nominally so.

Mr. CROCKET. I may say that he was, and that his associates were the Hon. Senator Costigan, and a clerk in the post office here, Mr. Bertrand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At all events, Mr. Malcolm has informed me that he has acquired a controlling interest in the charter. Now, who is Mr. Malcolm? He is a gentleman who has recently constructed, as contractor, the International railway, which is 113 miles in length, extending across the province of New Brunswick from Campbellton at the head of the Bay of Chaleurs to the St. John river at St. Leonards. Everybody who has seen that road will say that it is a first-class road. It is not up to the standard of the Transcontinental railway, but it is, I suppose, up to the standard of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. DANIEL. How much did it cost a mile?

Mr. PUGSLEY. According to the report of the inspecting engineer, it cost $23,737 a mile.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the minister the standard of construction of that railway?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I have not, but I may say that I have been over the road myself, and it is a first-class road in every respect. The highest grade is one and one-half per cent, but that does not occur very often.

Mr. CROCKET. I examined the report of the engineer, and also the contract. The maximum grade is 80 feet to the mile, which is more than one and one-half per cent, the minimum curvature is 10 degrees, and the weight of rails 56 pounds to the yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend is mistaken. I think the 80 feet to the mile refers to the grade coming out of Campbellton; elsewhere it is not more than one and one-half per cent. The government of New Brunswick has asked the legislature for authority to have a railroad built with Intercolonial grades up the valley of the St. John.

Mr. CROCKET. I think there must be some mistake about the cost of the International railway, because I find in the preamble of the Act of the New Brunswick legislature it is stated to be $27,339 per mile so that there must have been some misrepresentation at that time or some mistake now on the part of the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad that my hon. friend has called attention to that. That was the estimate of Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, the chief engineer, made practically at the commencement of the construction of the road, and I think it is very creditable to Mr. Malcolm that, through his economy, his great experience as a railway builder and his ability to organize his construction gangs, he actually constructed the road for $4,000 a mile less than the estimate of the chief engineer. Engineers allow for all contingencies, such as accidents, unfavourable weather, strikes, and so forth, and when you get an experienced railway contractor, who has a large and efficient plant, and who knows how to handle his men, it is often possible for him to make a great saving, and bring the actual cost below the estimate of the engineers. Mr. E. V. Johnson, the inspecting engineer, in his report of his final inspection of the International railway, says that 'the road has been completed, the track laid and the road fully ballasted with good gravel throughout,' and that 'all structures are of substantial and permanent character, bridges being steel girders on massive concrete substructure.' Then he says:

I have now to report the line as in excellent shape throughout and completed in accordance with the contracts.

This report is dated the 17th of December, 1910. There is also the report of the chief engineer who also makes the statement that 'the railway is completed in accordance with the contracts, and is in excellent condition throughout. Then, I have been favoured with a copy of the report of a gentleman whose name would carry great weight with the hon. member for York, that is, Mr. P. S. Archibald, formerly chief engineer of the Intercolonial railway, who made an inspection of this road.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the minister agree with me in the weight that should be attached to him?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Archibald is an experienced and very reliable engineer, and I would place great reliance on his statement. He speaks of the road as a good road. What did my hon. friend say was the weight of the rails of the International railway?

Mr. CROCKET. The contract specifies 56 pounds to the yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but he laid a very much heavier rail than the contract called for. Mr. Archibald's report says that they are steel rails, first class, and 67 pounds to the yard. Then my hon. friend says: But these rails are to be 80 pounds to the yard. So they are, but that will only add about $500 or $600 a mile to the cost. It only means a few additional tons per mile, some 18 tons, as between 67-pound and 80-pound rails. If it should fall to the lot of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) to travel over the International railway he will be astonished at the work done for the money this road cost, $23,000 per mile. There are rock cuttings, stream diversions by the mile, work of the very hardest character.

Mr. CROCKET. You should have given him work on the Transcontinental.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That may be. Some people work on a railway and make money; others work on it and lose money. A great deal depends on the experience and judgment of the contractor, and I am prepared to say that Mr. Malcolm is as experienced, able and reliable a contractor as is to be found in the Dominion. He built a portion of the Bangor and Aroostook railway, away in the northern part of the state of Maine, which is a marvellous success. He built the Temiscouata railway from Edmundston up to its point of junction with the Intercolonial. He has done railway building on the Canadian Pacific railway in the west. It would be difficult to find a man with larger experience and better judgment as a contractor. He made an offer to build this road; he knows whether he can build it or not,

and he made a straight business offer. He said to Mr. Hazen in his letter: If you will agree to guarantee the bonds of the road as each ten miles of it are finished, and as that proportion of the equipment is furnished, and if you will comply with the conditions contained in the resolution now before the committee, I will undertake the construction of this road and its initial equipment. More than that, I will give you security for the payment of interest upon every bond which you guarantee until the various sections are finished and the operation of the road is taken over by the Intercolonial. That surely is a business-like straight offer; and if the provincial government has any desire of securing the construction of a first class road, such as recommended by its own engineer, and of saving the province from that possibly enormous liability which must be incurred unless they accept this agreement which the Minister of Railways is asking from this House authority to enter into, they will accept Mr. Malcolm's offer, requiring from him, of course, all reasonable conditions, and all reasonable security.

Then my hon. friend says that the offer cannot be bona fide for another reason. It is impossible for Mr. Malcolm to carry it out. But what does he say to the proposition to build a second class road from Andover to the city of St. John which would cost $40,000 per mile, or $15,000 per mile more than the bond guarantee, with no provision for operation, and without having the government of Canada back of the company so far as the operation is concerned? Then he asks: What can there possibly be in this for a company which would enable it to finance a dollar beyond the Dominion subsidy, and the guarantee? I may say that if part 2 had been passed by the legislature as the provincial government sought at first to have it passed, providing that 40 per cent of the earnings should go to the province, even after the interest on the bonds were paid, there would have been nothing in it for the company. Would you believe it that when they introduced the Bill, with part 2 in it, they provided that before the company would be allowed to enter into a contract, they must pay the cost of surveying, some $20,000, and give security, and that after the road was built and the government began to operate it, every dollar of this 40 per cent would go into the provincial treasury, and the company would not receive a dollar? My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) knows that my statement is correct. I read the Bill over, and although we were prepared for almost anything on the part of the provincial government in order to prevent the Intercolonial from operating the road, yet we were amazed that any one would have the audacity to submit to the legislature a proposition of that kind. They asked the company to pay $20,000 cost of survey and give security before they could enter into a contract for the construction of the road for which, when it would be operated by the Intercolonial, all the moneys the Intercolonial paid were to go into the purse of the province and the company was never to have the opportunity of getting a single cent. That was changed on the representation of the leader of the opposition who pointed out the utter absurdity and injustice of such a proposal; and now, after the interest on the bonds is paid, whatever surplus there is of the 40 per cent will go into the treasury of the company.

Mr. hon. friend asks what that amounts to. Let me tell him. This road is to traverse a section of country which is more fertile than any traversed by the Intercolonial unless it be some of those valleys like the beautiful Sussex valley and those magnificent marshes up in the county of Westmorland and some other parts of New Brunswick. It will traverse a country settled for a hundred years by thrifty, industrious farmers, with a fertile soil capable of producing many hundredfold beyond what it produces to-day. In my opinion, in the course of a very few years the earnings of that road ought to be as great at all events as those of the Intercolonial. I look forward to a time in the not very distant future when trains of the Grand Trunk Pacific destined for the port of St. John will leave the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific at Grand Falls and come down the valley of the St. John to the terminus to be built at Courtenay bay. Or the road will cross the river at a place called Evandale and go down to St. John by Kingston and join the Grand Trunk Railway by a branch from Chipman at 23 miles from St. John, and utilize that part in connection with the Transcontinental. Does my hon. friend know what the gross earnings of the Intercolonial were to the 31st of March, 1910. They were $6,220 per mile. If, in the course of a few years, the gross earnings of the St. John Valley line reach this sum, the 40 per cent which will be paid over to the province will equal $2,488 per mile. After paying the $1,000 per year interest on the bond guarantee, that will leave a surplus of $1,488 per mile to the company. In other words, the 40 per cent of the gross earnings would pay the four per cent on $60,000 per mile, or on $35,000 per mile over and beyond the interest on the bonds guaranteed by the government. In view of the fact that the Intercolonial will operate this road section by section as completed, I know of no better proposition for capitalists. I do not wonder that Mr. Malcolm and his associates should be willing to risk their money; I do not won-

der that the contractor should be willing to risk his plant and services in order to secure the construction of this road and the benefit which will come to this company in the years to come as the result of this government entering into this long lease for the operation of this road on those favourable terms. Remember that the 40 per cent on the gross earnings is not limited to five, ten or twenty years, but is to last for the long term of 99 years.

No matter how large the earnings may be, during the whole of that period of ninety-nine years, the government is obliged to pay to this company, and the province of New Brunswick, this magnificent percentage of forty per cent on the gross earnings. The company will not spend a dollar upon repairs, to renew the rolling stock, provide new locomotives and cars as they are required, and all the time the company will receive this forty per cent upon the gross earnings. Out of that it will pay $1,000 a mile, leaving whatever surplus there may be towards paying dividends upon any additional securities the company may issue.

Now, I apologize for taking so much of the time of the House. I have done it, as I have said, because of the position taken by certain gentlemen in this matter. This government has gone great lengths, lengths for which there is no precedent so far as this government is concerned, to secure the construction of this road, both by the subsidy of $6,400 a mile, and by the agreement to operate and pay this large percentage of the gross earnings. I should have thought that, instead of being criticised, we should have been thanked by every man who desires to see this important enterprise undertaken. The attempt has been made to make us appear the enemies of the road, because we have insisted upon this high standard. It is a matter of the greatest possible gratification to me that, out of the mouth of the very man, who, of all others, is qualified to speak, and does speak, for the provincial government, our action is justified, he having reported that it would not be advisable to build a railway down the valley of the St. John river upon any other standard than the one which we have chosen and insisted upon, and that is the standard of the Transcontinental railway in New Brunswick.

Mr. DANIEL. It is not my intention to follow and reply to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) in all the various deviations he has made in discussing the subject before you, Mr. Chairman. He has discussed many things, but I notice that he has had very little to say regarding the amendment before the committee. So far as the hon. gentleman has attempted to show the great need of this railway to the people of St. John, and has spoken in admiring terms of the great fertility and the beauty of that country and its great adaptability for farming and fruit growing, I endorse all he has said, and think with him that it is high time that these people should be supplied with something like proper railway facilities. At present, they have no railway facilities whatever; practically the only transportation they get is in the summer time by means of the St. John river. The question before you has been dealt with quite fully from the point of view of the amendment by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket), and it will not be necessary for me to go over the ground he has so well covered. But the fact is, leaving to one side the legal technicalities and the verbiage thrown around the case this evening, the question simply comes down to this: Will the government equip this road with rolling stock or will it not? The Minister of Public Works, in speaking of the initiatory movement in this matter, spoke of the visit of the delegation from New Brunswick to Ottawa and their seeing the government. He stated that a definite proposition had not been made. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) said that the Prime Minister could not possibly have stated that it was a definite proposition that they had before them. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) stated that he had certainly seen such a report of the remarks of the Prime Minister. The hon. gentleman was entirely right. I have here the report of the statement of the Prime Minister, and I will read it to show that the statement of the Minister of Public Works, like so many of his statements, was not so entirely surrounded as it should have been with that necessary element which we all desire to see in the case in statements made in this House. This is how the Prime Minister is reported in the 'Daily Telegraph' of St. John, in its issue of April 17, 1909:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier made the reply for the government. He declared emphatically that he was in favour of the construction of a line of railway down the valley of the St. John which he knew as one of the most fertile and most productive valleys of Canada which stood in need of a railway. He declared that the government of which he was the head favoured the construction of railways wherever they were needed in Canada. He thought there was no need for him to argue that point, as the government had shown its policy by the appropriation of generous grants of money for railway building.

He was glad to be able to say that the Dominion government had failed to recognize the claims of the St. John Valley railway, which the delegates were now urging, and that the evidence was that the government last year had placed in the list of railway subsidies provision for a double subsidy for any line of railway which might be built down the valley of the St. John. That subsidy would stand and would be given as aid when the line was built. The delegation now came

with a further proposal, that on the province guaranteeing bonds of the company which was to build the road, the government should have it operated by the Intercolonial and turn over to the company forty per cent of the gross profits. Sir Wilfrid said that was a proposal of a definite kind which would have to be carefully considered.

This is exactly what my hon. friend from York said—that the Prime Minister had stated that this was a definite proposition that was made.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a little different—'a proposal of a definite kind.'

Mr. DANIEL. Is not that a 'definite proposal'?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does not say a word about the details, the specifications, standard or anything.

Mr. DANIEL. If the minister can see any real difference between the two statements, he can see more in it than I can.

It might be found on consideration that it was the best arrangement or it might be found that there could be a better arrangement . . .

But there is the fact, the Prime Minister received this delegation here, heard their proposal, assented to it, and received it as a definite proposal on behalf of the provincial government. When the Minister of Public Works made public his ultimatum I can assure you that the people of New Brunswick looked upon it as a severe backset to any hopes they might have had of getting that railway built. They looked upon it then and look upon it now as evidence that so far from helping this thing along the minister was doing his best to prevent its accomplishment. He insisted on a standard which was not carried out even upon the National Transcontinental going through the province of New Brunswick. He insisted on a four-tenth per cent grade, which is a higher standard than the National Transcontinental has going through New Brunswick. Yet this was a railway which was to be made part of the Intercolonial, which does not approach that standard, but has grades of 1 per cent and even 1½ per cent on parts of its line. It looks as if the minister had tried to prevent this thing going through, that he insisted on such a high grade for this railway that it became almost impossible to hope for its construction. The matter is well understood in New Brunswick. I saw the other day in the public press a notice of a meeting at Gagetown, in Queens county, on February 27, at which the following resolution was adopted:

First, resolved that the meeting express their gratification and hearty concurrence in the legislation passed last winter providing for the guarantee of bonds to the extent of $25,000 per mile in aid of the construction of the St. John Valley railway, and express their preference to have the said railway operated by steam and under the management of the Intercolonial railway if possible. If not, then by some substantial railway company, with transcontinental connections.

Second, that the Bill introduced in the federal parliament by the Minister of Railways may be so amended as to provide and guarantee that the Intercolonial railway management will take the road over when completed for the running of trains, and put on their own rolling stock for all purposes required.

Third, that should the local government fail to find a company willing to construct the said railway aided by the bond guarantee and Dominion subsidy, then we would heartily approve of them undertaking the construction of the said railway and completing it ready for the running of trains, beginning its construction and securing its completion within reasonable time.

Fourth, that as citizens of the St. John Valley we desire again to express how keenly we feel the want of transportation facilities, and that we are relying on the good offices of both the provincial and Dominion governments in their united and hearty co-operation to secure to us this much-needed railway.

So far as this meeting is concerned, its views are plainly expressed.

Mr. CARVELL. That meeting wanted Intercolonial railway operation.

Mr. DANIEL. The resolution speaks for itself. This government has made a proposal to build a railway to Hudson bay, and I presume that road will be constructed at the expense of the Dominion. The Dominion government is a wealthy government. New Brunswick is a small province, as we all know, and the provincial government are very much put to it to find means enough to carry on the ordinary business of a province. The Dominion government will doubtless construct the Hudson Bay railway. The province of New Brunswick has given a larger subsidy than it has ever given towards any public undertaking of this kind. The minister has spoken of the great feritility and value of the valley of the River St. John. It has always suffered from want of railway facilities. It would appear to me that it should be the endeavour of this government to assist the province in every shape and form in the laudable desire it has to build this railway and give this most fertile province of New Brunswick something like the railway facilities to which it is entitled. That is all that the people there are asking. The people of New Brunswick are taking a tremendous load upon themselves in offering $25,000 a mile to build this line, and all this amendment asks is a slight change whereby there will be placed in this Act the word 'equipment,' so as to carry out the intention of the government of New Brunswick. I think the minister would be

doing the right thing towards the province which he especially represents if he would accept the amendment which has been offered by my hon. friend from York, and arrange it in such a way as that the section will read as amended. It appears to me that we would be doing something which he, as a representative of New Brunswick, ought to be glad to do, and which would certainly facilitate this matter by making the proposal acceptable to the people of New Brunswick. It would show that this government were trying to help this project along all they possibly could. I certainly have very much pleasure in seconding the amendment which my hon. friend on my left (Mr. Crocket) has moved.

Mr. CARVELL. In view of the very able and lucid statement of this proposed railway legislation by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), it will only be necessary for me to spend a very few moments indeed in discussing it. I offer no apology for speaking on this question, because, perhaps, I have been more intimately connected with every move concerning this matter made during the last two years than any other hon. member of the House. I know what is required perhaps more intimately than any other man except possibly the minister himself. I have taken a great interest in it because the road, when constructed, will pass through my country for a distance of about fifty miles, and, having my ideas with regard to the work not only in my constituency but in six or seven other constituencies in New Brunswick, I feel its importance. I am fully justified in doing every thing which reasonably can be done in order to secure the construction of this great work. I shall not weary the House with an historical review of this question, and I am only going to refer to one thing. About two years ago now, a number of meetings were held in different parts of the province to talk the railway up and down the river St. John. This railway has been discussed and talked of and legislated upon for at least 25 years to my own recollection, and I do not know how far back of that. On two occasions work has actually commenced. I think that about 20 years ago work was commenced at Fredericton and five or six miles were graded. Through failure to make the necessary financial arrangements they were unable to proceed. About fifteen years ago another company was organized, and they commenced construction near Woodstock, they spent about $50,000 at different places and failed there also. The present agitation was started two years ago. A delegation from counties all along the river waited upon Hon. Mr. Hazen at Fredericton on the day before the legislature met in 1909. The night before they met the premier, I received a telegram from a gentleman at Woodstock telling me that the premier was going to ask them to go to Ottawa and see what could be done there. I wired back telling him what had been done; I told him that a subsidy had been voted during the previous year for a road all the way from Grand Falls to St. John and I cited to him the statute where it would be found. Next day when they met the premier he asked them to give him a fortnight he said: if you will get the federal government to agree to operate this road when constructed, and pay 40 per cent of the gross earnings back to the company or the government we will guarantee the bonds to the extent of $25,000 a mile. The result of the proposition was the monster delegation of thirty or forty people from all parts of the country which has been referred to by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) and my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel). Very shortly after the delegation went away the Conservative papers of New Brunswick commenced to harp upon the statement that the premier told the delegation that they had made a definite proposition. I never could understand the object for doing so, I never could see why there was so much importance attached to it. You will find that statement in the letter written by Premier Hazen to Mr. Chestnut. The premier said it was a definite proposition. I was present at the meeting, and I know the whole transaction. This delegation met in a room down in the Russell House, about half past nine in the morning, I was sent for, and when I got down there they were all sitting around the room, and they were having a good straight fight among themselves.

Mr. GRAHAM. New Brunswicker like?

Mr. CARVELL. New Brunswicker like. The whole delegation, with the exception of Hon. Mr. Flemming, who was representing the local government, wanted to ask the government to operate this road from Grand Falls to St. John. The Hon. Mr. Flemming refused to do it, and would not go north from a place called Centreville in Carleton because he said it was unfair to compete with the existing line of the Canadian Pacific railway, and he would never agree to it unless he could not help it. The situation was such that it was apparent nothing would be done, and Mr. Flemming immediately telegraphed to Mr. Hazen at Fredericton and got a reply in which he consented to the proposition being made. That is all that took place, the only thing we discussed and the only proposition put before the government was whether or not they would agree to operate the road from Grand Falls to St. John and pay to the government of New Brunswick or the company forty per cent of the gross earnings, operating the road as part of the Intercolonial railway,

We went before the government with that proposition, and the answer was given, I think, almost word for word as read by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) a few minutes ago from the 'St. John Telegraph.' If he can get any comfort out of it, all right, I find no fault. There could have been no kind of definite proposition except this one as to whether this government would operate the road and pay forty per cent of the gross earnings. Nothing was said about grades, guarantees, steel bridges or iron.

Mr. CROCKET. Nothing was asked.

Mr. CARVELL. It never got to the point where it could be asked. It would not be possible to make a definite proposition about the road, and the Minister of Railways objected because there was not something more definite.

Mr. CROCKET. He certainly did not make that objection to the delegation.

Mr. CARVELL. He certainly did.

Mr. CROCKET. I was there and my recollection is that nothing of the kind took place.

Mr. GRAHAM. I made the objection, and I was not very popular for doing so.

Mr. CARVELL. I was present too, and I do not believe the premier said what my hon. friend from York says he did.

Mr. CROCKET. The 'Telegraph' says he did.

Mr. CARVELL. That is not always right. However, a good many more important things have happened since then. The legislature was in session and a delegation of 25 or 30 of the most determined men I ever saw went to Fredericton and they went so far as to call on the provincial secretary to resign his seat if the government did not put the legislation through that year, and they got that promise, but two days afterwards the legislature prorogued, and there was no Act passed. Then some funny things commenced, and we began to get letters from Mr. Hazen, not through the Minister of Railways, and not through the premier, but through Mr. Chestnut the president of the railway company, which had been created by the legislature for the purpose of building the road.

Mr. CROCKET. And the chairman of the delegation that waited on the government.

Mr. CARVELL. No doubt, and a perfectly reliable gentleman he is, and a man who is as anxious to have this road built as the Minister of Public Works or myself, and a good deal more anxious than the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel).

Mr. CROCKET. You want to monopolize all the sincerity in the province.

Mr. CARVELL. In my letter read by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) I said that after the letter of the Minister of Public Works of the 19th of June no answer came back, no new proposition was made, no effort by the local government to get the federal government to change the specifications.

Mr. CROCKET. Did not the letter of Mr. Hazen suggest that a conference be held; did he not submit that proposition to the president of the railway company, and did not the Minister of Public Works refuse to accede to that?

Mr. CARVELL. No, he did not. My recollection is that the Minister of Public Works stated that until Mr. Hazen was prepared to go into details and state what kind of grades and curvatures he would provide for, there was no necessity for an interview. He invited Mr. Hazen to give something more definite, but Mr. Hazen has never done so. The next step was a letter written by the Minister of Public Works telling Mr. Hazen through Mr. Chestnut that if he thought the standard was too high, he ought to ask the legislature to give him the power to decide on these details, but in the face of that he deliberately placed on the statute-books of New Brunswick, chapter 6 of the Acts of 1910, which not only does not give him the right to have this road built, and operated by the Intercolonial railway, but actually prohibits him from doing it. We have section after section which binds Mr. Hazen hand and foot and makes it impossible for him to sign an agreement that can be worked out. And now, my hon. friend's friends in the province of New Brunswick have the effrontery to advertise in every Tory newspaper and on every platform in the province that the Minister of Public Works and myself have been deliberately planning and scheming to prevent the construction of this road. A year ago, when at Woodstock, I read Sir Wilfrid Laurier's letter agreeing to operate this road as part of the Intercolonial, and stated that I knew a man who would build the road for the assistance was offered, I was laughed at by every Tory newspaper in New Brunswick. But to-night I repeat the statement that the road can be and will be built unless Mr. Hazen and the Tory party of New Brunswick prevent it from being built, and it will be built and operated by the Intercolonial railway, and the people of that section will be getting the railway facilities they have been praying for since I was a boy. In order to show how completely Mr. Hazen and the Tory party of New Brunswick have prevent-

ed themselves from being in a position to sign this contract, I wish to point out that section 11 provides:

No such agreement shall be entered into with any company or corporation for the construction of the said line of railway or for the guaranteeing of the said bonds, and no such bonds or debentures shall be guaranteed until the parliament of Canada shall enact legislation authorizing the granting of a subsidy in aid of the construction of the said railway to an amount of not less than $6,400 per mile.

Now, at that very time there was federal legislation in force, chapter 63 of the statutes of 1908, providing for the subsidies to railways, and this railway among others, and the very first clause reads:

1. The Governor in Council may grant a subsidy of $3,200 per mile towards the construction of each of the undermentioned lines of railway—not exceeding in any case the number of miles hereinafter respectively stated—which shall not cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, and towards the construction of each of the said lines of railway, not exceeding the mileage hereinafter stated which shall cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, a further subsidy beyond the sum of $3,200 per mile of fifty per cent on so much of the average cost of the mileage subsidized as is in excess of $15,000 per mile, such subsidy not exceeding in the whole the sum of $6,400 per mile.

That is the standard clause in the railway subsidy Act for the last ten years, and if you take that Act as it stands, unless Mr. Hazen changes the condition of section 11, he will be prevented from signing the contract even if all other things were ready. The local legislature says that the government cannot guarantee these bonds until the federal government actually passes legislation agreeing to pay $6,400 per mile, but this government cannot do so because their standard subsidy Act says that the cost of the road must exceed $21,400 per mile before they can give a subsidy of $6,400 per mile.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the hon. member any doubt but that the subsidy of $6,400 per mile would be payable in this case.

Mr. CARVELL. Not a particle. But owing to the manner in which Mr. Hazen has tied himself down he cannot sign the contract until the legislation is changed.

Mr. CROCKET. You are getting very technical.

Mr. CARVELL. Yes, and I can tell you that if ever there was a piece of technical legislation put through any parliament it was the legislation regarding this railway which was put through the legislature of New Brunswick, because everything was done that human ingenuity could do in order to try and prevent having this railroad built and operated as part of the Intercolonial railway. When they made that proposition two years ago, they had no idea that this government would accept it, and there was nobody more surprised than the Tory party of New Brunswick when the Prime Minister's letter was read a year ago, and from that day to this they have never ceased to try to concoct some scheme to make it impossible to carry it out, and to enable them to build a road not up to the standard of the Transcontinental or even of the Intercolonial railway, but simply a cheap branch line to be controlled and operated by the Canadian Pacific railway. That is the whole transaction. Why, when we came to Ottawa two years ago to meet the government, the Hon. Mr. Flemming came along, and his whole fight was against building a road through the centre because it would compete with the Canadian Pacific railway. He wired to Mr. Hazen to get his consent. The night before, this same Mr. Flemming travelled all the way from Fredericton to Montreal in a private car of Sir William Van Horne. I do not say that Sir William Van Horne influenced him, but when he got to Ottawa, he was the most rabid Canadian Pacific railway man I ever met, and he has continued to be so down to the present time, and that is really at the bottom of the whole transaction. I do not blame the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; they are only following a good business proposition. I blame my hon. friend and his friends in the province of New Brunswick for being willing to barter away the rights of the people of that province in order to give this monstrous corporation a grasp on that part of the province for all time to come. The people of New Brunswick blame them too, and they will find that the people are not half as innocent or as ignorant as my hon. friend and his friends think they are. That is all I have to say about the historic part of this matter. My hon. friend wants this committee to adopt an amendment of his. I have applied that amendment to the resolution before the committee, and I want to read it as it would appear if his amendment were adopted. The whole trouble with hon. gentlemen opposite seems to be over the equipment. The morning after the Minister of Railways tabled his notice of motion about a month ago, the St. John 'Standard,' the leading Tory organ of the province, and the Fredericton 'Gleaner,' the next leading Tory organ, came out with identical editorials on this question, and the gravamen of their charge was that the federal government were trying to prevent the construction of this road on account of the equipment. When I read these two articles I could not understand what they meant, and I at once went to the laws which the

Tory government themselves passed, and I found that in section 10 they deliberately provide:

Before any company's bonds shall be guaranteed, the company shall provide, in a manner satisfactory to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, by a deposit in money or other sufficient security, or of a deposit of part money and part security, in addition to such mortgage, for the payment of interest on such bonds during the construction of the said line of railway, and until the same shall have been fully completed and provided with the initial equipment passed and approved by the government engineer.

I also find that by sections 11 and 16 they provided for equipment; and this thing has been going on ever since in the province of New Brunswick. I am surprised that my hon. friends bring it up here in view of what has taken place in the last fortnight. Now, I will read the enacting part of this resolution, with the amendment as proposed:

Now, therefore, it is expedient that His Excellency the Governor in Council be authorized to enter into a contract with any such railroad company and the government of the province of New Brunswick as aforesaid, for the leasing of the said line of railway when completed, with its appurtenances and rolling stock, and for the operation, equipment, maintenance, upkeep and repair by the said government of Canada, as a part of the government railway system of Canada, for a period of ninety-nine years, and for the payment by the government of Canada to the said province of New Brunswick, or the said company, each year during the said term of ninety-nine years, of the forty per centum per annum of the gross earnings of the said railway, as or in the nature of rental therefor.

Mr. CROCKET. Does not that conform precisely with the terms of section 11?

Mr. CARVELL. No, it does not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what respect does it not?

Mr. CARVELL. If you make this amendment, then you will be absolutely out of court, because section 10 says that until the road is equipped the government cannot guarantee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what respect does this not conform to section 11?

Mr. CARVELL. I will tell my hon. friend frankly that I have not read section 11 very carefully.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have.

Mr. CARVELL. I will read section 11:

No such agreement shall be entered into with any company or corporation for the construction of the said line of railway or for the guaranteeing of the said bonds, and no such bonds or debentures shall be guaranteed unless and until the parliament of Canada shall enact legislation authorizing the granting of a subsidy in aid of the construction of the said railway, to the amount of not less than $6,400 per mile, and authorizing the entering, by the said government of Canada, into an agreement with such company or corporation and with the government of New Brunswick aforesaid, for the leasing of the said line of railway when completed with its appurtenances and rolling stock, and for the operation, equipment, maintenance, upkeep and repair by said government of Canada, as part of the government railway system of Canada, for a period of ninety-nine years, and for the payment by the government of Canada to the said province of New Brunswick or government thereof, each year during the said term of ninety-nine years of forty per centum per annum of the gross earnings of the said railway as or in the nature of rental therefor.

Whether the amendment complies with section 11 or not does not make any difference, because section 10 provides that there must be equipment, and without equipment Mr. Hazen cannot sign the contract.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then the contention of the hon. gentleman, as I understand it, is that the amendment as proposed by the hon. member for York is perfectly consistent with section 11, but section 11 is not consistent with section 10?

Mr. CARVELL. That, I think, is pretty logical, and that is only one of the circumstances by which Mr. Hazen and the Conservative party have tried to prevent themselves from being in a position to sign the contract. If there is no equipment, how is there going to be any rolling stock to be leased to the government, for which section 11 provides? My hon. friend from York this afternoon said: Oh, there will be some rolling stock. If this road is constructed as all other roads are, by contractors, there would not be a wheel of rolling stock when the road is completed. What is the use of all this discussion about rolling stock? My hon. friends ignore the fact that a competent railway man goes to the province of New Brunswick and agrees to build this road and put on the rolling stock. There is nobody asking for this amendment. This parliament will be in session probably two months longer; the legislature of New Brunswick is in session; if Mr. Hazen thinks that is vital to the construction of this road, let him change his legislation and put the burden on us to see if we will not before we get through.

Mr. CROCKET. Does my hon. friend object to this government providing the initial equipment?

Mr. CARVELL. This government has nothing to do with it. It is a company which is going to build the railway.

Mr. CROCKET. Under an agreement on the part of the company that this government is to take it over.

Mr. CARVELL. That has nothing to do with it. The hon. gentleman spoke about making the poor government of New Brunswick provide the rolling stock, and he dilated on the poverty of that government and the richness of this.

Mr. CROCKET. I do not remember any remark of that kind.

Mr. CARVELL. Every other hon. member does. The poor government of New Brunswick, he said, were forced to provide the rolling stock. But who asked that government to do it? They put it in their own Acts that the company should provide the rolling stock. Take the letter, it has been almost insinuated that something unprofessional, something unfair has taken place, that I gave away something to the leader of the opposition in the New Brunswick legislature. I have no hesitation in telling the whole story. For three or four weeks there has been a notice on the Order Paper that application was to be made by the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company for a renewal of a charter, and that order stands in my name. I noticed frequently two of my hon. friends opposite holding down the front bench in the Railway Committee and wondered what was troubling them because as a rule they do not bother that committee very much. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) asked me when this Bill was coming up, and I said in the ordinary course. Not long afterwards the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) asked me to name a day and he said that he had some amendment to propose. I immediately wired Mr. Malcolm that some of our friends opposite from New Brunswick were opposing the Bill for some reason or other. I met him in Montreal and he gave me this letter, marked copy, and signed by himself, and he told me he had submitted it to Mr. Hazen, and that he had agreed to enter into a contract according to the terms of the resolution of the Minister of Railways now under discussion. I wanted an opportunity to make this letter public before the Railway Committee, and I notified the leader of the opposition in New Brunswick to get copies of all documents in connection with that matter. I did not give a copy of this letter as my object was first to get all the information possible from the New Brunswick government about this proposition. Notice was given in the local house on the 2nd of March, but the First Minister there gave an evasive answer, stated that there was a good deal of correspondence had with different people, and promised to bring down the papers at some future time. About a week ago I went home and gave a copy of the letter to some of the prominent Tories in Woodstock and I said to them: That is what your government has to meet, and I want to know what it is going to do about it. A copy of that letter was sent to Mr. Hazen on a Saturday and on Tuesday the leader of the opposition moved that it be brought down. Not receiving the letter, on Wednesday night he made it public. I take full responsibility for its publication. It was not marked 'private'.

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Hazen says it was.

Mr. CARVELL. If the hon. gentleman will produce that letter, he will find it is not marked private.

Mr. CROCKET. I read a letter from Mr. Malcolm this afternoon in reply to a letter from Mr. Hazen in which Mr. Malcolm referred to the fact that this letter was marked 'private.'

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend can take what comfort he likes from that. I am giving him the facts, and if he does not accept my version let him produce the letter to Mr. Hazen. There is no reason why my hon. friend should make any trouble in this House or bother his head at all about this matter because this equipment is not coming out of the poor government of New Brunswick or the federal government but out of the contractor or the company. If Mr. Malcolm is willing to put up the money for the equipment, that is his affair. I do not think the people of New Brunswick will lose much sleep or trouble themselves much about who provides the equipment so long as the equipment is provided and the road operated. Therefore I can see no reason why we should adopt this amendment. All the resolution provides is that this government shall have the right to enter into a contract to operate the road for a period of 99 years, when completed and equipped with the initial rolling stock. It is only a question whether parliament will give the Minister of Railways that power or not. If it does, this government will be in a position to carry out the very thing they have been asked to do. In every letter, every resolution, every discussion from beginning to end, the New Brunswick government have asked the company or somebody else to provide the rolling stock. If my hon. friends can induce the government of New Brunswick to change their legislation calling on the company to provide rolling stock, we will be in a position to meet them. My hon. friend had better have legislation introduced into the New Brunswick legislature amending the specifications and changing section 16 and section 11 about the subsidy.

Mr. CROCKET. Are not those the specifications laid down by the Minister of Public Works and approved by the First Minister?

Mr. CARVELL. They follow very closely the specifications set forth in the letter of the Minister of Public Works. But a year ago my hon. friends knew that the Minister of Public Works was prepared to reduce those specifications if it was thought necessary. But they hid that letter away and did not make it public, and it never was known until the Minister of Public Works made it known here to-night. It will be a surprise to the people of New Brunswick to learn the true facts.

My hon. friends opposite complain that the standard is too high. All right we will change the specifications. All we want is to have the road built and then have it operated by the Intercolonial, and we are passing legislation to have that brought into effect. It is then for the government of Mr. Hazen to say whether they will change their legislation and put themselves in a position to meet us and have the road constructed. If they will change that legislation and comply with this resolution, if they will guarantee those bonds and sign the contract, the road will be in construction inside of a month and built inside of two years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I shall not go into the historical matter on which my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) have spoken, though the latter promised he would not indulge in anything of the kind. I am afraid, however, that he lapsed very far from his pledge before he got through. He spoke of the shackles imposed by the government of New Brunswick. Well, the only shackles they imposed were due to the fact that they accepted literally the proposition of the Minister of Public Works and the right hon. the First Minister and put that in the form of a statute. They simply accepted the offer made by this government in the very terms in which that offer was made. I do not propose to deal with the question of this private letter. Mr. Hazen and the gentleman who wrote it say it was private. The Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for Carleton say they know better and that it was not. We will let that matter stand as it is. Nor will I deal with the very interesting distinction made by the Minister of Public Works between a 'definite proposal' and a 'proposal of a definite kind.' We will leave that as it is.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Like Sir Charles Tupper's statement that he could not understand the man who said he could not understand the difference between 'an offer of unrestricted reciprocity' and 'unrestricted offer of reciprocity.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is much more clear that the distinction the minister is trying to make to-night.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It always puzzles me.

Mr. CROCKET. On which side was the minister then?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the right side.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Let us come down to the question really before us. The Minister of Public Works has told us of the fertility of the St. John valley and how important it is that it should be afforded the railway communication which it is due. We all agree to that. We all agree that the progress and development of the St. John valley will be very greatly enhanced by the carrying out of the proposal which is made a matter of controversy to-night. But it is a remarkable thing, it seems to me, that the Minister of Public Works should assure us that the production of that valley would be increased not merely a hundred fold but many hundred fold by the construction of this railway, and yet that he should balk so much at an expenditure of $250,000 for the provision of rolling stock. And it is a remarkable thing that my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) should agree entirely with the very proper view of the Minister of Public Works with respect to the St. John valley, and yet should regard adherence to the particular form of legislation in vogue in this parliament as of much more importance than the construction of that railway. For that is the argument he seriously put forward—I am assuming that he put it forward seriously. The government of New Brunswick, he says, have rendered it impossible that the railway should be constructed, because, forsooth, we have been accustomed to enact grants of subsidies in a particular form in this parliament. I think he will see, on reflection, that that is not a very weighty argument.

Mr. CARVELL. Then, does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax), propose that this parliament should pass a special Act providing a subsidy of $6,400 a mile for this railway regardless of the cost of construction?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I say that if the road is of the importance attached to it by the Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., parliament may well do that and nobody would be much hurt by it. The hon. member for Carleton himself has said that the road would cost so much that the subsidy to be paid would be $6,400 per mile. Then he calls attention to the nature of the New Brunswick statute which requires a subsidy

to the amount of not less than $6,400 a mile, and says, because some technical and more or less frivolous distinction might be drawn, by reason of the very wording of this section, this road is to remain in abeyance forever.

Mr. CARVELL. That is what will happen.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is what will happen—assuming the hon. gentleman's argument to be correct—unless this parliament is willing to put legislation on the statute-book that will provide $6,400 a mile. Then, so far as I am concerned, I am ready and willing to support legislation of that kind. But I may sav, if I am to judge by the utterances of the hon. member for Carleton and the Minister of Public Works, they are not willing to go that far for the purpose of bringing about the construction of this railway in the St. John valley. However, the hon. member, perhaps, can explain himself if he likes in the very peculiar and difficult situation in which he finds himself by reason of his somewhat unguarded utterances in that respect.

But, let us come to the real question. The real question, as my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) put it very tersely and forcibly is this: Is the government of Canada prepared to spend $250,000, the amount named by the Minister of Railways and Canals, in providinig rolling stock for this railway? It has been pointed out that if you follow the analogy of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the government of Canada should provide the rolling stock for this road. No attempt to meet that argument has been made except by declamation and the somewhat heated and excited utterances of the Minister of Public Works and the member for Carleton. But, apart from that, let us come down to the real aspect of the situation created by the proposal of my hon. friend from York that these resolutions should be amended. I say that the recital contained in the resolution submitted to this committee is an incorrect recital, and I challenge contradiction of that statement. It correctly recites the New Brunswick legislation with the exception of one word, and it leaves out that word 'equipment.' Then, when you come to the enacting part of it, you will find in 'Hansard' to-morrow that the resolution as proposed to be amended by my hon. friend from York is in exact accordance with the New Brunswick legislation, and that the legislation proposed by the Minister of Railways and Canals is not in accord with that legislation. I make that statement and challenge contradiction, for I have compared the two very carefully. I followed the hon. member for Carleton as closely as I could—not to embarrass him, but that I might understand his argument—and, if there is anything in his argument, or in that of the Minister of Railways and Canals, it is that section 10 modifies the construction of section 11, and, therefore, the Minister of Railways and Canals was justified in departing, as undoubtedly he did, from the language of section 11 when he framed his resolution. If there is anything in the long and wearisome argument made on that side with respect to this matter it amounts to that and nothing more. I am open to correction or interruption if any hon. gentleman does not agree with me. Let us see if there is any contradiction or inconsistency between section 10 and section 11 taken in conjunction with other parts of the statute.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Section 9,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have looked at these sections pretty carefully, and I think I understand them as well as one can understand them in the brief time I have been able to spend on them. Section 10 reads:

> 10. Before any of the company's bonds shall be guaranteed, the company shall provide, in a manner satisfactory to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, by a deposit in money or other sufficient security, or of a deposit of part money and part security, in addition to such mortgage, for the payment of interest on such bonds during the construction of the said line of railway, and until the same shall have been fully completed and provided with the initial equipment passed and approved by the government engineer.

Not a word in that inconsistent with section 11 which has been put on 'Hansard' by the hon. member for Carleton. Section 11 is embodied in the terms of this resolution, if the resolution be amended as proposed by my hon. friend from York. What was the object of section 10? Simply this, that, inasmuch as the 40 per cent could not be received by the government of New Brunswick until after the road had been completed and was earning the revenue, therefore during the intervening period it was required of this company that some provision should be made for the payment of interest. It is absolutely consistent and not in the least conflicting with a word to be found in section 11. What is the general intention of this statute with regard to the equipment? A great deal of light is shed upon it by reference to the concluding words of section 16.

> And such contract shall also provide that such railway shall be equipped by the said company or by the government of Canada, with proper and sufficient rolling stock.

What then is the whole scope of the legislation? In the first place, by section 10 provision must be made during the

period antecedent to the operation of the road for the payment of interest upon the bonds guaranteed by the government of New Brunswick. That is plain and simple.

Mr. CARVELL. Do not sections 10, 11 and 16 provide that before the government of New Brunswick can guarantee bonds rolling stock must be provided by somebody?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The government of New Brunswick intended that until rolling stock should be provided provision should be made for the interest on those bonds, a most businesslike proposal from every standpoint. After the road should be equipped with rolling stock and should be in operation, then they looked to the revenue derived from the operation of the road for the reimbursement of the interest payable on the bonds, but until that had been accomplished they insisted by section 10 that provision for the payment of that interest should be made. There is nothing in that provision inconsistent with section 11 or section 16.

Mr. CARVELL. Does not that provide that some one must provide rolling stock?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Section 16 left it entirely open as to whether the rolling stock should be provided by the company or the government of Canada, as I understand it. Therefore section 11 very properly uses the word rolling stock, because if the rolling stock had been provided by the company the lease must necessarily carry the rolling stock as well. It was possible under the provision of section 16 that the rolling stock under the contract as eventually agreed to would be provided by the company; therefore it was absolutely necessary in section 11 to use the words rolling stock in connection with the lease, because after the company provides the rolling stock it is not only the road but the rolling stock as well that must be leased with it. It seems to me that if you take sections 10, 11 and 16 and construe them in the ordinary commonsense, businesslike meaning of the words, you have not the slightest difficulty from beginning to end. There is not a word in section 10 that conflicts with section 11, there is not a word in section 11 that conflicts with section 16. Because it is open under section 11 to the possibility that the company may provide the rolling stock, therefore you find in section 11 the provision that the road when leased shall carry any rolling stock with it if that rolling stock shall be provided before——

Mr. CARVELL. Why do my friends object to rolling stock being provided?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am discussing the question as to whether the Minister of Railways has properly recited the legislation of the province of New Brunswick? It must be apparent to any one that if this proposal is to be carried out it cannot be carried out by provision of one kind in the legislation of New Brunswick and of a different and inconsistent character in the legislation of this parliament. What I am endeavouring to emphasize is that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) makes this resolution thoroughly consistent with the New Brunswick legislation, while the resolution proposed by the Minister of Railways is not consistent with the New Brunswick legislation, for the reasons to which I have alluded, and which were dealt with in detail by the hon. member for York.

Mr. CARVELL. If my hon. friend is so anxious to have this portion of the resolution conform with the statute of New Brunswick, why does not the member for York go further and ask to amend the resolution as to the question of standard and specifications?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Because, as I understand the situation, there is no need—

Mr. CARVELL. There must be an amendment——

Mr. CROCKET. The New Brunswick statute specifies the standard as the Minister of Public Works does, the National Transcontinental grade in New Brunswick.

Mr. CARVELL. Does he not admit that if this legislation goes through as proposed to be amended by himself, it is even then necessary for the legislature of New Brunswick to change their legislation before they are empowered to sign the contract? Why does he not try to make the whole thing harmonize?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not desire that my hon. friend shall interpose with a controversy with the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) who is perfectly well able to take care of himself as my hon. friend knows. I am pointing out to hon. gentlemen opposite, especially to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways, that their recital is an untrue and incorrect recital. The operative part of their resolution does not follow the operative part of the legislation of New Brunswick, and the road cannot be built unless the legislation of this parliament and the legislation of New Brunswick are made to conform. I challenge the contradiction of the statement that the resolution proposed by the Minister of Railways and Canals does not conform to the legislation of New Brunswick. Therefore, I send back to hon. gentlemen opposite their own words that their action in this respect may well bear the implication that it is not the bona fide in-

tention of the government of Canada to bring about the completion of this road; otherwise they would see to it that their own legislation is conformable to and consistent with the legislation placed on the statute-book of New Brunswick by the government of that province for the purpose of bringing about the construction of that road which is a matter of vital interest not only to the valley of the River St. John, but to the entire province of New Brunswick.

Mr. GRAHAM. I might draw attention to the point of order that the hon. gentleman's motion, if it means what he says it does, involves an additional charge on the revenue of Canada. If it does not mean that it would not mean anything. I find that after being pressed pretty hard by the Minister of Public Works, and the member for Carleton, New Brunswick, in trying to meet what I thought was the desire of the people of New Brunswick to help this railway line, I have got into a hornet's nest. I am not so sure I would have done what I did, for I thought I was acting pretty liberally as the head of the Department of Railways, if I had known that two prominent members of the opposition had intended to obstruct this legislation. I expected to have their hearty support, but they have obstructed it at every point, and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has also been drawn into the question. Let me point out one thing.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the Minister of Railways and Canals state that I have been attempting to obstruct the passage of this resolution? I am surprised to hear a statement of that kind coming from a minister of the Crown.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will put it in another way.

Mr. CROCKET. I have been endeavouring to secure the passage of the resolution in a manner that would bring about the construction of this road and make it conform to the legislation of New Brunswick.

Mr. GRAHAM. I should not use the word 'obstruct'; in place of it I will use the word 'oppose.' We might as well understand that the legislation of New Brunswick from start to finish implies and states in every paragraph relating to it that the company was to provide some rolling stock and equipment. In every paragraph where it is mentioned it states that. My hon. friend says: No, you supply the equipment, and he pretended to state this afternoon what cannot be found in their statute from start to finish. They demand, not this House, not the Minister of Railways, but the provincial government of New Brunswick, in their statute that the company getting this contract shall provide the initial equipment. I will take some clauses not yet mentioned to show that the New Brunswick government, in every part of this Act, acted upon that assumption. Take clause 27 if you like:

> Before any such guarantee shall be given, the payment of the said bonds and interest thereon, shall be secured by a trust mortgage, made and executed by the said company to a trust company, to be approved of by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and covering all the said line of railway and its appurtenances.

Mr. CARVELL. That is part 3.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the second class.

Mr. GRAHAM. But the same principle applies to both roads, they were to supply the initial equipment at least and the mortgage in either case, either upon this road, or upon the one horse road, as my hon. friend calls it, was to be secured on the rolling stock in accordance with the Act passed by the legislature of New Brunswick. Let me go back a little further and come to clause 16. I agree with the leader of the opposition; I say in this regard that sections 10 and 11 are not consistent one with the other. I agree with the leader of the opposition to the extent that my argument is largely that. I admit further that I take the responsibility, in so far as I have to, for the use of the word 'equipment' not being in the resolution, because we cannot say in one clause that the company shall provide the initial equipment, and in the very next clause that the government shall do it. Let me proceed a little further. Take clause 16. I shall not put it on 'Hansard' because it has been read. This clause fully accepts the Transcontinental railway standard, practically the standard outlined in the letter of the Minister of Public Works. The government of New Brunswick accepts that standard, and put it in their statute, Upon what ground does my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) ask this House to say that that standard should not be adopted when the government that he speaks for accept it and make it part of their statute?

Mr. CROCKET. My amendment does not ask that the standard be changed.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, but the hon. gentleman's argument was devoted for an hour to an attack upon this government for adopting a standard that the government of New Brunswick have accepted and have adopted and put in their statute. Then, the matter of the standard is wiped out; there is no complaint on that ground.

Mr. CROCKET. That is because this government insisted upon it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, the government of New Brunswick does not always take the advice of this government. Clause 16 says:

And such contract shall also provide that such railway shall be equipped by the said company or by the government of Canada, with proper and sufficient rolling stock.

That is inconsistent with the whole tenor of the statute? Why? The government of New Brunswick say first that the 'initial equipment' must be provided by this company. Compare that with the language in clause 10 which I shall read in a moment. Undoubtedly the government of New Brunswick expected that this government, when we came to operate, would supply any additional rolling stock, but to use the word 'equipment' in that regard unqualifiedly was not proper legislation, it was not consistent. and this House should not pass inconsistent legislation merely to make it conform with what we might consider to be inconsistent in some other legislation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Suppose we assume that my hon. friend's argument as to the meaning of the word 'equipment' in that respect is correct—I do not agree with him in his contention as to that—but if his argument is correct, is not that the best reason why we should insert that word?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is my argument why we should not do so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You require the word 'equipment' in the restricted sense to make it conform with the legislation of New Brunswick.

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Certainly.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend has forgotten or missed the few words with which I introduced my argument on this point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, I have not.

Mr. GRAHAM. My contention is that the legislation of New Brunswick is inconsistent one clause with the other, and we should not make ours wrong because theirs is wrong. In our legislation we are meeting the desires of the New Brunswick legislature because that is what is in every portion of their statute.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister did not get my point.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not agree at all that we should make our legislation conform with theirs if theirs is wrong, or inconsistent—I do not mean wrong.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If you purport to recite it you ought to recite it correctly.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are not purporting to recite it; we are purporting to recite the meaning of it. Before I get through I think I will show my hon. friends that we are anxious to meet that situation, so that there will not be the vestige of an excuse for the government of New Brunswick not guaranteeing these bonds and entering into a contract. I have pointed out what I mean about clause 16. Now I will go back to clause 11:

No such agreement shall be entered into with any company or corporation for the construction of the said line of railway or for the guaranteeing of the said bonds, and no such bonds or debentures shall be guaranteed, unless and until the parliament of Canada shall enact legislation authorizing the granting of a subsidy in aid of the construction of the said railway, to the amount of not less than $6,400 per mile, and authorizing the entering, by the said government of Canada into an agreement with such company or corporation and with the government of New Brunswick aforesaid, for the leasing of the said line of railway, when completed——

Mark the words:

—with its appurtenances and rolling stock.

If this company were not to provide rolling stock why was it put in clause 11 that they must have that rolling stock or the bonds would not be guaranteed? That meant that the company must first furnish the initial rolling stock. That is what they say in section 10 and that is what was in their mind. They thought that as the business increased the operating company must furnish additional rolling stock. They provide in section 10 for initial equipment and then, in the next clause they provide for equipment which overlaps everything. In clause 10 we find a provision that will carry out their idea of initial equipment by the company and of additional equipment by the government of Canada. I think that no reasonable person could take any other meaning from looking into all the circumstances of the statute. I have read section 11 which says that they contemplated that this company must have rolling stock. Let me look back at section 10 and see if it is not based on the same idea:

Before any of the company's bonds shall be guaranteed, the company shall provide, in a manner satisfactory to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, by a deposit in money or other sufficient security, or of a deposit of part money and part security, in addition to such mortgage, for the payment of interest on such bonds during the construction of the said line of railway, and until the same shall have been fully completed and provided with the initial equipment——

It means exactly the same and coincides with the other clause, except that the use of the word 'equipment' shows that the government had it in their mind that it would be reasonable to expect that the company should supply the initial equipment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is there in that which is inconsistent with the idea of the government supplying it. The point

of that is, that until the road is in operation and earning a revenue there must be some provision made for the payment of interest,

Mr. GRAHAM. They are going to release this money every ten miles, and consequently the section cannot mean what my hon. friend says it does. What they meant to say undoubtedly, and what we are willing to provide for, is that, when the road is completed and the government takes it over, as additional rolling stock is needed the government of Canada will provide it for the increasing trade. I cannot see that their legislation means anything else. To put the word 'equipment' in in two places and to say in one place the company must supply the initial equipment, and in another to say that the government of Canada must supply the equipment is conflicting. I believe the government of New Brunswick never intended it to mean anything else than that the initial equipment should be supplied by the company, and the company agrees to accept that. I am, therefore, prepared to agree to an amendment, and I think every reasonable man will accept it, which will cover what I think the government of New Brunswick had in its mind and will be what I believe to be reasonable, and that is to add after the word 'operation' in line 16, the words: 'Including the supply of additional rolling stock from time to time sufficient to handle the traffic as it may increase.' That means that the government of Canada in leasing this road shall agree to supply additional rolling stock from time to time sufficient to meet the needs of the traffic. Surely that would make it plain, and be fair, and it will I believe place in this resolution exactly what I believe the New Brunswick government had in its mind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The meaning of the legislature can only be found in the construction of the language used, and in my opinion it is utterly impossible to get any such meaning out of section 10 as that which the Minister of Railways has placed upon it. It is perfectly consistent with section 10 either that the equipment shall be supplied by the company or the equipment shall be supplied by the government of Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM. Would the hon. gentleman think it reasonable that the government of New Brunswick should suppose that this government would supply the equipment as the road is being constructed?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not dealing with suppositions. I am dealing with the language of the statute. There is not one word in section 10 inconsistent with the provision in section 16, that the road may be equipped either by the company or by the government of Canada with proper and sufficient rolling stock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does the hon. gentleman make of section 9 which provides that the company shall give a mortgage upon its railway and rolling stock to secure the bonds which the province is to guarantee?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not wonder at the Minister of Railways who has not had the advantage of a training in the construction of statutes making an argument of that kind, but I am surprised at the Minister of Public Works who is an able and experienced lawyer, making such a suggestion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You won't answer?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will answer very quickly, and the answer is that this statute looked to two possibilities in respect to equipment, one possibility was equipment by the company and the other possibility was equipment by the government of Canada, and it was absolutely essential that both in sections 9 and 11 they should include rolling stock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the provincial government was in no way concerned in having the company provide the initial equipment why should they expressly provide that the mortgage for their security should cover the rolling stock?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Because if the rolling stock was there it was businesslike to provide that they should have a lien upon it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend think that the company would provide that initial equipment just for fun?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)? Certainly not; but in the progress of the negotiations the arrangement might have been that the company would provide the rolling stock, or, that the government of Canada would provide the rolling stock, and it was perfectly reasonable and consistent that the term 'rolling stock' should be used in sections 9 and 11. I should not think that the Minister of Public Works, who is a lawyer of well-known ability and experience, would put forward such an argument seriously. Section 10 had simply one thing in mind, and that was that the province of New Brunswick should have reasonable provision made, before this road was in operation, for the interest upon those bonds, and hence the wording of that section. It was absolutely immaterial, so far as that clause was concerned, in that aspect, whether the equipment should be provided by the company or by the government of Canada. What they were concerned with was chiefly that until the road was in operation and until revenue was being earned from it, some provision should be

made for the payment of the interest on these bonds. The Minister of Public Works would himself have used about the same language as section 10 is couched in, to meet the same conditions.

Mr. CARVELL. I want to point out to my hon. friend from York that the object of the proposed amendment is to meet the contention which is put forth in the province of New Brunswick for the last three or four weeks, to the effect that they could not build this road on account of the little bit of equipment that is required. They say, if you get rid of the equipment, we can do it; but they are not touching the really important parts of this resolution. If my hon. friend were sincere, and wanted to make this conform to the legislation of New Brunswick, he would cut out the whole of the latter part of the resolution, which reads as follows:

Provided, however, that the said contract shall be entered into only upon the condition that the said railway be constructed upon plans and specifications to be approved of by the Governor in Council upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and shall be up to the general standard of the said National Transcontinental railway through the said province.

Section 11 of the Provincial Act provides that there can be no grade higher than four-tenths of one per cent. As the legislation stands, the government of New Brunswick could not sign a contract for a road with a higher grade than that.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that not the general standard of the Transcontinental?

Mr. CARVELL. No, it is not. The general standard is four-tenths of one per cent going east and six-tenths going west, where practicable; but if that is not practicable, the grade going west can be as high as one and one-tenth. When Mr. Hazen and his friends passed this legislation, they particularly located the road to run from Grand Falls to Andover, from Andover to Centreville, from Centreville to Lakeville, and from Lakeville to Woodstock. Now, it is a physical impossibility to build a railway between Clearview and Woodstock on a four-tenths grade, except at a cost of probably $100,000 a mile and by lengthening the road 8 or 10 miles. Therefore the government of New Brunswick will be compelled to change its legislation if it hopes to have the road built. My hon. friend from York is not sincere when he says he is moving this amendment to make it conform to the legislation of New Brunswick. He knows that he is not. He is only moving it for election purposes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is not in order to question the sincerity of any member of the House.

Mr. CARVELL. If the Chairman wants me to withdraw that, I will do so, and I will say that if my hon. friend is sincere in wishing to change the unimportant part of the legislation, why does he not move to change the important part, and have a vote upon it? He dare not do it.

Mr. CROCKET. I will leave the sincerity of my hon. friend and myself in this matter to the electors of the counties of Carleton and York.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I ask your decision on the point I raised a few moments ago?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point raised, as I understand, is as to the power of this committee to introduce a word which might have the effect of imposing an additional burden on the people. The resolution has been brought down on the recommendation of the Governor. By it power is given to the government to enter into a contract for the operation, maintenance, upkeep and repair of a certain railway. A part of the proposed amendment is to introduce after the word 'operation,' the word 'equipment.' It would seem to me that this would mean an additional burden on the people, and therefore would come within the rule forbidding a private member moving an amendment or bringing in a motion involving an additional expenditure. But I am willing to hear the opinion of experienced members of the House on the point before ruling.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not sure that the rule applies where a resolution has been introduced and an amendment proposed. When a resolution is brought in by the government, it is obviously not incapable of amendment, and I think I have seen authority that it may be extended in such cases.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My view is that the resolution may be amended, but only in the way of reducing the burden on the people, as in Committee of Supply a private member can not move to increase an appropriation, but can move to reduce.

Mr. CROCKET. I was quite aware of the rule which precludes a private member from introducing a resolution or amendment which might entail a financial burden on the people; but I do not think that precludes a private member from moving an amendment to a resolution brought down by the government even though it may have the effect of possibly increasing the expenditure. I certainly can recall instances in which amendments of that kind have been moved in this House. For instance, when the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill

was before this House, amendment after amendment was moved to change the route of the railway, adding possibly to the expense that might be entailed. The first part of this amendment seeks to amend the preamble of the resolution. It is simply only for the purpose of converting an untrue preamble or recital into a true preamble or recital. I submit that the amendment is perfectly in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the amendment of the hon. member had been divided into two parts and that down to line 15 stood alone, I presume I could accept it, it being merely a recital, but in the enacting part, lines 26 and 27, it appears to be in a little different position.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax), thinks he knows of occasions when a money resolution was amended so as to extend it——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would not contradict my hon. friend, but I have no such recollection. The spirit of the rule is that no charge shall be laid upon the public except upon the initiative of the Crown, and it would surprise me if precedent could be quoted to the effect that the rule had been extended in the way suggested. It will strike every member of the committee that if the object of the amendment is to extend the charge upon the people, it would certainly be out of order. I have listened all afternoon to this discussion, and would observe to my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) that when the resolution provides for the leasing by the government of the road with its 'appurtenances and rolling stock' in my humble judgment that is the same as 'equipment.' I cannot see any difference.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Have we been sitting here since three o'clock discussing a matter without knowing that it was out of order?—discussing it from three o'clock until 11.20 and the Prime Minister raised no objection before? If we had known that you, Mr. Chairman, intended raising an objection of that kind, it could have been settled at three o'clock this afternoon. You have allowed this——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must interrupt the hon. member. The point of order has been raised by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) within the last fifteen minutes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But the amendment was handed to you this afternoon. Surely you as chairman should know whether it was out of order——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CROCKET.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is at liberty to address himself to the point of order. That is the subject before the Chair and not the conduct of the chairman.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But, on the point of order, I have been under the impression that when an amendment is placed in the chairman's hands he should know whether it was in order or not. In that way, we should be prevented from losing hours and hours, perhaps days, in a discussion over a resolution that could not be voted on. In other words, the Prime Minister, who is leading the House, I should think, would have raised the objection at the time, and not allowed the whole day to go by. I think it is the duty of the Prime Minister to have shown us at the start that he intended to raise this objection. There is no doubt that if the Prime Minister says he will withdraw his opposition as to this being out of order, we can take the vote. But, as he has raised the point of order, the vote cannot be taken. There is some object in preventing the vote being taken. I think it is unfair that we should be here all day, and, at a quarter past eleven, the Minister of Railways should raise a point of order simply to escape a vote.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No authority has been quoted to me to show that the amendment is in order. I have had handed to me by the clerk a ruling of Speaker Kirkpatrick on a subject closely allied to this, and reported in Desjardin's 'Speakers' Decisions:'

Amendment ruled out of order because its effect would have been to increase the burthen on the people beyond that recommended by the Crown.

The House, according to order, resolves itself into a committee to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the granting of land, or scrip redeemable in land, to the members of the enrolled militia force actively engaged in suppressing the half-breed and Indian outbreak in the Northwest.

The question being proposed, that the said resolutions be now read a second time; Mr. Watson moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. Carey, that all the words after 'now' to the end of the question be left out, and the words 'recommitted to Committee of the Whole House, with power to amend the same by providing that any member of said enrolled militia who has located a homestead and pre-emption shall, in lieu of the grant hereinbefore mentioned, be entitled to get his pre-emption free,' inserted instead thereof.

Objection being taken to the said proposed amendment on the ground that it was in effect increasing the burthen beyond that recommended by the Crown,

Mr. Speaker said: 'That the point of order was well taken, and that the motion in amendment could not be put.'

It appears to me that this is sufficiently close to the present case to be applicable,

and that the spirit of the rule with regard to increasing public burdens without the recommendation of the Crown applies to the proposed amendment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The authority which I had in mind is to be found in May's 'Parliamentary Practice', page 564:

The committee is not bound by the terms of the provisions which the ministers of the Crown have inserted in the Bill; and any member may propose an increase of the grants specified in these clauses, or to extend the application of the provisions of the Bill, whatever may be the cost resulting therefrom, so long as the power conferred by the royal recommendation is not exceeded.

That is the question here.

Acting on this principle, when, in 1812, a committee was considering a message from the Prince Regent, recommending, in general terms, provision to be made for the family of Mr. Spencer Perceval, amendments were permitted for increasing the provision proposed by the minister; and this practice has been supported by rulings from the chair, though, on the last occasion, not without remarks which deserve careful consideration.

I knew I had seen something of the kind. But there are other authorities later in the book which seem to point in the other direction. But what I have read is what I had in mind.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My ruling would be that the amendment is not in order.

Mr. CROCKET. In accordance with your suggestion, Mr. Chairman, I move that the preamble of the resolution be amended by inserting the word 'equipment' between 'operation' and 'maintenance' in the fifteenth line thereof.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am willing to hear any objection on the point of order, if any member desires. It appears to me that it is in order to make this amendment as being in the preamble, the recital, and not in the enacting part.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM. I move that between the word 'with' and the words 'rolling stock' in the twenty-seventh line the word 'initialled' be inserted. That conforms absolutely with section 10.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM. In order that we may remove the last vestige of misunderstanding, I would move to insert after the word 'operation' in the same line, the words 'including the supply of additional rolling stock from time to time sufficient to handle the traffic as it may increase.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You would have to get the assent of the Crown to that.

Mr. GRAHAM. His Excellency, I think, understood this to be the meaning of the resolution. I do not think it will require the consent of the Crown, it is simply to make the meaning plain.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the proposed amendment involves an increase without the consent of the Crown, I would not be prepared to consent to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Better go to the telephone.

Mr. GRAHAM. The operation really means the addition of that rolling stock, but in order not to have a misunderstanding it is better to have this inserted. There is one other amendment, that the figures '50' in the phrase 'from Fredericton south a distance of 50 miles' be changed to 40. The reason for this change is that if we leave it at 50 miles it might be that we could not enter into arrangements to operate that section until a bridge was constructed, which might cause delay.

Amendments agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 150) to authorize the government of Canada to acquire by lease a certain line of railway in the province of New Brunswick.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 21, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 142) for the relief of Lorne Forbes Robertson.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill (No. 143) for the relief of Cecil Ernest Freeman.—Mr. Blain.

Bill (No. 144) for the relief of Ethel May Hornell.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 147) to amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 148) respecting the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.—Mr. Molloy.

Bill (No. 149) respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—Mr. Harris.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—HON. MACKENZIE KING.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). Before the orders of the day are called, I rise to a question of privilege. In the 'Mail and Empire' of March 15 there is an article under the following heading:

MINISTER'S DENIAL IS PROVED FALSE.

Mr. King declares Berlin Board of Trade did not denounce reciprocity. Record disproves it. Return in Commons shows that he was informed of board's action.

Then appears the following:

Special to the 'Mail and Empire.'

Ottawa, March 14.—Another return of resolutions and correspondence respecting the reciprocity agreement was brought down to parliament to-day by Hon. Mr. Fielding. Among the resolutions opposing the agreement was one passed by the Board of Trade of Berlin, on January 13. It will be remembered that during his speech in condemnation of the government's policy Mr. Lloyd Harris (Brantford) mentioned that the Berlin Board of Trade had adopted such a resolution. He was at once contradicted by Hon Mackenzie King.

The file of correspondence brought down today includes the resolution to which Mr. Harris referred. It also includes a telegram from Mr. M. W. A. Lochead, secretary of the Berlin organization, apprising the Minister of Labour of the action of the board and an acknowledgment of its reception sent in reply by Mr. King. The resolution itself reached Ottawa on January 14 and Mr. King wrote to Berlin saying that he had laid it before Sir Wilfrid Laurier and that the premier had promised to give it due consideration.

There is such a semblance of truth in that article that I am afraid the public will not be able to discern the amount of error which it really contains. The statement I made to the House when the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris) spoke the other evening was entirely and absolutely correct. I refrained from drawing the attention of the House to this article until my hon. friend, who has been absent for the last few days, was in his seat; and as he is in his seat to-day, I now draw the attention of the House to it. When my hon. friend was speaking, he made reference to an article which appeared in the Toronto 'Globe' and which led him to believe that the Berlin Board of Trade had, a day or two previous, passed a resolution opposing the agreement which is proposed and which is now before us for consideration. The hon. gentleman, along with others in this country, got his information from a report sent out erroneously by the secretary of the Berlin Board of Trade, and which appeared in several papers, but in particular in the London 'Free Press', under the following head:

The Berlin Board of Trade unanimously oppose pact.

Then it goes on:

At a recent meeting of the board this resolution was reaffirmed.

Referring to a resolution passed while the negotiations were under way, and before the present agreement was made known. This article, which appeared in the London 'Free Press', was copied into other newspapers, and also a despatch was sent to the Toronto 'Globe.' It was this despatch which led my hon friend and many others to believe that the Berlin Board of Trade had reaffirmed the resolution they had passed at the beginning of the proceedings; and it was to this alleged reaffirmed resolution, which he supposed to relate to the proposed agreement now under consideration, that my hon. friend referred. My hon. friend is in his seat and acknowledges that in that statement I am quite right. I understood him to refer to the resolution that was supposed to be reaffirmed, but which in fact was never reaffirmed; and it was because I knew he was in error and would not intentionally make an error that I corrected him. The Berlin Board of Trade did in fact pass a resolution when they were afraid that the manufacturers of that town were going to be seriously affected by the reciprocal agreement. That resolution was forwarded to me and I presented it to the right hon. the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister will recall that I spoke of the importance of considering the weight to be attached to an expression of opinion of that kind coming from a manufacturing centre like Berlin.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the hon. gentleman a copy of that resolution?

Mr. KING. I have. It is as follows:

That in view of the agitation now being carried on in the United States in favour of a reciprocal trade agreement with Canada, obviously for the purpose of enlarging the markets for the manufacturers in the United States at the expense of Canadian industries and of Canadian workingmen.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. KING (reading):

And in view of the present agitation in the prairie provinces for a reduction in the Canadian tariff.

It is hereby resolved that we, the members of the Berlin Board of Trade are very strongly opposed to any reciprocal tariff arrangement between Canada and the United States which would mean the lowering of the present Canadian customs tariff, as we are convinced that any such reduction would be injurious to Canadian interests. That this board is of the opinion that the Canadian tariff must be so framed and maintained as to continue to encourage the investment of capital in Canadian enterprises and to transfer to the workshops of the Dominion the manufacture of many of the goods which are now imported from other countries, and notably from the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. KING (reading):

That this board is further of the opinion that while our tariff should be primarily framed for the protection of Canadian manufacturers and other Canadian interests, it should nevertheless continue to give a preference to the mother country and also to any

other part of the British Empire with which reciprocal preferential tariffs can be arranged, and recognizing always that under any conditions such preference should continue to afford adequate tariff protection to all Canadian interests.

That was the resolution passed.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the date of that?

Mr. KING. That resolution was on January 13. I have here an article from one of the Berlin papers which explains what took place on February 24, which was the time at which Mr. Lochead, secretary of the Berlin Board of Trade, sent to the London 'Free Press' and one or two other papers the statement which led them to believe that the Berlin Board of Trade had reaffirmed the resolution it had passed at an earlier date. I have verified these facts, and they have been given to the public and never questioned, so I will read from this statement:

Unfortunately Secretary Lochead's letter has placed the Berlin Board of Trade in a wholly false light on the question of the tariff agreement, and at the same time has played into the hands of a newspaper that is exploiting the question for political purposes.

In the first place the Berlin Board of Trade did not pass a resolution opposing the tariff agreement. The resolution quoted was passed while negotiations were pending and before any agreement had been reached, and therefore before it was known that the interests of all Berlin and Waterloo county industries had been carefully protected.

In the second place, the Board of Trade did not reaffirm the resolution passed at the annual meeting in January, as stated by Secretary Lochead in his letter. . . .

According to the minutes there were but six members of the Board of Trade present at the meeting. The motion arose out of a complaint made by several members of the board that proper publicity had not been given to the reciprocity resolutions passed at the annual meeting in January. A motion to reaffirm was, it is true, submitted, but after lengthy debate it was decided that it would be improper for half a dozen members of the board to undertake to reaffirm on behalf of the whole board a resolution which had been passed at a general meeting at which 150 members were present, and when the members had no information as to the text of the tariff agreement before them. It was also argued that, since by the terms of the agreement, not one Berlin industry could be shown to be prejudicially affected, and that as the purpose of the original resolution was the protection of local interests, to reaffirm the original resolution would be inadvisable. The motion above quoted was then adopted as a compromise between the contending sections of the Board of Trade council.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that an editorial of the newspaper?

Mr. KING. No, it is a news item headed 'Board of Trade Council did not reaffirm the reciprocity resolution.'

Mr. BLAIN. What newspaper?

Mr. KING. The Berlin 'Telegraph,' of February 27 last. So, what I said the other evening in reply to my hon. friend is absolutely correct, and this item which appears in the Toronto 'Mail and Empire,' and which says that my denial proved false is wholly incorrect. I think the facts I have given the House are sufficient to bear me out in my statement.

Mr. HARRIS. I accept the explanation given by the Minister of Labour (Mr. King). I made the statement on the floor of the House in perfect good faith, having read in the Toronto 'Globe' a report to that effect. Since that item appeared, a copy of the Berlin 'News-Record' has been sent me. That paper gives the date of the passing of the resolution as January 12, and on the 13th the secretary telegraphed to the minister the gist of the resolution asking him to place the contents before the Prime Minister. That was acknowledged. But the end of the paragraph states this:

To make its position stronger, the Board of Trade, since Hon. Mr. Fielding laid the terms of the proposed pact on the table of the House, has ordered copies of the original resolution to be sent to the leading newspapers of Ontario, thus showing that the board considered that it covered the ground well and was opposed to the pact.

I presume the explanation made by the minister is in connection with this last statement by this newspaper. That was probably at the meeting where the six members were present. However, I am not familiar with the details, and only wish to say that the statement I made on the floor of the House was made in entire good faith.

PRIVILEGE—MR. CROTHERS AND THE FARMERS' BANK CASE.

Mr. T. W. CROTHERS (West Elgin). I rise to a question of privilege. Referring to remarks made by myself on the 15th of this month when the affairs of the Farmers' bank were under discussion, the Ottawa 'Free Press,' in an article on March 17, in a leading editorial, has the following:

In order to bolster up his case for an investigation into the incorporation of the Farmers' Bank, Mr. Crothers with the idea of showing that 'something was held back' revamped the story in distorted form of a purely ordinary business transaction which Mr. Calvert had with the said bank.

I shall not read the whole of that article, as it would not edify the members present nor improve the fragrance of 'Hansard.' What I did say on that occasion, as will be found at page 5486 of Unrevised 'Hansard,' was as follows:

We have been told—I do not remember whether in this House or out of it—that the person who was chief whip in the Liberal party in this House at that time introduced Travers to the Finance Minister. It has been established——

I think, perhaps, that word 'established,' was a little too strong. I would not use it if I were speaking now, but I did use it then.

It has been established that, shortly afterwards, that chief whip made a loan from this bank—stated by some to amount to $5,000, but, I believe, stated by himself at $3,000, and that loan was charged up to commissions. Something occurred we had not learned yet.

The difficulty seems to be about the statement that this loan was charged up to commissions. My statement was founded on the report of the police court proceedings, as reported in the Ottawa 'Citizen,' and the Ottawa 'Journal,' of February 18, which report was in concurrent terms and was as follows:

Travers had a personal conference with Hon. Mr. Fielding, being introduced by W. S. Calvert, then Liberal whip. Mr. Fielding asked Travers if he had paid anything to Calvert for the latter's friendly interest, and Travers was able to answer truthfully that he had not. Later Calvert was lent $5,000 without security, which was charged to 'commissions' on the bank's books. This loan, later, was repaid in full.

The proceedings were reported in the 'Evening Telegram,' of Toronto in these words, this being part of the cross examination of Travers under oath:

'What took place between you and Calvert in the delay in getting the certificate?'

'We took it down to Fielding, and we had 15 or 30 minutes interview with him.'

'Did he assist you?'

That is, Calvert.

'Yes, he said all he could for us.'

Travers swore he never paid Mr. Calvert anything at any time.

'Did you loan him any money?'

'Not then, but I did some months afterwards.'

'How much?'

'About $5,000 or $6,000.

Travers said that all had been paid back but $560, and he had heard this was paid since the failure of the bank.

The statement I made that this $3,000 or $5,000, whichever it was, had been charged up to commissions was based on these reports of the proceedings in the police court in Toronto as evidence coming from Travers under oath, and not made without any foundation whatever as charged in this article.

INVESTIGATION INTO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SOREL NAVAL SHIPYARDS AND ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THE MEMBER FOR RICHELIEU.

Mr. P. E. BLONDIN (Champlain). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I desire to request certain information from the hon. the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur), and with that end in view I will ask permission to read a letter which I have this moment received:

Sorel, March 20, 1911.

My Dear Mr. Blondin, M.P.,

This is to inform you that I have been dismissed by the department from St. Joseph de Sorel. It happened on Friday evening when my presence card was taken from me.

I immediately spoke to the chief, Mr. Papineau, who told me that he knew nothing about the matter. I also saw Mr. Badeau, head of my department, who also professed ignorance on the subject. This means that the timekeeper has taken upon himself to dismiss me on the order of Mr. A. Archambault, assistant to Mr. Oscar Champagne, at present in Ottawa.

Ask Champagne why he dismissed me.

Yours truly,

A. SENECAL.

That Mr. Senecal is the witness, Andromique Senecal, who came here last week and gave evidence in the investigation now being carried on concerning Marine Department matters at Sorel.

I wish to inquire of the minister whether he gave orders to any one in the department to dismiss that witness, and also if it is his intention to permit attempts at intimidation of witnesses and thus to prevent us from obtaining, in the course of this investigation, independent evidence free from all constraint.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, I may say that I have given no orders for the dismissal of Mr. Senécal. I will also inform my hon. friend that very far from preventing witnesses from stating the truth, the Marine Department is anxious to do all in its power to make the investigation thorough in every way.

I should add, however, that I understood from the witness himself when he gave his evidence here that he had left the government service.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) yesterday called attention to two returns which he said had not been brought down, one relating to the

appointment of fish wardens in Victoria county, from 1906 to 1910 and another as to the fish bounties paid in the south riding of Cape Breton at the same time. I must inform my hon. friend that on February 28 last I laid before the House the return concerning the fish bounties. The other report is being prepared by the officers of my department. The hon. member will see that he has asked for the name, length of service and amount paid to each of these wardens. Owing to the demand for the length of service, the return involves more than a few days copying, as it is necessary to look into all the reports and records of each of these guardians. If my hon. friend does not insist on the length of service, I may get the return to-morrow.

Mr. MADDIN. I had no notice of the return having been brought down, and on five or six occasions I called at the office of Mr. Polkinghorne and inquired for the return. I must say in justice to Mr. Polkinghorne that on none of these occasions was he in the office. With regard to the fish wardens, I asked a similar question in the House in 1909 for the year 1908, and the information was furnished concerning about 125 appointees, as an answer to a question, in a very few days. The additional years would only multiply the work by four, and I trust that the minister will let me have that return as promptly as possible as I am quite interested in having it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to call the attention of the government to a number of returns not yet brought down and which were moved for some time ago. These returns are as follows:

December 5, by Mr. Blain, for Mr. Lennox, touching a contract between the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company and Mr. M. P. Davis.

December 5, by Mr. Roche for Mr. Lennox, touching the number of public buildings occupied in whole or in part as post offices.

December 7, by Mr. Macdonell (Toronto), for papers relating to the barracks site at Toronto.

December 7, by Mr. Monk, for a copy of the Imperial Defence Committee concerning the defence of the empire.

December 7, by Mr. Staples, for a copy of correspondence between the government and the government of Manitoba respecting the extension of boundaries.

December 12, by Mr. Macdonell (Toronto), copy of orders in council, &c., appointing members of the Canadian section of the Joint International Waterways Commission.

December 14, by Mr. Ames, for a return of moneys expended in each province since 1880, by the Department of Public Works for harbours and rivers.

December 14, by Mr. Sharpe (Ont.), for a return showing the total payments by the government to the Eclipse Manufacturing Company, Limited, and to the Office Specialty Company.

December 14, by Mr. Taylor (Leeds), for a return of the amount paid by the government for cab hire and street railway fares in Ottawa.

December 14, by Mr. Taylor (Leeds), for a return showing amounts paid for travelling expenses.

December 14, by Mr. Sharpe (Ont.), for a return showing what ministers of the Crown were abroad in 1908, 1909 and 1910 on public business, and on what business, with their expenses.

January 11 by Mr. Perley for Mr. Ames,—Return showing the total value of buildings owned by the government and occupied as post offices, &c.

January 11 by Mr. Sharpe (Ont),—Return showing amounts paid to Messrs. Dussault & Lemieux, dredging contractors, during the years named.

January 16, by Mr. Armstrong,—Copy of all correspondence and other documents relating to the establishment of a fast Atlantic service between Canada and the mother land.

January 16 by Mr. Rhodes,—Copy of all instructions or communications from the Department of Public Works or the Minister of Public Works to the chief architect with respect to the preparation of plans for the construction of a post office building at Parrsboro, N.S.

January 18 by Mr. Lennox,—Return showing how many aliens there are in the service of Canada who are residing out of Canada.

January 23, by Mr. Monk,—Copy of the report of the engineer who made the survey of the Back River or Riviere de Prairie.

January 23, by Mr. Borden,—Copies of all orders in council and other documents touching the participation by employees of the government in civic or municipal affairs.

January 26, by Mr. Boyce,—Statement showing the amount paid by the various departments of the government to the Sherwin-Williams Co.

January 30, by Mr. McCarthy,—Return showing the number of births and deaths in each province of Canada in each calendar year from 1901 to 1910 and other like information.

January 30, by Mr. McCarthy,—Return of the abstract of vital statistics prepared or compiled by the government of Canada or of any province, setting forth or showing the number of births and deaths in each province and territory from 1901 to 1910.

January 30, by Mr. Arthurs,—Copy of all advertisements, letters, contracts and other documents regarding mail routes. Trout Creek to Loring and Powassan to Nipissing or Restoule.

February 1, by Mr. Taylor (New Westminster),—Return showing all applications for homesteads or pre-emption in the railway belt in the district of New Westminster.

February 1, by Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar),—Return showing certain particulars respecting the 16,506.70 acres of Dominion lands and the 14,160 acres of land sold to the Grand Trunk Pacific Development Co.

February 1, by Mr. Blain for Mr. Taylor (Leeds),—Return showing the names, &c. of certain persons who have been given employment in connection with the care of the

grounds around the public buildings, Major's Hill park, &c.

February 6, by Mr. Edwards,—Return showing the employees connected with the Printing Bureau in 1896 and other like information.

February 13, by Mr. Sharpe (Ontario),—Return showing the names and addresses of all sessional employees of the House of Commons during the period mentioned.

February 15, by Mr. Jameson,—Return showing all communications relating to the rifle range at Bear River, N.S.

February 16, by Mr. Maddin,—Return showing how many wardens for the protection of fisheries were appointed in Victoria county, N.S., during the years named.

February 20, by Mr. Jameson,—Copy of telegrams, letters and documents in any department of the government relating to the payment of $500 to assist in the construction of a bait freezer at Barrington Passage, Nova Scotia.

February 20, by Mr. Sharpe (Ontario),—Copy of all letters and agreements between the city of Ottawa Municipal Electric Light Company and the Department of Public Works relating to the lighting of public buildings, &c.

February 20, by Mr. Sharpe (Ontario),—Copy of all memorials, reports, &c., of Boards of Trade and other bodies in the hands of the government both for and against the continuance of bounties to the steel and iron industries of Canada.

February 20, by Mr. Blain for Mr. Maddin, —Copy of all applications by or on behalf of the Glace Bay Bait Association in connection with cold storage building.

February 23, by Mr. Monk,—Return showing sums of money paid by the government to 'Le Canada' newspaper of Montreal.

February 27, by Mr. Macdonell,—Return showing the value, respectively, of certain products of the country, by provinces, during 1909-1910.

February 27, by Mr. Taylor (Leeds),—Return showing applications for aid in the construction of dry docks.

February 27, by Mr. Taylor (Leeds),—Return showing how many Canadians have been accepted as members of the Canadian navy.

February 27, Mr. Borden for Mr. Jameson, —Return of all letters and other documents between the Imperial authorities and the government of Canada touching the settlement of the case in the matter of the North Atlantic fisheries arbitration at the Hague.

February 27, by Mr. Borden for Mr. Taylor (Leeds),—Return showing all applications for aid under the Dry Docks Subsidies Act, 1910.

February 27, by Mr. Borden for Mr. Jameson,—Return of all letters and other documents showing the names of persons who supplied materials or worked in connection with the construction of a wharf at Deep Brook, Nova Scotia.

February 27, by Mr. Borden,—Return of all communications, regulations, &c., showing the systems of method by which the census is taken in the United Kingdom, the British dominions and foreign countries.

February 27, by Mr. Meighen,—Return showing all statutes, regulations, reports and proceedings in the courts of the United States or in the courts of any of the respective states touching the methods and operations of the meat trust and other trusts and combines in the United States.

February 27, by Mr. Campbell,—Copy of all orders in council relating to the fishing lease granted to one Markey in the waters of the Nelson river.

The others are of a more recent date, but I have given the orders and addresses which have been moved for up to the 6th March. The Prime Minister will know that there are some of them which involve greater delay than others, but in so far as these others are concerned, I would think that they might have been brought down before or at least that they might be brought down at a very early day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think that some of these orders have already been complied with; for instance that with regard to the boundaries of Manitoba, I believe that everything there is up to date on the question has been brought down already. Then, I think that all the resolutions and communications in regard to reciprocity have been brought down.

Mr. FIELDING. They have been brought down in instalments from time to time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then there are some which take a very long time. For instance, I notice that amongst the returns asked for is a return of the regulations of Great Britain with regard to the taking of the census. It will take some time to get that. Then there is another return, moved for by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), with regard to certain regulations in the United States touching trusts. We cannot get that except by very long and tedious correspondence. At all events there are some of these returns that can be brought down.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not depending on my own information. I made an application to the proper officers of the House for a statement of all the returns which have not yet been complied with. It may be that some misapprehension has occurred. Undoubtedly, certain documents have been brought down that would be included in this list. I might say that in so far as the return with regard to matters touching the census are concerned, I had a personal conversation with my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) who told me that if the order were literally complied with it would take a very long time, and he suggested that the purpose might be attained by bringing down the return in a very much simpler and abbreviated form. I at once assented to that being done and said that if we required more information we would inform him of the fact.

Mr. FISHER. I may say that the chief census officer is engaged in the prepara-

tion of what my hon. friend asks for, and it will be ready in a few days.

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to the return relating to the Atlantic Fisheries the reports were brought down some time in December last, giving all the pleadings before the Hague Tribunal and the award. After that, the papers in reference to the settlement of the question of litigation were brought down on my own motion, and these are all the documents I know of.

SUPPLY—STATEMENT IN 'GLOBE' RE DISSOLUTION OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an article published in the 'Globe' newspaper yesterday, which reads:

GOVERNMENT TO FORCE OPPOSITION'S HAND.

Attempt to Delay Passage of the Reciprocity Agreement.

To Concentrate on Supply Vote.

Continuation of Present Tactics Might Necessitate Appeal to Country.

(Special Despatch to The Globe.)

Ottawa, March 19.—With the ending of the fiscal year less than two weeks away, and a very small percentage of Supply for the coming year voted, despite the persistent efforts of the government, and with the obvious obstruction of the opposition, particularly during the past two weeks, it has been decided by the government to devote most of the balance of the month to endeavouring to get Supply, leaving the less urgent matter of passing the reciprocity proposals over until next month.

The article goes on to say:

The government will, by attempting to force Supply during the next two weeks, compel the obstructionists to clearly show their hand, and in the event of a continuation of the present tactics and a refusal to pass an interim Supply Bill, if found necessary, it might be that an appeal to the country would be found necessary to solve the deadlock. The issue in that event would be clearly defined, and although it would be obviously unjust for the opposition to force an appeal to the country before another session, when the Redistribution Bill could be put through and the west given its proper representation in new members, the onus would lie with the opposition, and the government would not fear the result.

Further on it says:

It is probable that Supply will be the first order of government business for the next two weeks, with probably one day in each week given to the continuation of the debate on reciprocity. The developments of the two weeks, with the government's determination to keep the House sitting late unless some progress is made, should serve to put the situation clearly before the people of Canada.

I would like to point out that the article says that the less urgent matter of passing the reciprocity proposals will be left over until next month, and it concludes in these words:

It may be noted that during the past two weeks the business of legislation and the voting of supplies has practically not been advanced a single step. It may also be asserted with assurance that the government has no intention of either dropping or modifying its reciprocity proposals, and will use every endeavour to have them passed by the House as speedily as possible.

These two statements seem to contradict each other. Now, as every one in the House knows that article is absolutely untrue, and the 'Globe,' with its usual indifference to truth, evidently pays no attention to what transpires in this House. I have gone through 'Hansard,' and counted up the columns occupied by Liberal members and Conservative members respectively, to see exactly who has been guilty of obstruction, if there has been any obstruction. On the 28th of February, when the discussion on reciprocity was resumed, there were 80 columns taken up by the Liberals and none by the Conservatives. On the 2nd March reciprocity was again up and there were 54 columns taken by the Liberals and 29 by the Conservatives, while on the matter of the health of Ottawa nine columns were taken by the Liberals, making 63 in all for the Liberals that day. On the 23rd of March the questions before the House were: the garnishment of civil servants' salaries and the Hague Tribunal, and on that day there were 32 columns taken by the Liberals and 44 by the Conservatives. On the 6th of March the subjects under discussion were the Lanctot matter, Ottawa's health, the Hague Tribunal and Supply, and on that day 42 columns were taken by the Liberals and 29 columns by the Conservatives. On March the 7th reciprocity was again before the House, and there were 43 columns taken by the Liberals and 40 by the Conservatives. On March the 8th reciprocity was again before the House, and there were 68 columns taken by the Liberals and 27 by the Conservatives. On March the 9th reciprocity was again discussed, and there were 53 columns taken by the Liberals and 48 by the Conservatives. On March the 10th the Minister of Railways brought in his annual statement, and he and his Liberal friends occupied 67 columns, as against 19 columns by the Conservatives. On March the 13th the Georgian Bay canal was discussed, and there were 39 columns occupied by the Liberals as compared with 19 occupied by the Conservatives. On March the 14th the question of the capitalization of the railways introduced by the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean), was before the House and including a speech by the member for North Cape Breton on reciprocity the Lib-

erals occupied 33 columns that day and the Conservatives 47. On March the 15th and 16th the question of the Farmers' Bank was under discussion and the Liberals occupied 73 columns these two days as compared with the Conservatives 142, that being a field day for the Conservatives. On March the 17th several matters were before the House including the question of health, the question of the speech made by the hon. member for North Oxford, alien labour, and the reading of resolutions in regard to reciprocity, after which the House went into Supply. Yesterday, the resolution of the Minister of Railways was before the House and the Liberals occupied 46 columns and the Conservatives 33. A summary of this from and including the last day of February up to date gives 687 columns of 'Hansard' filled with speeches from the Liberals and 549 columns occupied by Conservative members. If we exclude the discussion on the Farmers' Bank, and every one will admit that the members on this side were justified in bringing that up, then the Liberals have occupied 614 columns to 407 by the Conservatives. During all this time we have only had an opportunity of discussing reciprocity on portions of five days, and while the Conservatives have filled 162 columns of 'Hansard' on the question of reciprocity the Liberals have filled up 335. In view of these figures it is up to the 'Globe' newspaper to apologize, although I do not expect that it will. This article in the 'Globe' accuses the opposition of obstruction, and it says that in consequence of that obstruction the government may be forced to go to the country. It looks to me as though the government were paving the way to go to the country as they know that the longer these proposals are before the people the more obnoxious they become. At all events the figures I have given prove that if the government do decide to go to the country and deprive the west of the extra representation to which it is entitled the onus and fault and blame will rest on the shoulders of the government and not on the opposition.

RECIPROCITY—QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a statement made referring to me by the member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), in his speech on reciprocity on the 14th instant, when I was not present in the House. He said:

> I received from a member from the west this afternoon some evidence that seems to me very striking. In the great province of Saskatchewan they have 51 members local and Dominion, and I am told on the authority of an hon. member from that province that out of the 51 there is only one man who is opposing this pact and that man is the hon. member for Qu'Appelle in this House. All the rest are in favour of the agreement.

The hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) has been already taken to task by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), because of a serious misrepresentation of that gentleman's attitude made in the course of the same speech, but his statement regarding me has been quoted outside of this House where the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) is not so well known as he is inside or I would not take the trouble to call attention to it. He had no warrant whatever for making the statement he did. I have so far refrained from expressing any opinion one way or the other. When I have a statement to make I will make it myself, and will not ask the hon. member for North Cape Breton to make it for me. He is one of the last men in the House to whom I would make that request. This is a matter of immense importance, and while the government supporters had no difficulty in endorsing the proposals the moment they were laid before the House and the country, and the moment they heard the barest outline of them, or even before they heard it at all, I have felt it my duty to carefully weigh every bit of information available before coming to a decision. That information has been meted out to us in a most niggardly way. It has had to be dragged out of the government item by item like drawing teeth. The House has a right to complain of the meagre information supplied, in such marked contrast to that supplied to Congress by the American government to enable them to study the question from every point of view. In some respects we are even now dependent on information supplied by the American government which our government should have supplied. But we want more information still than the American government has supplied, and along lines which it was not necessary for them to give. We want information in regard to the trade and prices in Australia and New Zealand, and the other British colonies and in Argentine and the other favoured nations which are to have free entry to our markets which is denied to us in their markets. I am justified in saying that no one in the House has yet had the information necessary to enable him to make a satisfactory study of the full effect of the agreement. It is only within the last few days that important statements have been made on the subject by the Prime Minister, and the Finance Minister which alter in a material degree the bearing of this whole question; and while it will no doubt still further add to the satisfaction of such manufacturers as

are endorsing these proposals—and there are many of them—it will on the other hand be received with bitter disappointment by those farmers who are also supporting it in the hope of getting a square deal.

On Friday last the attention of the House was called by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) to a report appearing in the 'Globe' newspaper of a speech delivered at Woodstock, Ontario, by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). The hon. member for Dauphin used these words:

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, there is a matter that I wish to bring to your consideration and to the consideration of this House. I do it because I see that the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) is in his seat. It is a matter that has been brought up already in this House by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). It is with regard to an article that appeared in the 'Globe' of date Saturday, March 4, of this year. At a meeting at Woodstock, in Ontario, the hon. member for North Oxford, in addressing the people there spoke as follows: The speech is so good I shall read it all:

'With regard to reciprocity, he noted that very little had been heard about the consumer's interest. He did not believe the reciprocity agreement being negotiated would affect the price to the consumer adversely. That might seem strange, as it was supposed the farmer would get a better price.'

He was addressing, I understand, an aggregation of men who were more or less engaged in manufacturing. He went on to say:

'He could not see that manufacturers would be touched very much, as few articles manufactured in Canada were affected. He was sure the Bain and Woodstock wagon companies would compete in the world's markets even with 2½ per cent reduction in the tariff. He thought the manufacturers opposed reciprocity because of what might follow, the 'thin end of the wedge,' but he had been assured——'

This is what I want to bring to your notice: '—he had been assured by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding that nothing of the sort would follow. They had gone as far in the farmers' interests as they would.'

As a farmer and a representative of farmers, I want to emphasize that point that one of the most aggressive members on the Liberal side of the House, one of the strongest supporters of the First Minister and his government, in a public meeting gives his word as a member of this House to the people of Woodstock, a manufacturing centre, that he has the word absolutely of the First Minister and the Minister of Finance that the farmers' interests would not be conserved any further than was done by this agreement. He goes on to say:

'It would be foolish for us to think of tinkering with the tariff or putting it on an unstable basis.'

He was talking to manufacturers.

'Therefore, the present government, in his view, would not tinker any more with it unless to make some minor adjustments.'

This matter was brought up by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), and the First Minister in reply said:

'With regard to the other question, I think my hon. friend had better wait until the hon. member for North Oxford is in his seat.'

This is the first opportunity I have had of bringing the matter before the House when the hon. member was in his seat. I hope that he will reply to me either that he is misreported in this Liberal newspaper or that he will repudiate this statement. From a farmers' standpoint, I hope he will not say the statement is correct.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I can relieve my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) from answering the question of my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell). I can answer him now. There is no doubt whatever as to the attitude of the government. It has been defined on this floor more than once, the last time it was defined was only two or three days ago, when the Minister of Finance, in answer to a question put to him with regard to the speech of President Taft and that answer will give all the information which my hon. friend wants. The Finance Minister was questioned as to the speech delivered by President Taft at Atlanta, especially to the following extract:

'When we entered upon these negotiations, I asked the Secretary of State and his commissioners to offer free trade in everything, but this Canada could not grant us, because she has a protective system and she was afraid of the competition of our better-organized industries.'

To this the Minister of Finance replied:

'That statement may be entirely correct, and I have no doubt is, as to the instructions that the President gave to his officials. But as to what actually occurred in the conference, the matter did not advance to a position which would enable these gentlemen to make such a formal offer in that way. At the very earliest stage in the negotiations we certainly gave them to understand that we could not undertake to have any free trade in manufactures, speaking generally.

This is the position of the government. We have undertaken to have reciprocity in natural products, not in manufactured products. At the present time our policy is before the House to have reciprocity in natural products, and I shall be very glad if we have the assistance of our friends that far in favour of the farmers. I doubt very much if we will, but we will see what we will do afterwards.

The Prime Minister then continued:

The statement made by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) was quite consistent with our policy, it was nothing new, and he had perfect authority, not only he but every member of the Liberal side, to make that statement.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance authorize the member in question to make that statement?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have answered that already. It is perfectly true. The hon. member for North Oxford and every Liberal

member had such authority, he was not kept in ignorance of our policy in this matter and knew it well. He only stated what is our general policy.

It may be added that this is in accordance with the answer given to the manufacturers' deputation by the Prime Minister in January last.

During the last few days I have received resolutions from different grain growers' associations in the following terms—they are all alike:

1. That the reciprocity agreement before the House of Commons be ratified during the present session.
2. That agricultural implements be placed on the free list during the present session.
3. That the British preference be increased to fifty per cent of the general tariff at the present session.

If the grain growers had been aware of the government's pledge to the manufacturers, they would not have passed these three resolutions, because the last two are incompatible with the first, and they must accept the alternative between them. If the members of the legislative assembly of Saskatchewan had been aware of the Prime Minister's statement that the present government had gone as far in the farmers' interests as they would, and that they would not tinker any more with the tariff, unless to make some minor adjustments, they also would not have added to their reciprocity resolution the clauses calling for a downward revision of the tariff and an increase of the British preference, because if the reciprocity agreement passes, it precludes a reduction of the duties on manufactured goods.

In regard to the period for which the government's pledge not to reduce the tariff holds good it must not be forgotten that in the exchange of letters that took place between the American and Canadian representatives it is expressly stated that while either party is free hereafter to make changes it is hoped and expected that the arrangement will remain in operation for a considerable period. The Minister of Finance has stated that the government are in honour bound to make every endeavour to carry out the understanding contained in the correspondence.

At the great farmer's delegation which was heard in this House on the 16th December last the memorial on the Customs tariff was presented by Mr. McCuaig with the remark that it was the most important of all the requests presented that day.

The arguments used by nearly every speaker on its behalf were levelled at the undue protection granted to the manufacturers and the burden thus imposed upon the farming community. Mr. R. McKenzie, secretary of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association and editor in chief of the 'Grain Grower's Guide,' in the longest and most exhaustive speech made on the subject touched on no other point and from beginning to end confined himself to a reasoned demand for the reduction of the excessive protection now enjoyed by the manufacturers. Under this agreement it now appears that almost the sole benefit to the farmers is that they are to be allowed to sell their products in a free market, but they must continue to buy their implements and all the necessaries, including such natural products as coal, coal oil and lumber, in a highly protected one. It seems impossible to believe that Mr. Mackenzie, who has for weeks been in such close touch with the government and the Liberal members, has been in ignorance of what has now come to light. Yet the 'Grain Grower's Guide' has so far given no intimation of it to the farmers of the northwest.

In the reciprocity negotiations we were informed that the Canadian commissioners would not even listen to the offer of the Americans for any reciprocity in manufactured goods. The farmers delegation specially asked amongst other things for free trade in agricultural implements, machinery, vehicles, illuminating fuel and lubricating oils, cement and lumber. The only concessions they get in regard to any of these items is a reduction in the duty on agricultural implements and cement, so small as to be of practically no material advantage to them. And the condition attached to the so-called reciprocity in natural products—which by no means includes all natural products—

Mr. SPEAKER. I have allowed communications, telegrams, &c., concerning reciprocity to be read on the motion to go into supply; but as the House has referred the reciprocity resolutions to the Committee on Ways and Means, I do not think that a specific discussion of the reciprocity question can be in order at this stage.

Mr. LAKE. I have no intention of entering into a specific discussion of the question at all, but I am merely making a statement of facts very much along the line of those made in the House on a resolution to go into supply. I do not intend to argue the question from any point of view but wish simply to make what I understand to be a statement of the facts:

And the condition attached to the so called reciprocity in natural products—which by no means includes all natural products—is that the present government will positively not tinker any more with the tariff for a considerable time to come unless to make some minor adjustments. At this session the government has turned down the proposals of the opposition for government abattoirs and chilled meat system, for the government operation of terminal elevators, and for a sub-

stantial reduction of the duties on agricultural implements.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that the government had turned down the proposition of the opposition for a reduction of the duties on agricultural implements. Is that the policy of the opposition which has been turned down by the government?

Mr. LAKE. The hon. gentleman may draw what conclusions he chooses in regard to that matter, the fact still remains that the government turned down a resolution on that subject. I firmly believe that for a time advantages will accrue to the farmers of the northwest from the free entry of their grain and cattle into the United States market. It will give better competition for these products and they will be better assured of getting their true value. It must not be forgotten, however, that both countries have a surplus, and the price of the whole is finally fixed by the value of that surplus in the Liverpool market.

It is true that it has been generally expected that the democratic party now coming into power in the United States would have materially reduced or taken off altogether the duty on food products and raw materials whether this agreement had been entered into or not. But apart from that I have from the first been favourably disposed to the pact both on account of the free entry of our grain into the United States, and also from the belief that it was a step which was certain to be followed by a reduction of the present high protection on manufactured goods.

On the other hand the principle laid down by the government that the measure must be accepted or rejected as a whole now appears in the view of the government's latest statement to involve the acceptance of their now declared policy that there shall be no further substantial reduction of the duty on any manufactured goods. This is a policy I will not accept. It changes the whole situation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must admit that he is now discussing reciprocity, and that cannot be done except in committee.

Mr. LAKE. I have just but a couple of minutes more when I shall conclude.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman is allowed to do that, every other member can do the same thing.

Mr. LAKE. I am merely making a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must submit to the rule of the House and not discuss anything which has been referred to in the committee except in committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my hon. friend is violating the rules, there have been at least a dozen others who have been guilty of the same violation.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have said that on the motion to go into supply, telegrams and resolutions might be read, but no one could enter into a specific discussion of the question of reciprocity which has been referred to the committee. I am in the hands of the House. The older members know what the custom is in a matter of this kind.

Mr. LAKE. I wish merely to say a few words with regard to the statement made by the right hon. the Prime Minister the other day and also to ask for some information from the government with regard to this most important question. The right hon. the Prime Minister states that every Liberal member was aware of the government's policy in this respect and knew it well. I presume they were informed in caucus. They kept it well to themselves, for though I had strong suspicions that it might be so, I had up to Friday last no positive information. Nor, I am sure are the people generally aware of this condition, especially in the northwest.

It therefore appears that Liberal members and the Liberal press have been trying to have this matter rushed through before all its phases and all its significance have been thoroughly before the people.

It cannot become effective before the American Congress has dealt with it, which will not be for some time yet. In the meantime the government should compile further statistics in regard to the prices of the various commodities dealt with both at Canadian and American centres and also at the principle points in the British colonies and the favoured nations which may come into competition with our farmers in the Canadian home markets. Also statistics should be compiled in regard to the exports of those countries to other nations as well as to Canada, and such further information which will give parliament and the country generally a clearer understanding of what they are doing. In the meantime the valuable discussion which has been taking place in the House should be continued from time to time by those who have information to impart. This is too big a question to be decided without the fullest investigation.

Mr. FOWKE. May I ask a question?

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is out of order.

Mr. FOWKE. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) opposing the reciprocity agreement because it does not provide for reciprocity in manufactured articles?

Mr. LAKE. I have made a definite statement, and the hon. gentleman can take what comfort he likes from it.

RECIPROCITY—RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY ASSOCIATIONS.

Mr. FOWKE. I should like to present a resolution moved by the Oshawa fruit growers and the letter accompanying it:

Dear Sir:—The following was carried unanimously Friday, March 10, at a largely attended meting of our co-operative company: That the Oshawa Fruit Growers, Limited, heartily endorse the fruit schedules of the reciprocity agreement negotiated by Messrs. Fielding and Paterson and that we as farmers and fruit growers are strongly in favour of the adoption of the agreement without change unless it be to broaden its scope of free trade.

Yours truly,
Elmer Lick,
Secretary.

I should like to explain that this co-operative society embraces hundreds of the leading agriculturists of the county of Ontario and the adjoining county of Durham and includes also the horticulturists of that large district.

Mr. REID (Grenville). May I ask the hon. gentleman was not there another resolution passed by certain parties in Oshawa?

Mr. FOWKE. If so, I never heard of it.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). I would like to put on record a statement of the employees of the Hamilton Cotton company as follows:

The Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Premier, Dominion of Canada,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—We, the undersigned employees of the Hamilton Cotton Company, wish to place ourselves on record as strongly opposed to any change in the tariff relations between Canada and the United States.

We would respectfully call your attention to the fact that the working people of Canada, generally, have been for some years more prosperous people of the United States, and we working people of the United States, and we firmly believe that any change in the fiscal policy of the country will be detrimental to the interests of the working class and have a tendency to lower wages and increase the cost of living.

This is signed by the employees of the Hamilton Cotton company, each one giving his street address. I have also a statement from the request of the employees of Brandram-Henderson, Limited, a large manufacturing concern, with branches in Montreal, Halifax, St. John and Winnipeg. Their petition is as follows:

We, the undersigned employees of Brandram-Henderson, Limited, would greatly urge that there be no reduction made in the present tariff rates, as we feel sure that if the government makes any reduction it would be very bad for the city workingmen of Canada, as we chiefly depend on the manufacturers of Canada to gain a livelihood.

This is signed by John E. Doyle, Fred Robinson, and other employees of the company to the number of forty-eight. I have also one from the Daughters of the Empire claiming to represent 10,000 women in Canada:

Moved by Mrs. H. S. Strathy, seconded by Mrs. E. F. B. Johnstone, resolved, that this Order fears that the proposed reciprocity agreement with the United States of America will, if ratified, tend to weaken the ties that bind Canada to the British empire, of which we are proud to form a part, and will also tend to destroy our Imperial ambitions and firm determination to assume our share of the responsibilities of the empire.

That the detrimental tendency and ultimate effects of the proposed agreement upon the empire and upon Canada are vastly more important than any temporary financial benefits which may be secured.

That this order earnestly hopes that the government, parliament and the people of Canada will put aside all party, sectional or individual advantages, and carefully consider the inevitable effect of the proposed agreement upon the great, broad, vital interests of Canada and the British empire.

February 22, 1911.

I have also a resolution adopted by the Brantford Board of Trade, as follows:

At a general meeting of the members of the Brantford Board of Trade, held on Tuesday, March 14, 1911, convened to consider the reciprocity pact now before parliament, the following resolution was adopted:

That, whereas the conditions at present prevailing in our Dominion are satisfactory in so far as agriculture, commerce, industry and transportation are concerned;

And whereas interprovincial and inter-Imperial trade are on a fairly prosperous and developing foundation under existing fiscal arrangements; therefore,

Resolved, that in the opinion of the Brantford Board of Trade, our material, national and empire interests will be best served by keeping entirely free of reciprocity entanglements with the United States at the present time. We, therefore, strongly protest against the ratification of the proposed agreement.

That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Prime Minister, Mr. R. L. Borden, Hon. Wm. Paterson and Lloyd Harris, M.P.

I have another resolution adopted by the United Empire Loyalists:

Resolution adopted by the United Empire Loyalists Association at Toronto on the 23rd day of February, 1911.

Resolved, that as it was the desire for a united empire which actuated our ancestors in laying the foundations of all our institutions as they exist to-day, and which led them and their descendants, with their French Canadian compatriots, to preserve this land with all its latent possibilities throughout the

fierce and bitter, but successful, struggle of 1812-14;

In the firm belief that an inter-Imperial preferential tariff would not only be in keeping with our feelings of loyalty to the unity of the British empire, but that it would be much more to the commercial benefit of Canada than reciprocity with any foreign nation, and in the confident assurance that a preferential tariff will soon be given to us by the United Kingdom if Canada stands as she does to-day;

We, the United Empire Loyalists Association of Ontario, for these reasons, sincerely deplore the tariff agreement recently made by the representatives of our government at Washington, and we pray parliament not to ratify the same;

Resolved also, that copies of this resolution be sent to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada, and Mr. R. L. Borden, K.C., M.P., leader of His Majesty's loyal opposition at Ottawa.

W. Napier Keefer, president; Wm. Hamilton, hon. secretary; Nina M. Clarkson, hon. asst. secretary.

Mr. E. N. RHODES (Cumberland). In view of the fact that the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Fowke) read a resolution from certain people in Oshawa, I think it well to place on 'Hansard' the exact terms of a resolution passed by a very influential body of men, the Board of Trade of the town of Kentville, in the constituency represented by the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden). I believe that resolution was referred to in the House, but the exact terms of it do not appear in 'Hansard.' It is as follows:

Whereas the adoption of the proposed reciprocity agreement between Canada and the United States would substantially reverse the policy which has brought Canada to her present prosperous and enviable position and cause widespread disturbance in her trade and injury to many interests, and jeopardize the commercial and political status of the Dominion,

And whereas it would hamper Canada's freedom in developing her own resources in her own way and by her own people,

And whereas it would check the growth and development of trade between the various provinces and parts of Canada with each other and between Canada and the empire, and would diminish Canada's position and influence as a unit within the British Empire.

Therefore, resolved that this Board places itself on record in protest against the adoption of such reciprocity agreement.

This resolution was passed after a discussion of several hours. The meeting was held after ample notice was given, was largely attended and was presided over by the President of the Board of Trade who happens to be one of the most influential and best known fruit men of the Annapolis valley. I believe that the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) referred to the fact that a resolution had been passed by the Board of Trade of Kings county, but that resolution was passed prior to the resolution which I have just read, and my information is that it was passed at a small meeting of which ample notice was not given, and there was no discussion. If I am credibly informed, the matter is to be reintroduced for discussion by that board, when we shall know the real views of its members.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The statement I made the other day as to the action taken by the Kings county board of trade was absolutely correct. The meeting was not a small meeting. The vote was carried in favour of reciprocity by 87 to 2, which would not indicate a small meeting. Also, it was held in daylight and the vote was taken in daylight. The vote on the resolution to which my hon. friend (Mr. Rhodes) refers was taken between one and two o'clock in the morning, and in the dark —a deed of darkness. The only fruit grower or farmer, or man directly interested in fruit-growing, the principal industry of Kings county, was the president. The meeting was called ostensibly to transact other business, but, in the course of the evening, the secretary of the Tory party of Kings county——

Mr. HUGHES. A fruit man.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, a lawyer, not a fruit-grower and not interested in fruit growing—the secretary of the Tory party brought in the resolution, and it was seconded by my former opponent, Mr. Webster, another lawyer. The discussion was kept up until the electric light service of the town, which is a partial service, had ceased, and no vote was taken. I am credibly informed that at the time the meeting dispersed, so far as could be seen in the darkness, there were only 8 people left in the room.

Mr. RHODES. I do not know that it is material whether the resolution was passed in daylight or in darkness, I cannot see that the question of light or darkness would affect the hearing of those at the meeting, but my information is that this resolution was passed unanimously and I have that authoritatively from the secretary.

Mr. BLACK. There were just six left and they were in the dark.

Mr. STRATTON. I desire to present a resolution from the Cheese Board of the county of Peterborough, asking for the adoption of the proposed agreement regarding freer trade relations between Canada and the United States.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I desire to present to the House a resolution passed by the Board of Trade of Peterborough as follows:

I have the honour to inform you that I have received instructions from the president of our board to notify you that at a special meeting of the board held Tuesday, the following resolution was duly moved, seconded and carried nem. con.:

That in view of the great change in the fiscal system that will be brought about by the putting in force of the reciprocity pact.

Be it resolved that this Board of Trade memorialize the government that the reciprocity Bill be not put into effect until the people have had an opportunity to express their views on it at the polls, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the government at Ottawa, and also to our representative in the House of Commons.

Mr. STRATTON. How many were at that meeting?

Mr. McCRANEY. I beg to call the attention of the House to a resolution passed on the 18th instant by the Central Saskatchewan Consolidated Boards of Trade at Saskatoon:

Saskatoon, Sask., March 19.—At a representative meeting of the Central Saskatchewan Consolidated Boards of Trade held here last evening the following resolution was moved and unanimously carried:

That the Central Saskatchewan Consolidated Boards of Trade desire to go on record as heartily and from purely a national standpoint endorsing the attitude of the provincial government towards the reciprocity agreement, and that a copy of the resolution be forwarded to Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance, and George McCraney.

Members of both political parties voted in favour of the motion.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to a report of a speech delivered by him in Boston on October 27 last, as reported in the Montreal 'Star':

Any proposals the United States may make for reciprocity with Canada will receive careful consideration from the Dominion government, but the attitude of the Canadian people is to let well enough alone. . . . The predominant note in public affairs in Canada to-day, is contentment with its present lot and hope that the future may bring forth closer relations with the mother country.

I was somewhat amused the other day when the Minister of Militia was listening to the Prime Minister making light of this cry, 'Let well enough alone,' applauding the Prime Minister's utterances. At the time this extract came into my mind. Is that a correct report of the speech delivered at Boston on that occasion?

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course the minister has already spoken on this resolution. With the consent of the House the minister can speak again.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I feel greatly flattered to observe that the hon. gentleman from York not only reads my speeches made in Boston, but watches my countenance to see how I accept the views expressed by the Prime Minister of this House.

Mr. CROCKET. Denouncing those which you expressed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, not at all. Since the question has been put I may say that I had the honour of being invited to address a meeting of Canadians in Boston some time ago, and although I cannot remember exactly the remarks I made, the impression I endeavoured to give was very much on the line of this quotation. I do not think I used the words 'Let well enough alone,' but I had no idea at that moment that the authorities of the United States would accept a treaty with this country on the lines which the ministers who went to Washington were able to secure. I had in view that which I had for the last 15 or 20 years believed to be in the minds of the United States that no treaty would be made with this country which did not include free trade in manufactures, and from that point of view, I thought, and I still think, it would be advisable for us to remain as we are. But, Mr. Speaker, I never was foolish enough and, representing a county such as mine, I would not be wicked enough to refuse to accept from the United States an open market for our agricultural products in that country, the greatest blessing which could possibly be conferred upon the producers of natural products, particularly agricultural products and fruit in this country.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would call the attention of the House to the following despatch:

Mr. W. A. Shepherd, member of the Council of the Consolidated Boards of Trade of Saskatchewan, asserted to-day that all the boards of trade in that province were opposed to reciprocity, as were also a majority of other people.

Mr. McCRANEY. I would call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that this Mr. Shepherd is a member of the Consolidated Board of Trade whose resolution was read by me.

PROCEDURE OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been very much interested by the play of argument on the question of this reciprocal arrangement, by the deft reading of resolutions and extracts from papers. It is a thing which in my experience is novel in the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. One would have been astonished 10 or 15 years ago to have an

episode like this take place. What I am asking myself and would like to ask the first Minister and the Speaker is, what kind of a House we are going to have if this irregular mode of procedure is allowed to go on. Mr. Speaker seemed to have had a hazy idea that in going into supply we ought not to be allowed to take up and discuss the question of reciprocity, the reciprocal pact which has been referred to the Committee of Ways and Means. In that I believe he is correct, but the reading of every one of these resolutions and all the discussion we have had for the last half hour, which might go on for 55 hours so far as any objection from the Speaker or the House is concerned, is clearly a violation of the rule which the Speaker laid down. I am not at all censuring or attempting to censure the members who have been engaged in this interesting form of discussion. It has brought out many points. I just end as I began, by asking whether or not we propose to allow the House to drift into this irregular method of proceeding. If so I do not know what will become of us as a deliberative body, and I do not quite see how we shall ever get through with the business.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) are appropriate, I thank him for having brought the attention of the House to the matter, and in future I think we should endeavour to keep within the rules and practice of the House as we find them in the books.

GRAND TRUNK TRAINMEN'S STRIKE.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to call the attention of the House to the conduct—I can hardly say the action—rather the inaction—of the government, particularly of the Department of Labour in connection with the regrettable strike on the Grand Trunk railway during the past year of the conductors and trainmen. Briefly, to explain the situation, I believe that in the month of January, 1910, a demand for an increase of wages was presented by the men to the company. The company having declined to accede to the demand, an application was made to the Minister of Labour that a Board of Conciliation might be appointed. When that application was received at the Department of Labour two courses were open. Two Acts were on the statute-books under either of which the matter might have been referred. On the one hand, there was the Conciliation and Labour Act and, on the other hand, there was the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. Under the Conciliation and Labour Act, if the matter were referred by the very words of the statute, the minister had the power, in case the Board of Conciliation failed to effect its object, to order an arbitration with a consequent award, and even under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act there was a clause, section 5, by which, if application were made, the minister still had the power to refer the matter not under that Act, but under the Act of Conciliation and Labour, known as the Mulock Act, and so secure the operation of a Board of Arbitration with a consequent award. It is well known that at the time feelings were strained between the men and the company, and I venture to think that at this first stage the department would better have served the purpose which it is intended to serve had it referred the matter in such a way that an award might have been obtained and a settlement of the unhappy differences between the parties secured. However, the matter was referred, under the Industrial Disputes Act, to the arbitrators. The Hon. Wallace Nesbitt was named by the company, Mr. O'Donoghue was named by the men, and Mr. Atkinson was named by the department. This board sat first in the city of Montreal in the month of May, and finally completed its meetings in the city of Toronto in the month of June, the result being a majority and a minority dissenting report, Mr. Nesbitt dissenting from the opinion of the other two arbitrators. With regard to the conduct of the government, there is no evidence whatever before us to show that up to that stage the government had endeavoured to secure an arbitration in the one statutory way in which such a thing could have been expected. On the 22nd of June, not an award, but majority and minority reports were made by this Conciliation Board. When these reports were made the report of the minority conciliator, Mr. Wallace Nesbitt, was very strong and was sufficient to have called the attention of the government to the public responsibility which rested upon it. I shall only read the first sentence of Mr. Nesbitt's report, and I read it from the 'Labour Gazette' of July, page 91, in which he says:

> In this matter there seems to be no possibility of conciliation. The parties are absolutely apart on principle, and both present their case with clearness. In my view the only remedy is for the parties to submit their differences to some person whose decision will govern, or to three parties, the majority to govern.

I merely read the opinion of Mr. Nesbitt for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the fact that even up to the 22nd of June when this report was made the Department of Labour apparently had never thought of the principle of arbitration. On the 22nd of June their attention was specifically called to it by Mr. Nesbitt, and one would have thought that

of all courses which would have commended themselves to the government, that is the one which they would immediately and persistently have followed. However, although this report was made on the 22nd of June and the parties were notified, and although the men declined at once to accept the report and the Grand Trunk railway, after the men had so declined, intimated that they would accept it, no attempt whatever was made by the department to secure any arbitration. The strike did not begin until the 18th of July. Practically a month elapsed. There is no evidence of any kind in the correspondence and documents brought down to show that the department at any time in this interval had taken any step to secure arbitration. There is, however, on the 21st of July, a letter from Mr. Charles M. Hays, to Mr. King, Minister of Labour in which he says:

I have your letter of July 20——

When for the first time arbitration was suggested by the government.

I have your letter of July 20th suggesting arbitration. What you propose is what I offered Messrs. Berry & Murdock in my letter of July 8th. It is also what I proposed in my letter to you of July 13th, to which in yours of July 15th you replied: 'I regret that it does not seem to me that I have the requisite authority to take either of the courses you suggest, nor do I believe it would be in the public interests to do so.' While your attitude appears to have changed, I infer from the report statement of the views of Messrs. Murdock & Berry, as contained in the morning papers, that they maintain the same position they have taken from the beginning.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) CHAS. M. HAYS,
President.

Apart from the fact that the department might have thought of referring this matter to arbitration, apart too from the fact that Mr. Nesbitt in his report had suggested it, there was this singularity that both parties all along had been in favour of arbitration. The Grand Trunk railway were in favour of arbitration, the men were in favour of arbitration, and the principle had been accepted by both. The only difference between them was as to the tribunal to whom the differences should be referred to. It is not a part of my duty here this afternoon to stand in judgment between the men and the railway company, but the men, on the one hand, contended that the two arbitrators to whom the matter should be referred were two gentlemen on the other side of the line who had acted with regard to similar matters in dispute with a number of American railways, and who had standardized the rates in the States. The men were in favour of arbitration, but insisted that these two arbitrators should be appointed. On the other hand, the Grand Trunk was equally in favour of arbitration, but insisted that the matter be referred to a board composed of experienced railway men with the obligation of abiding by the result of the finding. If ever there was a case in which the department, which is supposed to act the part of conciliation, which is supposed to prevent strikes and to put an end to them as soon as possible in case they do occur, in which one would think that the wisdom of referring the matter of arbitration would occur at once, it was in such a case as this and, in spite of the fact that both parties desired arbitration, and the only difference was as to the composition of the tribunal, a difference which might have been settled by an appeal to the Minister of Labour and which might have been settled by the exercise of the law provided by the government, no suggestion whatever was made of arbitration until after the unhappy strike had commenced.

Now, in view of these facts is not one justified in saying that no general demand had been made for arbitration? For six months the difference had existed between the company and the men and for months it had been acute. For months the Conciliation Board had been sitting and nearly a month lapsed from the time it gave its report until the strike actually occurred. Yet during all that time not one finger was raised, not one suggestion was made by the Minister of Labour in favour of arbitration even although the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company says that he himself suggested this arbitration to the minister on the 13th of July. As soon as the strike had really commenced the suggestion was then made by the Minister of Labour that there should be arbitration. On the 20th of July the minister writes to each of the parties concerned pointing out that it is rendered imperative in the public interest that means be found to affect a settlement of the difficulties and the speedy resumption of work in all branches of the company's service. The answer, it must be admitted, was not very satisfactory. The men promptly declined the suggestion and the Grand Trunk replied that they had offered this before and that the men had refused. The letter of the 21st July of Mr. Hays which I have read, states that he declines to accept the proposition made by the government. But, nothing was done by the government then. Having written that letter to both parties the government seemed to think all had been done that should be done and until the 27th of July, so far as one can judge from the correspondence, nothing practicable seems to have been done by the government other than the writing of letters. Then, it apparently began to dawn on the minister that something really must be

done, and he wired to Messrs. Murdock and Berry representing the men, again suggesting arbitration, and asking them to consult the head authorities whom they represented to obtain, if possible, their consent to arbitration; the matter to be referred to some persons who would be mutually acceptable. I think it must be said to the credit of the men that on receiving this appeal from the minister, which was based on grounds of the public interest and in view of the loss which the strike was causing, within 24 hours a reply came by wire which was followed by letter, accepting the proposition of the minister and offering to refer the matter to the arbitration of some parties mutually acceptable. Mr. Hays, however, took a different position and on page 96 of the report we have this reply as follows:

Montreal, Quebec, July 24, 1910.

Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Ottawa.

Your telegram of the 23rd received, while as you know from the many conferences urging your action before the strike took place and from our offer repeated and urged upon the committee we were desirous of arbitration and so avoiding the existing trouble. The time for such action has now passed and it is only necessary that we should have the protection to which we are entitled to enable us to resume the full operation of the road.

CHAS. M. HAYS.

We have now come to the 24th of July, when the first genuine appeal was made by the government to both parties, and the men accepted the offer of arbitration, and the president of the Grand Trunk declined, stating the strike was over and that all the Grand Trunk wanted was sufficient protection for their property to enable them to resume the operation of their road. It must be admitted that if the statement of Mr. Hays were true, it amply justified the position he took. The strike had commenced on the 18th of July and by the 24th of July according to him, the strike was over, and if that were so, he would be justified in saying that having beaten the men, all he wanted was protection for his property to resume operation of the road. But, the question arises whether this telegram of Mr. Hays to the Minister of Labour was true or not. No one in the world should better know the truth of the statement than the president of the Grand Trunk, and had the government no evidence to the contrary, they might act upon it, but the first thing it was the duty of the government to do, was to ascertain what was the real truth. It happened that owing to the absence of the Prime Minister, Sir Richard Cartwright, Minister of Trade and Commerce, was acting Prime Minister, and recognizing the gravity of the strike and the injury to Canadian trade, Sir Richard Cartwright on the 26th of July, two days after Mr. Hays had declared the strike was over, sent a telegram to all the collectors of customs in the province of Ontario asking reports from them as to the manner in which business was being carried on. This is the telegram:

Ottawa, July, 26, 1910.

Confidential and urgent. Please inform me by wire immediately, not later than noon Wednesday, if possible, extent to which business in your locality is being affected by present strike, to what extent is fright being moved.

Then a letter was sent by Sir Richard Cartwright on the 27th of July to Mr. Hays, after all the answers to this telegram had been received, and that letter reads:

July 27, 1910.

Dear Mr. Hays,—I am inclosing for your information copies of telegrams received this morning by the commissioner of customs in reply to a wire sent last night to the collectors in the several towns and cities of Ontario, asking for information as to the extent to which business is being affected by the present strike. You will observe that the replies cover virtually all of the important localities in the province on the Grand Trunk Railway system, and that, without exception, they go to show that up to the present little or no freight has been received or sent out by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, also that in some localities industries are being obliged to close down, while in other localities which are fortunate enough to be served by two roads, the facilities of the other roads are proving inadequate to the demands upon them.

The government has been carefully considering the whole strike situation, and whilst it is the wish of my colleagues and myself to cause you as little embarrassment as possible, we cannot but feel, in view of the situation as disclosed in these messages, all of which are from an official and strictly impartial source, as well as from many other urgent representations, that it is eminently desirable that some settlement of the present dispute should be immediately effected, and that if this cannot be brought about by a conference between the parties, the matter should be left to arbitration as already suggested by the government.

I very much hope that you may find it possible to co-operate with the government along the lines suggested in its endeavours to deal with the critical situation which has arisen, through the interruption of operations over a large part of your company's system.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) R. J. CARTWRIGHT,
Acting Prime Minister.

I shall not read all the answers that came in from the 60 or 70 collectors of customs. The Minister of Trade and Commerce having said in his letter to Mr. Hays that the trade of the country was paralysed, that little or no freight was moving on the Grand Trunk, that many industries had closed down and others would be compelled to close down, I shall quote a few sample bricks from the replies sent

to the Department of Trade and Commerce. The first is from Trenton and it reads:

Trenton, Ont., July 27, 1910.

John McDougall,
Commissioner of Customs, Ottawa.

Little inconvenience from strike apparent here to date. Have Canadian Pacific railway and boat connection with Montreal and Toronto, and Merchants' needs supplied in that way. No freight moving on Grand Trunk railway. Loss trifling so far and will not suffer for ten days yet.

ROBERT FRASER,
Collector.

That, I think, is about the most favourble of all the replies, and that says:

No freight moving on the Grand Trunk.

The next is from Owen Sound:

No Grand Trunk freight trains moving; Grand Trunk not receiving freight and freight sheds actually closed and business badly affected.

The next is from Orillia:

No freight has been moving since the 18th July. The material cleared here has been merchandise that was on hand. The customs revenue affected by strike would be in the neighbourhood of $1,000.

The next is from Woodstock:

No freight moving on Grand Trunk railway; local business not affected so far.

The next is from Windsor:

Wabash passenger and freight trains leaving Windsor as usual, no interference. Grand Trunk passenger trains leaving Windsor as usual, no delay. Grand Trunk local freight handled by Canadian Pacific and Michigan Central railways. No freight leaving Windsor by Grand Trunk with exception of six car-loads of horses by Canadian express to Fort Erie. Two freight trains from east to Windsor over Grand Trunk since strike was inaugurated.

I will not occupy the time of the House in reading these 60 or 70 communications from the various collectors of customs; but in going through the return brought down by the Minister of Labour, I find, in addition to these telegrams from collectors of customs, that about 100 pages are filled with protests from mayors of various municipalities in the province of Ontario. The first is from Mr. Patterson, mayor of Brockville, dated July 27, urging the government to renew the effort to bring about conciliation; another from Mr. H. A. Currie, mayor of Collingwood, to the same effect; another from a wholesale firm in Hamilton; another from Kincardine, from the mayor; another from Walkerton, from the mayor; another from Peterborough, from the mayor. There are probably 60 or 70 additional communications, bearing date the 27th or 28th of July, from mayors of municipalities and from presidents of boards of trade throughout the country, protesting that business was paralyzed by the strike, and stating that no freight was moving on the Grand Trunk. Therefore the fact is uncontradictable that the government knew on the 27th and 28th of July, if they could place any reliance on the words of their own collectors of customs and on the words of the mayors of various municipalities, and the presidents of various boards of trade, that the strike was continuing, that practically no freight was being moved on the Grand Trunk, and that trade was being paralyzed throughout the country. Now I think I am justified in saying that at such a time as that, when an appeal had been made to the government for arbitration, when one side had consented to arbitration and the other side had declined simply and solely on the ground that the strike was over—though the government had in their possession incontrovertible evidence that the strike was not over—the premier and the Minister of Labour might well have used the big stick on the president of the railway to insist on a settlement of this matter by reference to arbitration; and yet nothing of the kind was done.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the big stick?

Mr. NORTHRUP. That is an American expression, and as the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues have had more experience with the people of that country than I have had, I would hardly venture to instruct him in the American vernacular. The late President of the United States used that expression very frequently.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think my hon. friend used the expression without knowing what it means.

Mr. NORTHRUP. There is no doubt as to the meaning of the expression. The government has a certain power which it can exercise over railway companies and other corporations which are continually asking favours of the government, to compel them to do what is right, and that power is what the late President of the United States described as the big stick. I do not go so far as to say that the government of this country has power to compel railway companies to do what is wrong; but I think their power is irresistible when it is exercised to compel a railway company or any other corporation to do what is right, provided they have public sentiment at their back. The only reason the president of the Grand Trunk gave for declining arbitration was that the strike was over; but in face of all these telegrams which came to the government between the 24th of July and the 28th of July from all parts of the province of Ontario, I think the government would have

been amply justified in saying to the president of the Grand Trunk: You have made a statement which is not justified by the facts; the only reason you give for refusing arbitration has fallen to the ground, and we insist on arbitration taking place now. Various gentlemen throughout the country who took an interest in this matter also wrote to the government. I find in the correspondence a letter from Mr. Mills, who is connected with the Mutual Assurance Company of Canada, and one from Mr. Trowern, Secretary of the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada, eminently shrewd, practical business letters, calling the attention of the Minister of Labour to what he might and should do; and I venture to say that the real solution of all these difficulties as suggested in these letters. That is not merely in an arbitration between the men and the company. If a strike takes place, it is the people of the country who have to foot the bills. It means an enormous loss to the people who are doing the business of the country. It is the duty of the government to protect these people; and therefore, instead of having simply an arbitrator for the men and another for the company, the only fair way would be to have an arbitrator for the railway company and another for the men, another for the agricultural interests, another for the mercantile interests, another for manufacturing interests, thus constituting a board sufficiently large and representative to command the confidence of all parties, and then by legislation to have it declared that the finding of that board should be absolute and final. If something of that kind had been done in this instance the country would have been saved an immense loss which has resulted from this unfortunate strike. But nothing of the kind was done. Not only prior to the strike was nothing done to prevent it, but during the continuance of it nothing practical was done to bring it to an end. At last towards the end of July an appeal came from Messrs. Murdock and Berry stating that they had seen Mr. Hays and nothing could be expected from him, and praying that the Minister of Labour would come to Montreal and see if he could do something. Then for the first time the Minister of Labour took some action. He went to Montreal; and it is a curious fact that Mr. Hays, who on the 24th of July had said that the strike was over, is found three or four days later negotiating for a settlement of the strike. The strike was settled on the 29th or 30th of July.

Mr. KING. On the 2nd of August.

Mr NORTHRUP. The settlement was practically agreed two or three days before. The Miniser of Labour (Mr. King) did go to Montreal and meet the Grand Trunk railway authorities and the men, and an agreement was come to. I need not weary he House with the terms of this agreement save as to one item, on page 341 of he return, the agreement is set forth, and n it there is this clause:

> The company will put back as soon as possible the men other than those who have been or may be found guilty of acts of violence or disorderly conduct, the understanding being that there is to be no coercion or intimidation used towards the new men.

The men declined to accept that condition. They said very naturally that if the company was only bound to put the men back as soon as possible, there was no limit to the delay. It might be months or years or never, so that although the men and the company had agreed on the terms, the agreement could not be made operative simply because the men said: We must have some definition as to what you mean by putting the men back as soon as possible. Failing to agree, the men left Montreal. The Minister of Labour (Mr. King) and the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), however, continued their good work, and I give them full credit for what they did at that time; and after two or three days an arrangement was come to, and this wire was sent to Mr. Murdock and Mr. Berry, and also a letter from the minister over his own signature a few days later. The telegram will be found at page 336 of the return. This was the wire sent to James Murdock, representative of the general committee of the Grand Trunk railway and Canadian Pacific railway:

> Confidential. Mr. Hays has given Borden and myself an understanding that the men will within three months from this date be taken back into service and within that time be placed in their former positions. All men referred to in agreement signed by both parties. We understand by the men, all men referred to in agreement signed by both parties. In accordance with our understanding with you, I shall expect to hear by wire immediately that the strike has been declared at an end. I will confirm this wire over my own signature.
>
> MACKENZIE KING,
> Minister of Labour.

On that telegram being received by the leader of the men, the strike was, on the 2nd August, called off. Immediately felicitations began to be exchanged between the department and the men over the happy results of the negotiations whereby the men immediately, or within three months at the latest, were to be returned to their former positions. Unfortunately as time went on, the men began to find that these felicitations were rather premature. The men were refused their old places, and put into inferior positions. In fact to such an extent was that done that it seemed almost as if Mr. Hays was in a jocular mood when he

said he would put the men back, for that is what he really did. He put the conductor of a limited on an express train and the conductor of an express train on a local. At all events complaints were rife as to the manner in which the Grand Trunk railway was failing to keep its agreement with the men. Unfortunately the department did not seem able to do anything. It seemed to content itself by merely writing a letter now and then protesting to the Grand Trunk railway that the company was not doing what was right by the men, and it suggested that Judge Barron might be appointed to investigate the complaints. The Grand Trunk railway, however, refused to accept any such proposition, and Mr. Hays wrote this extraordinary letter which will be found on page 468 of the return. The Minister of Labour (Mr. King) had written Mr. Hays urging on him to carry out his agreement, and on the 10th of November this extraordinary refusal was received from Mr. Hays. The House will remember that the agreement was that the men should be put back in their old positions within three months. Mr. Hays writes as follows:

I have yours of November 9. In the opinion of the officers, our undertaking to re-employ all who were not found guilty of acts of violence or disorderly conduct has been complied with.

Here is the extraordinary feature of this letter:

In the interests of good discipline and public safety it is imperative that the officers of the company shall be the sole judge as to the proper qualifications of the employee and his fitness for the duties assigned him. It would, therefore, in our opinion, be prejudicial to the public interests to leave to an outside party, positively unacquainted with the railway service, the determination as to the fitness of any one for our railway service. That responsibility can only be assumed by the proper officials of the company.

So we find this extraordinary state of affairs, that when the president of the Grand Trunk railway had agreed with two ministers of the Crown that he would put the men back within three months and when the men relying on that assurance, had resumed their work, and when the Grand Trunk railway had failed to put the men back, the president of that road, in reply to an appeal from the minister to carry out his agreement, gave as a reason for not doing so that the company had the right to decide as to the fitness of the persons to be reinstated. But the company had been satisfied with these employees. The company had not discharged any of them. The men had gone out voluntarily to the regret of the Grand Trunk railway, and yet after the company had promised two ministers of the Crown that within three months it would restore these men to their positions, its president dared write to one of the ministers refusing to carry out his pledge and giving as the reason that his company had the right to decide who were and who were not fit for the positions. If ever there was an opportunity for the ministers to use the big stick, to exert their authority to say to this railway magnate: You cannot break your agreement in that way, you cannot break faith with these men, who accepted this agreement on the faith of ministers of the Crown—if there ever was an occasion, it was this; and the ministers who would fail to assert their dignity and compel this railway president to carry out the promise he had made to them can hardly expect to command the confidence of this House.

After that letter had been sent on November 10, the Minister of Labour acknowledged it. One would have thought that there would have been an outburst from the Minister of Labour, one would have thought that after the Minister of Labour had received this letter stating such a wilful, deliberate breach of faith, which put the ministers of the Crown in the position of having given a pledge to the men that was not being carried out, the minister would have sent to Mr. Hays such a letter as he would not easily forget. What did the minister say:

Ottawa, Ont., Nov. 12, 1910.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge and thank you for your communication of the 10th inst. in reply to mine of the 7th, in regard to employees in train and yard service of the Grand Trunk Railway Company who have not as yet been taken into the company's service.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) W. L. MACKENZIE KING.

Chas. M. Hays, Esq.,
President G.T.R. Co.,
Montreal, Que.

Now, am I not justified in saying that no genuine, sincere, honest effort was made by the government to secure the return to their places of these men, when, in the face of such a breach of faith as I have just pointed out on the part of the president of the Grand Trunk railway, the minister, instead of teaching him a lesson he would remember to his dying day, wrote thanking him for his communication? A minister who appreciated his position would have notified the authorities of the railway that, if their president was a man who would deliberately make an agreement with a minister on which the minister intended to act and did act, and on which some 3,000 men had acted on the statement of the minister, and afterwards would try to put a lie in the mouth of the minister, then, for all time to come, he would decline to do business with a man who had so failed to appreciate his

position, and the position, dignity and honour of a minister of the Crown.

Now, the question arose afterwards as to what position was really occupied by the minister at the time this agreement was made. I have read the telegram sent by the Minister of Labour to the men stating that an agreement had been made by Mr. Hays with him and Sir Frederick Borden. Now, let me read you another letter. This is found at page 549 of the Return brought down. It is dated November 29, 1910, and was written by the Minister of Labour to Mr. Murdock. I will not go into the whole letter, but will read only a few extracts:

I have, of course, nothing to say as to the method taken by Mr. Hays. That is his own business. I feel, however, as stated at the interview with Mr Berry and yourself that it is eminently desirable that whatever course may be suggested by Mr. Hays should be followed by men who are seeking reinstatement, provided the course suggested is both feasible and honourable.

And further:

From communications which have been received, it would appear that an effort is being made in certain quarters to hold the government responsible for the non-reinstatement of all of the men involved in the recent dispute. This, as I am sure you will admit, is most unfair, inasmuch as the undertaking as to the reinstatement was given not by the government but by the company, Sir Frederick Borden and myself being in the position of witnesses to such undertaking.

Now, does the minister really appreciate the importance of that statement? First, a telegram is sent, followed by a letter over his own signature, to the men, that an undertaking had been given to them, the ministers. That undertaking is not carried out, and the men are protesting against it not being carried out. Members who sit behind the Minister of Labour are protesting on behalf of their constituents and pointing out that the men by hundreds are being discriminated against and a gross injustice done. When these protests come in, the minister writes Mr. Murdock stating that the agreement was made not by the government, but that 'Sir Frederick Borden and myself' were 'witnesses to the undertaking.' Could there be a flatter contradiction of what the hon. gentleman himself had wired the men? Witnesses! How could they be witnesses? There must be two parties to an agreement. The men were not there; they had gone away, refusing point blank to be parties to the agreement unless the term 'as soon as possible' were defined. Then the minister intervened, and an agreement was made, as truly said by wire in the first instance, between Mr. Hays on one side and Sir Frederick Borden and the Minister of Labour on the other, that so and so should be done. And afterwards the minister writes that he is a witness.' It is perfectly obvious why he wishes to be regarded only as a witness. If the agreement were admitted to be made with the ministers, as the minister stated in his telegram and in his letter, then the ministers were responsible for the carrying out of the agreement, because they were parties to it—the men could not be, for they were not there. The ministers and the railway company were the only people there, and therefore, as stated in the telegram, the agreement was made between the railway company and the ministers. And this meant that it was the duty of the ministers to see that the agreement was carried out.

I wish to make my remarks as brief as possible, so I will not go over the almost endless correspondence between the parties representing the men and the individual men, with regard to the hardship, the injustice done them by the Grand Trunk authorities in refusing to reinstate them. To put the matter briefly and taking the case that was least injurious to and most favourable to the men, a man was put in this position: If the Grand Trunk authorities decided not to re-employ him, he was compelled to bring his evidence and go before the very official under whom he had worked and prove that he was innocent. It was the first time in the history of British jurisprudence when a man was asked to prove his innocence, instead of being held innocent until proven guilty. And this proof he had to bring before the official who had dismissed him, and dismissed him, as appears in many cases, without rhyme or reason. To prove himself innocent meant thereby to prove that the official who had dismissed him was wrong. Talk about appealing from Philip drunk to Philip sober! Here was a case of appealing from Philip sober to Philip sober, and attempting to prove that he had been wrong in the judgment he had given. And if, after trying to prove his innocence, the judgment of this unusual court was against him, he was at liberty to appeal along up the line, and if he succeeded in reaching Mr. Hays, Mr. Hays would be willing to hear him. Is it any wonder that dissatisfaction arose among the men? At last, so much dissatisfaction arose that the government suggested that Judge Barron be appointed, and offered to pay his expenses if he were appointed. But after the president of the Grand Trunk refused to have any person appointed, on the ground that the railway company had the right to decide who were the persons to have in their employ, suddenly, the Grand Trunk did employ Judge Barron. Now, I have nothing but the most profound respect for Judge Barron personally. I doubt if any man could be found more likely to act rightly and judiciously in this matter than he. And I am delighted to see that the

men themselves gladly accepted his appointment. But was it fair to Judge Barron, and was it fair to the men? The government offered to bear the expenses so that he might be impartial. Yet, as it turns out, after all, despite his official position, so far as he is acting in this matter, he is as much the employee of the Grand Trunk as any trainman in their service, If he is appointed by the Grand Trunk to do certain work, and paid by the Grand Trunk for doing that work, he is an employee of the Grand Trunk. Now, I desire again to guard myself; I would not be misunderstood or misinterpreted as having cast the slightest slur upon Judge Barron. But one can see the effect upon the feelings of the men when they are applying for re-employment under conditions that they consider most unjust and unfair, when, after having been out not for only three months, but for five or six months, they have to go before a man who is paid by the employer who has refused to take them back and give them the bread and butter, which, perhaps, they absolutely need for themselves and their families.

A return was brought down subsequent to the first return. I wish it were possible for me to read the whole of this return to the House, it is so interesting in many respects. But I will venture to read only a few scraps from it.

I find a letter dated December 6 from Messrs. Murdock and Berry representing the men to Mr. Hays from which I shall read a few extracts to show how the situation struck the representatives of the men in December, a month and two days after the men should all have been taken back.

Paragraphs forming basis of settlement were signed and agreed to on July 31, but it was not until August 2, about 6 p.m., that we received from the Minister of Labour a definition as to the intended application of paragraph 1, quoted above. At 6 p.m. on the evening of August 2 we received from the Minister of Labour as the assurance of the sub-committee and undersigned, the following telegram, which was later ratified by a letter over the personal signature of the minister, and read as follows:

'Confidential. Mr. Hays has given Sir Frederick Borden and myself an undertaking that the men will, within three months from this date, be taken back into service and within that time be placed in their former positions. We understand by the men all men referred to in agreement signed by both parties. In accordance with our understanding with you, I shall expect to hear by wire immediately that the strike has been declared at an end. I will confirm this wire by a letter over my own signature.'

When the sub-committee and undersigned received the telegram quoted above over the signature of the Minister of Labour, they were pleased to give the necessary instructions with a view of calling off the strike, and from that hour have worked consistently and honestly with a view of bringing about the mutual feeling of co-operative interests and regard between employer and employee so desirable in railroad operation.

It was with mingled feelings of surprise and regret that the employees found on November 2 some 270 men still out of the service, many of whom the employees believed should have been returned to service within the expiration of ninety days from August 2.

It was, of course, recognized that some individuals on the line who had been on strike might have been indiscreet in their word or action during the trying days of the strike, but it was not believed that there could have been very many men on the entire line who could be charged with having committed offences as described in the first paragraph of the agreement signed on July 31. Another matter of surprise with the employees was the fact that some of the men who had been kept out of the service were amongst the most reliable and conservative of the old employees who had gone on strike, and in numerous cases it was found that these men who were now being kept from re-entering the service were looked upon as among the best citizens of the localities in which they live. It is further in evidence that in Western Ontario a much larger percentage of men were being kept out of service than in other parts of the system.

As you are aware, this matter was taken up with the officials of the Dominion government early in November, as the employees and the undersigned have looked to and believe they are justified in expecting that the officials of the Dominion government should see through to a proper conclusion the agreement that they made with yourself in reference to the definition of the words 'as soon as possible.'

As a result of the efforts made to carry out the suggestions quoted from your letter of November 10 to the Minister of Labour, the great majority of your employees who had been kept out of service after November 2, made a direct appeal to Mr. Fitzhugh or yourself from the decision of the subordinate officer immediately in charge, and requested that Mr. Fitzhugh and yourself intercede in their behalf. The result of the appeals made directly to Mr. Fitzhugh and yourself, in almost every case, was that letters identically similar in language, except as to address, were sent to the individuals still out of the service, advising in each case that the records of the company showed that the individual who was making an appeal for reinstatement in his former position was ineligible for reinstatement, and that it would be necessary for him to prove that he was not guilty of acts of violence, disorderly conduct or the intimidation of new men, further intimating that it would be necessary for the applicant for position to produce evidence to the satisfaction of the superintendent of their divisions that they were not guilty, as cited above, before they would be eligible for re-employment.

The position taken would appear to be somewhat at variance with established precedents of British justice, which at least presumes a man innocent until he is proven guilty, and places the onus of furnishing proof upon the authorities or parties making the charges of guilt. This phase of the situation appears to be more than ever unusual, when it is under-

stood that a great number of the men still out of service have not been charged, to their knowledge, with anything in the form of misconduct or acts of violence, but have rather, in many cases, been simply advised that they would be sent for, if required, and in other cases have been advised that they were being kept out of service because they had participated in the strike.

When it became apparent that satisfactory understandings were not to be forthcoming as a result of the Minister of Labour's efforts to bring about a settlement on these questions, it was deemed advisable to convene in Montreal the Joint General Committee that had dealt with this situation on behalf of your train service employees during the negotiations that took place before the strike and after.

Then follows an account of their interviews with Mr. Hays, and how unsuccessful and unsatisfactory the interviews were. The letter goes on:

When an attempt was made in the latter part of November to convene the General Committee men for consideration of the questions referred to above, it was found that certain officials on the line were disposed to strenuously oppose the committeemen's efforts in meeting for mutual discussion. This attitude was in some localities displayed not only toward the unemployed former employees, but also in the case of a number who had been returned to service, and were at the time employed.

Then came the threat at the end, and I am sure nobody could blame the men for making it:

If yourself and the other officers on the line are still insistently of the opinion that the terms of settlement have been and are being applied as intended, there would appear to be no other alternative before the employees and the undersigned than to take such means as may appear to be consistent and desirable, to insist on the government or the ministers of the Crown taking such steps as they may deem proper, looking toward the carrying out of the several agreements as intended.

Then there is an appeal by the men to the Minister of Labour, a letter from Messrs. Murdock and Berry, dated December 13, asking him to assist them in the position in which they are, and again the men's bitterness of spirit comes out.

It appears to the committee that the government can consistently lend its further aid in straightening out this matter when the fact is recalled that the unreinstated Grand Trunk employees who are asking for the carrying out of the agreement made, are placed in such a position on account of the fact that aliens or American citizens who are at present in charge of Grand Trunk affairs, have repudiated an agreement made with Grand Trunk employees and an undertsanding reached with ministers of the Crown.

It is insufficient for those American officials to hide behind the statement that they have carried out their agreement as 'acts are more forceful than words,' and the facts are that more than 200 reputable Canadian citizens who have not been guilty of any overt act are being wrongfully held out of service to satisfy the vindictive and retaliatory desires of officers in charge.

Mr. KING. Would the hon. member read the first part of that letter?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Certainly. It reads:

Dear Sir,—In further reference to conference held yesterday between the Premier, the honourable Minister of Railways and yourself with a committee of unreinstated Grand Trunk employees accompanied by the undersigned, at which meeting the facts in connection with the Grand Trunk Company's failure to equitably apply terms of settlement made when strike was called off were discussed.

The committee desire to assure you and through you the government that they deprecate the attitude taken by certain gentlemen (presumably well intentioned), whereby an effort is being made to hold the government responsible for the failure to apply the terms of settlement made.

We appreciate fully the assistance given both at the time of the strike, and since, by the government in its efforts to bring about on behalf of the Canadian public and the citizens of Canada, who were involved in the strike, a settlement, and an equitable carrying out of the terms of that settlement. It is definitely understood by the men interested and the undersigned that it is not on account of any failure on the part of the government that the present unfortunate situation obtains, but that the existing conditions are rather the result of the obstinate disregard for contract obligations on the part of Grand Trunk officials.

The assistance given so far in a conciliatory and mediating way by representatives of the government is much appreciated, but the committee would further request that if consistent the government should take further means, if possible, either by the appointment of a Royal Commisison or in some other consistent manner to enforce from the officials of the Grand Trunk an acceptable carrying out of the agreement made and understandings reached.

In the subsequent part of that letter they protest against the men who have repudiated the agreement made with the Grand Trunk employees and the understanding reached with ministers of the Crown. As I pointed out one can hardly relieve the ministers of the Crown from the responsibility that rested on them of seeing that the agreement made with themselves was carried out. The men seem to have acted with wonderful forbearance. They seem to be most grateful for any slight crumbs of service that fell to them from the Crown and certainly if ever there was a body of men, if one may judge from the correspondence as set forth by the Minister of Labour, who deserved to have him stand by them, it was the striking employees of

the Grand Trunk railway in the late strike, and I think there is nothing more touching than the fidelity with which up to the last they stood by the minister and the reckless disregard of their interests by the minister whenever the mighty head of the Grand Trunk railway appeared on the scene.

Then there is an interesting correspondence between the men and Judge Barron. There is first a letter from the President of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, and the vice-president of the conductors to Judge Barron dated January 5, from Toronto. They send a number of names to the judge, of men that they claim have been left off. They also send a number of names of men who were formerly conductors and who were reduced in position saying:

> Men who were formerly conductors have been started into service as brakemen and numbers of men have been continuously employed on inferior trains or in less preferable positions than those occupied prior to the strike.

They also promised to send him a further list. Judge Barron acknowledges that letter on January 10, and says this:

> I have now carefully compared your list with that sent me from Montreal. Your list contains 127 names of men, not given me by the Grand Trunk railway to investigate. I have no explanation for this great difference. But I would suggest for your consideration the propriety of every man who wishes to do so (and who has not yet done so) applying for a hearing under section 12, page 10, of the regulations governing employees, and then appealing to the general officers of the company, should the result of the hearing be unsatisfactory. The wisdom of doing this is that if delay arises in the decision for fifteen days, he thereafter receives his regular pay, and furthermore such action brings him within the sphere of my investigation should the railway not reinstate.

In so far as I can see from all the documents and correspondence brought down, that is the only insight we have into the jurisdiction of Judge Barron. We know he is appointed by the Grand Trunk, we know he is paid by the Grand Trunk, we know he received a list from the men and a list from the Grand Trunk, and that the list from the Grand Trunk contained 127 less names than the list supplied him by the men. Writing on the 10th January he points out the wisdom of a man appealing to the officer who discharged him, and then by regular gradations up to the head of the railway, this action alone bringing the man within the sphere of Judge Barron's investigation. Surely the minister must be willing to impose a little more on these men than he would like others to impose on him if he thinks that the gratitude which they expressed again and again in the early days of this case should be continued to the end when at the most all they get is a tribunal such as that, and when Judge Barron, in his own letter addressed to Mr. Murdock, the men's representative, pointed out that the only case in which he had the jurisdiction of a sort of Supreme court was when the men had exhausted all courts of appeal from the first man to whom he appealed, the man who had discharged him, up to Mr. Hays and when, if justice had not been done by Mr. Hays, he could appeal to him.

Now, there is a very long letter from Messrs. Murdock and Berry, and I will only read a few extracts from it. It is dated Toronto, January 13, 1911. This letter was addressed to Judge Barron on receipt of the letter to which I have just referred.

> We acknowledge herewith receipt of your letter of January 10, wherein you advise that the list which we sent to you some days ago contains the names of 127 men that are not shown on the list furnished you by the Grand Trunk railway.
>
> We are advising the employees generally at the several terminal points on the line whose names are not shown on the list given you by the Grand Trunk officials of that fact and suggesting to them that they should at once make necessary application for further hearings or undertake to ascertain in some way why their names have been omitted from the list furnished you.
>
> We note your statement that section 12, page 10 of the regulations governing employees would give these men their regular pay if decision was not given in their case within fifteen days, or that it might at least be contended that they should be paid if not reinstated within that time.
>
> We beg to advise that under past and normal conditions the apparent intent of the section you refer to, has been a dead letter to the extent that we never heard of its application in a single case, and we are firmly of the opinion that its intent would be equally ignored in the cases referred to.
>
> As you may possibly be aware, we have endeavoured to conform to any reasonable suggestion or requirement of the officials of the Grand Trunk, although we are satisfied that the contention made that men should appeal from the subordinate to the higher officials for reinstatement in the cases cited is unreasonable, and only brought forward for purposes of delay and excuse. As a matter of fact we hold numerous letters over the signature of Mr. Fitzhugh in which he says:
>
> I am in receipt of your letter of Nov. 18 requesting reinstatement in the company's service, and in reply, beg to say, our records show you deserted your post, and are, therefore, ineligible for re-employment.

There is no contention of disorderly or improper conduct, merely that you deserted your post, you went on strike and therefore you are ineligible for re-employment.

In the face of such contentions on the part of the higher officials of the Grand Trunk, it does appear as though there was an endeavour to technically evade the actual terms of settlement by the higher officers of the Grand Trunk, insisting on an appeal from one official to another when in no individual case

any other result has so far been secured only a reference by the higher officials back to the officials making the original decision.

If we might be permitted to do so, we would like to draw your attention to two or three important facts in connection with men being charged and kept out of service. For instance, certain men who have been loyal employees of the company for many years have been refused their former positions on the contention that they could not write the necessary examination. We contend that in many cases this is unfair, as the company's officials knew full well for many years that those men were educationally unable to pass a written examination. Samples of such cases are in evidence in the case of Mr. Purtell and Mr. J. Cain.

It is not necessary that I should weary the House by reading the names given to the judge of men whom the company were bound to reinstate if they had not been guilty of disorderly conduct who were subjected to an examination which they could not pass, and therefore refused reinstatement.

Then, there is this letter, dated January 13, from Messrs. Barry and Murdock to Mr. Chas. M. Hays, and I will only give two or hree quotations from it:

We are advised that you have requested and authorized his honour Judge Barron, of Stratford, to commence investigations in the cases of some of the men who have not yet been returned to service.

On Dec. 3 last a sub-committtee, representative of the general committee for the Grand Trunk and Central Vermont, handed to you a list which contained the names of 268 men located at different terminal points on the line, and who had not at that time been returned to service. That list also showed the reasons so far as known by the committee and as given by your officials for keeping those 268 men still out of service.

As stated above Judge Barron now finds that the names of 127 men given on the list we handed you December 3 (copy of which have given the judge) had been omitted from the list which you had handed to him. There is apparently no explanation for the difference in the lists.

We are also advised by Judge Barron that he had been instructed that the investigations to be held are not to include Central Vermont men. It appears to us that this is entirely inconsiderate of the terms of settlement, which intended to apply to the Central Vermont as well as to the Grand Trunk railway system, and so stated.

One of the complaints of the men was that they had not been reinstated on the Central Vermont system. Then they go on:

We do not believe that when settlement was agreed to on July 31 it was contemplated that a great number of men would be kept out of service at the option of your officials, and without any apparent reason for so doing, except the general statement that the men had deserted their posts, and we are confirmed in our belief in this regard by one sentence in the telegram we received from the Minister of Labour on August 2, wherein he in referring to the understanding between yourself, Sir Frederick Borden and the Minister of Labour, said: 'We understand by the men, all men referred to in agreement signed by both parties.'

There is a letter of January 17 from Mr. Hays to Messrs. Murdock & Berry which reads:

Messrs. S. N. Berry, vice-president O.R.C.
James Murdock, vice-president, B. of R.T.

Dear Sirs,—Yours of January 12 duly received. As you have been advised, this company considers that it has complied with its obligations under the agreement to which you refer. Since you were not parties to the agreement, or present at the time it was entered into, we cannot concede your right to say what was intended or to place your own interpretation thereon. As to such of our former employees who may desire Judge Barron to look into their cases where such men are still out of employment have applied to their superintendents for a hearing and have not been satisfied as to the result of such application, there is no objection to their being heard by Judge Barron.

That was on January 17, and it will be interesting to note that from that date to this no step has been taken by the minister to bring to his senses this magnate of the Grand Trunk who not only in this but in other matters which the Minister of Railways will remember and understand, seems to have an hypnotic influence over this government, or some other influence which they either fear or perhaps love so much that they wish to have it extended and increased. In conclusion, I say that I believe this correspondence shows beyond all question that no effort of any kind, good, bad or indifferent, was made by the government to avert the strike by means of arbitration. It shows also that when the government had its choice of appointing a conciliation board under either of two statutes it chose the one which did not give the power to the minister to have an award made which would be binding on the parties. The evidence also shows that after the report was made by the conciliation board, and when the minority report by a gentleman of the standing in the country of Mr. Wallace Nesbitt, pointed out that conciliation was impossible, although a month elapsed before the strike commenced, no effort was made by the government to secure arbitration, and Mr. Hays in his letter claims that not only had no effort been made by the government, but the suggestions made by him in that direction had been turned down by the Minister of Labour. Then, after the strike was on there is nothing to show that any practical effort was made by the department until the agreement of the 2nd of August. I give the department full credit for having made

that agreement, which at the time was apparently satisfactory to both parties, and for having wired the terms of it honestly and fairly to the men, on the strength of which they abandoned their strike and returned to work. I do, however, think that the government will fail to command the best judgment of the House in not taking steps to enforce the agreement which they themselves had made with the Grand Trunk. When the men appealed to the ministers to see that the agreement made by them is enforced, the only answer they get is that the ministers made no agreement, and that they were simply witnesses to an agreement between the men and the company; the fact being, according to the letter of the company to the men, that the agreement was made between the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Militia and Mr. Hays as to the three months within which the men would be restored to their positions. Therefore, I submit that the responsibility and duty in all fairness and honour rested with the government to exercise every power in their possession to compel the president of the Grand Trunk to carry out the agreement he made with them, and not to have the pitiable exhibition that notwithstanding that the men had been assured on the word of the minister of the Crown that every one not guilty of acts of disorderly conduct would be restored to his position within three months, there are to-day 258 men still off the road. And Judge Barron, who is appointed by the Grand Trunk, and paid by the Grand Trunk, tells the men that in order that he may have jurisdiction under the rules laid down, the men must first appeal to the man who dismissed them, and then through the various grades of officials until they come to the president, and that then if they do not obtain justice he will inquire into their case. That is the position in which these innocent men are placed; men against whom no charge is made, men whom the Grand Trunk are in honour pledged to restore to their places. And, Sir, this agreement is violated with respect to these men without protest on the part of the Minister of Labour, who seems to be content, in his correspondence with this magnate of the Grand Trunk railway, to thank him for his kindness, although apparently he was badly snubbed. I beg to move:

That all the words after 'that' be struck out and in place thereof the following be inserted:

This House expresses its regret that the government, through the Department of Labour or in any other way, wholly failed to make any intelligent effort to avert the late strike on the Grand Trunk railway, to put an end to it during its continuance, or to compel Mr. C. M. Hays, the president of that railway, to effectively carry out the agreement made with the government, on the faith of which when communicated by the Minister of Labour to the Brotherhoods concerned, the men at once offered to resume their service with the company.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

LA BANQUE DU CANADA.

House in Committee for further consideration of (Bill 123) to incorporate La Banque du Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike.

On section 1.—corporate name.

Mr. McCRANEY. I simply wish to enter my protest against the name, the Bank of Canada, being used in this Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS RECOMMITTED.

The following Bills were referred back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines for consideration of amendments made by the Senate therein:

Bill (No. 60) respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Canadian Northern Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Cash.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 138) for the relief of Gertrude Maud Grant.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 140) for the relief of Mary Hamilton Johnston.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 141) for the relief of Dalton Mabel Stapleton.—Mr. Tolmie.

SUPPLY—GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY TRAINMEN'S STRIKE.

House resumed debate on motion for Supply and Mr. Northrup's amendment thereto.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). When the House rose at six o'clock, the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup) had moved an amendment to the motion to go into Supply to the effect that the House expresses its regret in three particulars: first, that the government, through the Department of Labour or in any other way, had wholly failed to make any intelligent effort to avert the late strike; second, that the government had failed to put an end to this strike during

its continuance; and third, that it had failed to compel Mr. Hays, the president of the Grand Trunk railway, to effectively carry out the agreement made with the government. There are therefore in that amendment three distinct charges. First, that the government is responsible for not having effectively prevented the strike which took place on the Grand Trunk railway; second, that the government was responsible for its continuance or failure to terminate it; and third that the government is responsible for the alleged failure on the part of Mr. Hays to carry out the terms of the agreement.

I shall endeavour to deal with these charges in their order; but before doing so it may enable the House better to understand and appreciate the significance of the strike and the difficulty of dealing with it if I briefly outline its nature and true proportions. Let me point out first of all that this strike was but the culmination of a movement which started on this continent nearly two or three years ago, on the part of the organizations connected with the railways of the continent to bring about a standardization in the rates of pay and the conditions under which the men are obliged to labour. I say on the continent, because these brotherhoods have organizations not only in Canada and the United States but also in Mexico. They extend throughout the whole of North America. About three years ago they endeavoured to bring all the railways on the continent on to one plane as respects the conditions under which the workingmen are obliged to labour. That movement, which started in the western states, took up the greater part of the year 1909 in that section of the country. Then having succeeded in bringing about an equalization of conditions on the American roads, they endeavoured to bring a similar condition in western Canada and succeeded, so far as the Canadian Pacific railway was concerned. In 1910, these organizations endeavoured to bring into line the railways in the eastern states. Some 40 or 50, or perhaps 60 different railways were affected; and when these brotherhoods were able to bring about an equalization, making allowance to a certain extent for the different conditions under which men were obliged to work—when they succeeded in bringing into line the whole of the United States and western Canada, they next turned their attention to eastern Canada. In that connection there were two different railways to be considered—the Grand Trunk railway and the Canadian Pacific railway.

If hon. members have grasped the significance of what I have said, they will see that the dispute, which finally took the shape of a strike on the Grand Trunk railway, was but the culminating point of that movement which had been successful in every part of North America except in the Dominion as respects the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk railway. When that point is grasped, hon. gentlemen will perhaps hesitate before endeavouring to hold the government or any one responsible for the fact that that strike came on as it did with the force and effectiveness that characterized it. As I have said, there were only two railways left, after the railways in the eastern states had been brought into line. These were the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk railway. Under our law before any action can be taken in the nature of a strike, the parties are bound to submit their differences to a board. They applied for boards in the case of the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk railway, and these were granted in each case. The boards met simultaneously and reported in the case of each company. In neither case was the report wholly acceptable to the men, but I believe in the case of the Canadian Pacific railway, that company was prepared to accept the award of the Board of Conciliation, though the men were not. What followed? After the board had given its award in the case of the Canadian Pacific railway the men in the employ of that company expressed dissatisfaction at certain things, and then the Canadian Pacific railway company and the men came together and negotiated further and arrived at a settlement satisfactory to each. That left the movement then confined enirely to the Grand Trunk railway. The men had been successful on all the railways in the United States and western Canada and in eastern Canada, with the exception of the Grand Trunk railway, with which they had been unable to bring about a satisfactory settlement. One reason alone is sufficient to account for that fact, and that is that different methods of payment in connection with the two roads the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk railway, had been in existence. In the case of the Canadian Pacific railway the men were paid by the mile, and in the case of the Grand Trunk railway by the day. On practically all the railways in the United States, these organizations had been able to bring about a system of payment by the mile, and the object of the struggle in connection with the recent strike was to compel the Grand Trunk railway to change its system from a day to a mileage basis. The importance of that difference will be apparent when one considers what takes place as the roadbed and the rolling stock are improved. Where the payment is on the mileage basis, the better the condi-

tion of the roadbed and the rolling stock, the greater the run can be made, and the longer the run, the more the amount of wages. On the other hand, when payment is by the day, every improvement to the roadbed and the rolling stock calls from the men the expenditure of a greater amount of energy; they have to travel over a greater distance for the same pay. And as the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk railway have been improving their roadbeds and rolling stock, the result is that the men on the Canadian Pacific railway were getting a higher rate of wage relatively than those on the Grand Trunk railway. In some cases the difference was as high as 38 or 40 per cent in favour of the men on the Canadian Pacific railway as compared with men doing the same work on the Grand Trunk railway. It was this large difference in the rate of wages and this difference in the method of payment that caused dissatisfaction among the men on the Grand Trunk railway, and it was because this difference was so great that the Grand Trunk railway was not prepared to accede to the demand made on them at the outset nor the terms proposed later on.

My hon. friend in his motion charges the government with not having made any intelligent effort to avert the strike on the Grand Trunk railway; and in endeavouring to impress this on the House, he said there were two ways open to the government by which they could have averted that strike. One was to appoint a board under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, and the other was to appoint a board of arbitration under the provisions of the Conciliation and Labour Act and compel the two parties to execute the award of that board and thus prevent the possibilities of a strike.

My hon. friend is a lawyer, and I am somewhat surprised that he should have made that criticism because he must be familiar with the laws which this House has enacted; and if he reads through the statutes he will be unable to find any law which gives the Minister of Labour power to compel an arbitration. This parliament has never seen its way to concede compulsory arbitration. And, in the absence of a statute of that kind, I am unable to see how the hon. gentleman could draw the inference he has attempted to draw that the minister had power to compel arbitration.

Mr. RHODES. With the permission of the minister, I desire to ask a question. Is there any question about the jurisdiction of this parliament to pass a compulsory Act? I ask purely for information.

Mr. KING. I do not think myself there is any question about it. I think that if this parliament decided that it was a wise thing to enact such a law, it would have full power to do so. When the matter was considered some years ago, a Compulsory Arbitration Bill was introduced by Sir Wm. Mulock, then Minister of Labour. That Bill was read twice, I think, in this House, and then copies of it were distributed throughout the country to labour unions and important companies with a request for their opinions as to a law of that kind; and they were pretty nearly unanimous in stating that they did not wish compulsory arbitration, but what they wished was compulsory investigation.

Mr. RHODES. Would there not be an interference with the right of contract if such a law were passed?

Mr. KING. So far as railways chartered by this parliament are concerned, I think certainly this parliament would have authority to enact a compulsory arbitration law. However, that is aside from the question. The point I wish to make clear is that there was not the alternative which my hon. friend has suggested. He has referred to some correspondence between Mr. Hays and the department as being rather extraordinary—he used that remark, I think, in reference to a letter written by Mr. Hays to myself. The line of argument he has taken is precisely that taken by Mr. Hays at the outset which, I must confess, I thought was somewhat extraordinary on Mr. Hay's part. For I felt that he could not but have the best legal advice, and I was unable to see how he could think that this government had power to compel arbitration. As I have said, the dispute was referred, first of all, under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. It was in January, 1910, that the men first presented their demands to the company. These demands were considered and negotiations took place between the parties until March 17, by which time they had discovered that it was impossible to reach a settlement by mutual agreement. The men applied to the department for a conciliation board. This board met for the first time on May 25, and on June 22 the board presented a report to the government. From June 22 until July 18, the parties continued their negotiations. The board's award was not taken as satisfactory to the men or by the company, but they used it as a basis in the effort to bring about a satisfactory settlement. So, from June 22 until July 18, the date when the strike was declared, the parties did their best to reach an agreement. My hon. friend says that during that interval, the government should have stepped in and compelled arbitration; and he says we should have do so as a consequence of a request which came to the government from Mr. Hays, pointing out that we had the power

to compel arbitration, and that it was the duty of the minister to compel it under the circumstances. I will not weary the House by reading correspondence, but will refer hon. members to a letter which is on file, and which had been brought down, of July 13, in which Mr. Hays suggested that the department should take action under the Conciliation and Labour Act to compel arbitration. And I would refer hon. members also to my reply to Mr. Hays and my communication to each of the parties involved on behalf of the railway organizations. I took this position—and I think it is the only one that could be taken: The dispute had been referred under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. So, any reference under the Conciliation and Labour Act could only be in the nature of a second investigation. I held that it was never the intention of this parliament, when it enacted the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, and made provision that railway disputes might come under that Act, or under the Conciliation and Labour Act, that such a dispute should be taken first under one Act and then under the other. That is, parliament intended to give the railway men an alternative to proceed under either of these statutes, and, the men having proceeded under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, they were not by law obliged to submit to a second investigation under the Conciliation and Labour Act. However, I pointed out to Mr. Hays that if it was an arbitration as commonly understood—that is, each of the parties agreeing to be bound by the award of some third person who might be called in—I would do my part to see if the men were willing to accept arbitration of that kind. I communicated with both Mr. Murdock and Mr. Berry, who were representing the men, and drew their attention to Mr. Hay's letter. What was the reply? In one letter, which I received, which was signed by Mr. Hays himself, he inclosed a communication from the men, and this had the following significant statement:

The committee have also carefully considered the suggestion contained in your letter in reference to arbitration, and they desire us to advise you that in their opinion the questions referred to (being the contentions of men employed in train and yard service in the eastern territory for standardization of wages and general conditions), have been very fully arbitrated already. First, for some eight days on the Baltimore and Ohio railway under the provisions of the so-called Erdman Act; later in the case of some ten or more properties by a submission of the entire question to two gentlemen experienced in these matters, to dispose of.

The committee are not inclined to believe that further arbitration should be necessary or that arbitration would bring out anything in the way of contentions upon either side that has not already been fully considered and passed upon.

Similarly, the letter which I received from Mr. Berry and Mr. Murdock in answer to the communication which was sent them transmitting Mr. Hays' letter, contained the following:

On behalf of the members of these organizations——

The Brotherhood of Trainmen and the Brotherhood of Railway Conductors—

—generally throughout Canada, and especially on behalf of the men employed in train and yard service on the Grand Trunk railway, we trust that it may be decided by the minister as unnecessary to apply the provisions of the Mulock Bill for the purpose of investigating this situation. The men on the line, generally, cannot believe that such action would conserve their interests, or the interests of the public, but would rather feel that any further investigation of the nature referred to would only tend to prejudice the situation unfavourably against them by causing further delay.

That was the situation. Mr. Hays had asked the government to try to bring about a second investigation under the Conciliation and Labour Act. I believed that an investigation of that kind could not serve any useful purpose, and, further, that it would be prejudicial; and I based that belief not only on my general knowledge of the situation at the time, but on the expressed opinion of the men themselves when Mr. Hays' communication was transmitted to them. I had no power to compel an arbitration. But had I tried to precipitate in any way this question of a further investigation into the difficulty as it was at that time, it would only have aggravated the situation and put the government in a position where it might reasonably have been held responsible for some of the trouble which might have ensued. All that it was possible to do, after the Board had presented its report was to offer the good offices of the government to the parties and to agree to meet any of the expenses which might be necessarily incurred in carrying out any proposal which either side might make and which would be agreeable to both. That I did in communications sent both to the company and to the men on every occasion; for example, in my letter to Mr. Hays I said:

I regret that it does not seem to me I have the requisite authority to take either of the courses suggested by you, nor under the circumstances do I believe it would be in the public interest to do so. If, however, either the company or its employees can suggest any way in which the good offices of the government can be further exercised towards mediating the present difficulties I shall be pleased to do my utmost to see that they are immediately placed at the service of the parties.

That was the standing offer which was kept before the parties at every stage of this dispute, that if either of them could suggest any way in which the government

would lend its good offices to prevent the situation becoming more critical, the good offices of the government would be placed immediately at their service.

Take the parallel case of the dispute on the Canadian Pacific railway. There the board had given its award, which was not accepted by the men; the company and the men continued negotiations. Had I done what the member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup) suggests I should have done in their case and said to the parties: You have been unable to get a settlement as a result of the investigation by the board, now the government wants you to arbitrate this matter, I would have been in a nice position, and the government would have been in a nice position if they had turned round and said: Thank you, we do not want any of your arbitration, we do not need it, and if they had subsequently shown that they did not need it by coming to an agreement, as they did, which is binding to-day. The Grand Trunk situation was precisely the same as that of the Canadian Pacific railway. There, too, the board's award was not accepted, they were still negotiating and for any third party to have gone in at that particular stage would only have been to make the situation worse than it was at that time. I would point out in that connection that the government on any occasion of this kind has to consider more than the immediate case. There is such a thing as precedent and particularly in dealing with these industrial disputes it is easy to establish a precedent which may lead to a great deal of trouble later on. My belief is that after a board has been appointed and has made an investigation the government should not interfere further between the parties unless there is something very exceptional to compel them to do so, because once the parties get the idea that government can be called upon indefinitely to lend its good offices they are not going to end their dispute or the negotiations at the first stage, they are always going to continue them until they have exhausted every possible means of gaining their end. So I feel in administering the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act that the government is on the right side where it refuses, unless the cases are most exceptional, to take any step as between the parties, after a dispute has been referred to a board, and the board has given its award on which they are to base their judgment.

I have in my hand a pamphlet signed by Mr. Lee, President of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. This pamphlet is an account of the Grand Trunk and Central Vermont railway strike as given by the president of this organization to the men who were concerned in the dispute. At page 5 of this pamphlet Mr. Lee sets forth the negotiations which took place between the company and the representatives of the men, after the award of the Board of Conciliation had been given. He points out that on July 16, there was a lengthy conference in the office of the president and again on July 18 another conference. He says:

> Mr. Hays replied shortly that he would meet the committee and officers at 11.30 a.m., the 18th, which was done, other officers of the company also being present. Mr. Hays at this conference stated that the company would definitely promise to put the eastern standard rates into effect January 1, 1913. This was not accepted and the conference was adjourned and resumed again at 3 p.m.

That was on July 18, the very day on which the strike was declared. The parties up to 3 o'clock that afternoon were negotiating together to see if it were possible to come to a settlement themselves. Mr. Lee goes on:

> Prior to the departure of the general committeemen a draft of a proposal of last resort was prepared and ratified which it was agreed should be submitted to Mr. Hays if it was finally concluded that a peaceable settlement could not otherwise be effected. After it appeared that Mr. Hays was indisposed to make any appreciable concessions, the proposition mentioned was presented to him, on which he expressed himself quite favourably and asked the opinion of other officers present as to the time it would take them to analyse it. They answered that it would take two or three days, but the attention of the officials was called to the fact that they had had several months to consider the men's demands, and that the committeemen were now out on the line getting ready to put a strike order into effect that evening and that the men were opposed to any further delay at that time. The president then stated that they would take until 5 o'clock to consider the matter and the officers and sub-committee were told to return at that time. Upon return the president handed Brothers Berry and Murdock copies of proposed terms of settlement as the company's ultimatum. The officials were informed that the terms offered were entirely unacceptable and, even if the officers and sub-committee were so disposed, they could not accept the offer as it was not up to the lowest basis, above referred to, fixed previously by the joint committee. Mr. Hays stated that the company would go no further and the meeting closed.
>
> It was now definitely realized that a strike was inevitable. Up to this time the sentiment in all parts of the Dominion was that the Grand Trunk Company could not consistently refuse to give the men the same rates and conditions as granted by practically all eastern railways. It was not believed that the company would engage in a strike.

That was the position the men themselves took in reference to this dispute. If, up to 5 o'clock on the afternoon on which the strike was declared, the leaders of that strike did not believe a strike would take place, wherein would the government have been justified, in the midst of these critical negotiations, with the example before

them of the case of another railway company having negotiated with the same body in which a successful settlement had been reached, it had rushed in and tried to compel an arbitration which the men themselves had indicated would only help to precipitate an element of danger into the whole situation? I say if the government had taken the course which the hon. member in moving this resolution has suggested they should have taken, I think the hon. member might have brought in the resolution which he has here, and have very properly condemned the government for being too precipitous, too officious, and for preventing the parties themselves from coming together and effecting a settlement which might have averted the strike. So I say as to the first part of the resolution which my hon. friend has moved and which expresses regret that the government had not endeavoured in any intelligent way to avert a strike on the Grand Trunk railway, he is wrong in two particulars: he is wrong first of all in the method he suggests should have been taken by the government, for I claim that is a wrong method, and he is wrong in stating that no effort whatever was made inasmuch as when the demands of the men were presented these demands were made a subject of investigation by a board which was appointed by the government and then the government from the time the board's award was given up to the time the strike took place, held out an offer continuously to each side in the dispute to lend its good offices in any way that would be acceptable to the two parties.

There seems to be just as little ground for criticism of the government's action as respects the second charge contained in this amendment, namely that the government had wholly failed to put an end to the strike during its continuance. Just here I would call the attention of the House to a curious contradiction in the motion of my hon. friend. He wishes to condemn the government on every possible side, first of all for the strike, secondly for not ending the strike, and thirdly for not having had the agreement carried out. But he finds himself in this dilemma that to hold the government responsible for the agreement being carried out, he has in some way to make the government responsible for the agreement itself. So he is put in the curious position of being obliged to admit that the government did bring about a settlement of the strike when he tries to hold it responsible for not having the terms of the settlement fully carried out. On the other hand, when he wishes to make his denunciation wholesale, he says the government are to blame for not putting an end to the strike during its continuance. Follow the two clauses of my hon. friend's motion. He says that the government have 'wholly failed . . to put an end to it during its continuance', and he goes on to say: 'or to compel Mr. C. M. Hays, the president of that railway, to effectively carry out the agreement made with the government, on the faith of which . . the men at once offered to resume their service with the company'. Either one of these two clauses must be wrong, both to my mind are wrong but either of them is certainly wrong and it must appear so to every one who reads them. If the government did not put an end to the strike then the government can not be held responsible for the terms of an agreement that, according to the third paragraph of the amendment, it is supposed to have drawn up and as a result of which the men returned to work. On the other hand, if the government did draw up an agreement as a result of which the men returned to work, then the second clause of my hon. friend's amendment, namely, that the government did not put an end to the strike, falls absolutely to the ground.

Just a word as to what the government did do when the strike took place. It was the 18th of July when the men decided to go out. On the night of the 18th of July an order was issued from Montreal to all the railway trainmen and conductors from Portland on the Atlantic to Chicago, half way across the continent, and the whole Grand Trunk railway system throughout that entire distance, including something like 4,000 miles of railway, was completely tied up. The number of men who went out at that time totalled 3,450 and then, a day or two following, after the company had closed its shops at Quebec and other points, the total number who were out in consequence of the strike was 8,500. What was the situation on the morning of the 19th of July? Between 8,000 and 9,000 men were out, an entire railway system was completely tied up, not a passenger or freight train moving from one end of it to the other and this over something like 4,000 miles of railway system. That was a position to which the government could not be indifferent. I have already said that I do not think it the business of the government to interfere once the board has issued its award, unless the case is exceptional, but I contend that in this particular case the situation was exceptional. This was one of the first strikes of any magnitude that had taken place since this legislation was passed, and when it became apparent that the whole railway system of the Grand Trunk was going to be effectively tied up it became the duty of the government to do what it could to relieve the situation. My hon. friend, in suggesting what might have been done, said that he did not see why the government did not

appoint a Board of Arbitration and place on that board merchants, manufacturers, working men and capitalists, so that all interests in the country would be represented. Now, the hon. gentleman knows just as well as I do that the government could have appointed a thousand boards and not one of these boards could have affected the situation one way or the other. The dispute had already been investigated. It could not have been referred to a Board of Arbitration without each party being willing that it should be so referred and being willing to abide by the award. The parties were not willing. The only step that was possible, in so far as I could see in the premises, was for the government to endeavour in some way to affect public opinion on the question so as to compel each of the parties to realize that theirs was not the only interest that had to be taken account of, that while they, as working men, or a railway company, might believe they could afford to fight over their own differences, the public also had an interest in the situation and the public was entitled to have its voice heard. So, on the day following the strike, I addressed a communication to each of the parties asking them if they could not see their way to refer this difference to arbitration. I pointed out that they had professed to be willing to arbitrate before the strike had taken place. I had my doubts as to the genuineness of their professions and my doubts increased when I gave them an opportunity to refer the matter to arbitration and they did not take advantage of it. That was the first step necessary to be taken and it was taken promptly. Each of the parties had asked if they would not agree to refer the dispute to arbitration, and I told them that in the event of their being willing to do so the government would bear the expense of the arbitration and assist in every way to see that it was faithfully and properly carried out. What were the answers that were received? The answer that came from the men was largely an evasive answer. The answer that came from the company was no less evasive. Each of them was unwilling to appear to be the first to give in by consenting to arbitration. I shall not delay this discussion by reading the messages that were exchanged on the one hand and the other, but I would point out to the House that what the department sought to do on that occasion was to let the public know who was responsible as between the two parties for the situation which had been created. That could be made apparent if one or the other was refusing what was obviously fair, and I felt that sooner or later the pressure of public opinion would make itself felt to such a degree that the parties could not longer stand out against it, and that very soon the strike would be terminated. That communication was sent to each of the parties, and as neither of them sent satisfactory replies I addressed the following letter on July 2 to each of them—to Mr. Hays on the one side and to Messrs. Berry and Murdock on the other:

Referring further to my letter of the 20th inst. and the replies received, I would respectfully point out that neither the reply from the president of the company nor the reply from the representatives of the general committee of the employees, answers the question it asks and which is, whether, as representing one of the parties to the present dispute, you will now be willing to refer the existing differences to arbitration, provided a board of arbitrators mutually acceptable can be secured, and the necessary expenses incidental to such board met by the government. This is a question to which the people of Canada who, at the present are being more largely affected by the existing dispute than either of the parties, have a right to expect a definite reply, and which, as a minister responsible to them, I feel it my duty to ask on their behalf. Will you kindly give a direct answer to this question at your earliest convenience, that the public may be able to judge for itself of the present positions and attitude of the parties on a matter which so vitally affects its interests?

That letter or telegram, for as a matter of fact it was wired, gives the keynote to the attitude of the government at that time. The government had made up its mind that it would find out for the people of the country who was responsible for keeping up this dispute, it was determined to give each of the parties an opportunity of entering into an arrangement which would afford a satisfactory way out of the dispute, and if either failed to take advantage of the opportunty its action could speak for itself. The answers to that communication will be found in the papers which have been brought down to the House. In brief, the replies that we received were also evasive. The committee that were dealing with the case of the men replied that they did not have authority to refer the matter to a board other than one of the nature which they had agreed previously to refer it to. Mr. Hays replied that he had nothing to add to his previosu letter. I continued to press for a definite reply, urging the obvious public grounds and in the course of another day or two one of the parties did finally consent to refer the dispute to a Board of Arbitration, this was the men. In their letter sent from Montreal on July 23, they give reasons which are well deserving of consideration and they say:

We recognize the special obligation to the public and regret exceedingly the inconvenience and loss to which public and private interests are being subjected, and with that recognition desire to advise you that we will be willing to refer the existing differences to

arbitration provided a board of arbitrators mutually acceptable can be secured.

The strike took place on the 18th July, and by the 23rd July the government had succeeded in getting one of the parties to consent to have the differences referred to a board of arbitration. Had Mr. Hays been ready to take the same step at the same time there is no reason why the strike should not have ended then. When I received this letter from Messrs. Murdock and Berry, I at once communicated its contents to Mr. Hays, and I asked him pointedly whether, the other party having agreed to refer the matter to arbitration, he would not also agree to do so. In reply he said:

Your telegram of the 23rd received, while as you know from many conferences urging your action before the strike took place and from our offer repeated and urged upon the committee, we were desirous of arbitration and so avoiding the existing trouble, the time for such action has now passed, and it is only necessary that we should have the protection to which we are entitled to enable us to resume the full operation of the road.

CHAS. M. HAYS.

Had the government been indifferent, had the government been prepared to take Mr. Hays' word, the matter might have ended with that letter, but the moment that reply was received from Mr. Hays the government communicated with the customs officials throughout Ontario as to the movement of freight in their respective towns, and from all of whom replies were received stating that the Grand Trunk Railway system was practically tied up, that trains were not moving in some, that factories had closed down, and, in all, that inconvenience, loss and distress were being experienced. The government then took action as a government, and a meeting of the cabinet was called, and Sir Richard Cartwright, who was acting Prime Minister, in a communication pointed out to Mr. Hays that the reports of the government officers demonstrated that Mr. Hays' telegram did not correctly describe the situation. Sir Richard Cartwright wrote:

The government has been carefully considering the whole strike situation, and whilst it is the wish of my colleagues and myself to cause you as little embarrassment as possible, we cannot but feel, in view of the situation as disclosed in these messages, all of which are from an official and strictly impartial source, as well as from many other urgent representations, that it is eminently desirable that some settlement of the present dispute should be immediately effected, and that if this cannot be brought about by a conference between the parties, the matter should be left to arbitration as already suggested by the government.

Mr. Hays had refused the offer of arbitration, and the government came back at him and pointed out that he should accept arbitration at that particular stage, and Sir Richard Cartwright concluded:

I very much hope that you may find it possible to co-operate with the government along the lines suggested in its endeavours to deal with the critical situation which has arisen, through the interruption of operations over a large part of your company's system.

On that day the Minister of Militia was leaving for the maritime provinces and he agreed to take this communication in person to Mr. Hays so as to impress upon him how determined the government was that the strike should be ended and ended speedily. The Minister of Militia took that letter to Mr. Hays on July 27, and the same afternoon I received this telegram:

Messrs. Garretson and Lee held conference to-day with Mr. Hays without result. May I be permitted on behalf of the men on strike to request that as a minister of the Crown and representative of the people you come to Montreal and by further effort try and arrange an honourable settlement either by arbitration or negotiation.

JAMES MURDOCK.

As a result of that telegram, I left on the following day for Montreal, and the Minister of Militia and myself did our utmost to bring together the two parties with a view to a settlement. I point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) that instead of being indifferent and doing nothing to bring about a settlement, the government was as active as it could be from the moment the strike took place. The only step we could take at the outset was to bring all the pressure possible on each side to get them to agree to a joint conference or arbitration and the communications which passed between the government and the parties were the means of helping to focus public opinion on the situation, and enable the public to discover which side was right and which wrong in refusing to take advantage of the government's offer. In this way public opinion combined with the active intervention of two of the ministers, eventually succeeded in bringing about a settlement, and instead of the government being criticised by my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) he should have complimented it on its activity and success in ending the difficulty in so short a time. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Northrup) said that the government should have used the big stick, and although he did not define what he meant by that expression, his meaning apparently was that the government should have done all it could to compel the Grand Trunk railway to agree to a settlement on reasonable terms. But, if we are to judge by results, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) has plenty of evidence to show that the big stick was used, and used pretty effectively on that occasion. There is no doubt at all that Mr. Hays did not intend to settle that strike. I have no hesi-

tation in saying that once the men went out on strike, it was the intention of Mr. Hays, no matter what the cost, to keep up that strike until he defeated the men. And that such was the opinion of the men themselves is evident from the statement in this same pamphlet sent out by Mr. Lee, the president of the organization, in describing the effort made to bring about a settlement. On page 6 he says:

The entire service was demoralized in the beginning, but before a great many hours enough strike breakers had been bought and borrowed to man a number of passenger trains and as usual the passenger service did not suffer badly after a few days. The freight service, however, was crippled seriously. The loss to the companies in revenue was enormous. Valuable freight contracts were lost, at least for the time. Mr. Hays, however, seemed to give little consideration to the immediate financial consequence of the strike, but appeared fixed in the determination that the men should be fought to the end.

Again he says:

He seemed as ever intent upon prolonging the strike indefinitely, regardless of cost, apparently with the view of eventually having the public interest itself to the extent of forcing the government to demand a resumption of the service.

He goes on to describe the efforts that were made by Messrs. Garrison and himself to bring about a conference with Mr. Hays with a view to settling the difficulty, pointing out that they were unsuccessful and that these efforts were finally broken off. The correspondence itself shows that the men saw plainly that the attitude of the company was that they were going to fight to the bitter end, no matter at what cost to the company or to the country; but the government made up its mind that the fight would not go on to the bitter end, but that a settlement of the strike would take place. So the efforts of the Minister of Militia and myself, during the two or three days that we were in Montreal, were devoted to bringing the parties together, and putting them in a position where each would be obliged to show exactly where they stood, so that the public might learn, if necessary, from us as ministers of the Crown, who were in the right and who were in the wrong. It was Thursday afternoon, I think, when we left for Montreal; by Saturday a joint conference had been arranged between the parties, and by Saturday night we had practically come to an agreement as to the terms of settlement except in one particular, and it took from Saturday night till Tuesday to get that one remaining question settled before the strike could be declared to be at an end. What I want to point out to my hon. friend is that by the action of the government, first, in offering arbitration and in bringing public opinion to bear on the situation, secondly, by actively intervening when requested to do so by the employees, and, thirdly, by bringing all the pressure possible to bear on the parties when we got them together, the strike was terminated inside of 15 days, instead of being continued over a period of time.

Now, I think I am right when I say that the efforts of the government to bring about a termination of the dispute were appreciated, not only by the public, but by the parties to the dispute themselves; and, seeing that my hon. friend thinks that no intelligent effort was made to avert the strike, or to end it after it began, it might be well for me to read some of the communications which were received immediately after the termination of the strike, to show that those who had to do with it and knew the situation took an entirely different view from what he does. For example, here is a communication from Mr. Garretson, president of the Order of Railroad Conductors. He was one of those who were present during the negotiations with Mr. Hays; in fact, he conducted the negotiations on behalf of the men. His letter is as follows:

Order of Railway Conductors,
Cedar Rapids, Iowa,
August 10, 1910.

Hon. William L. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir:—

I take this opportunity of expressing to you on behalf of not only myself and my associate officers, but of the organization at large, and more especially the Canadian membership thereof, the profound obligation under which we lie for the services of yourself and your associate minister in connection with the settlement of the strike upon the Grand Trunk and the Central Vermont railways. The ready recognition by you of the justification for the claims of the men on those properties and the exercise of personal and governmental influence toward securing a termination of the strike on those properties will not be forgotten by our membership, and I sincerely trust that those most directly affected, namely, our Canadian citizens, will in the future make that appreciation thoroughly apparent.

In conclusion, kindly accept my expressions of highest personal regard, and believe me, sincerely and gratefully yours,

A. B. GARRETSON,
President.

I believe that a similar communication was sent by Mr. Garretson to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence. Then, Mr. Berry, who represented the organization in Canada, in a letter dated Toronto, December 31, 1910, wrote as follows:

I inclose herewith a copy of minutes of Eastern Association General Committee, Order Railway Conductors and Brotherhood Railway

Trainmen, held at Buffalo, N.Y., October 18 to 20, inclusive, 1910. I would draw your attention to resolution on pages 9 and 10 expressing appreciation of action taken by the officials of the government, especially Sir Frederick Borden and yourself. This resolution had the unanimous endorsation of the meeting.

It will be observed that this letter is dated December 31, so that the feeling it expresses was not simply that which Mr. Berry entertained just at the moment after the strike was settled, but the opinion he continued to have up to the end of the year. The resolution referred to by Mr. Berry is as follows:

Resolved, that we express our full appreciation of actions of officials of the Dominion government in their untiring efforts to settle the strike, and we especially commend the efforts of the Minister of Militia, Sir Frederick Borden, and the Minister of Labour, the Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, who did so much toward restoring peace and harmony.

This resolution was passed at a joint meeting of the Eastern Association of General Committees of Railroad Conductors and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, held at Buffalo from October 18 to October 20. Then, in a communication from Mr. Barry, dated August 15, on behalf of the Canadian members, I find the following:

In conclusion, I wish to take this opportunity of expressing to you on behalf of myself, other officers of the Order of Railway Conductors, and especially our members employed on the Grand Trunk and Central Vermont railways from Portland to Chicago, and the Canadian membership in general, the profound obligation under which we lie for the services of yourself and your associate ministers of the Dominion government in connection with the settlement of the strike upon the above-named railways. I feel, and sincerely trust, that the ready recognition and untiring efforts of Sir Frederick Borden and yourself will not be forgotten by the Canadian citizens, especially our membership, and that they will in the future make that reciprocation thoroughly apparent.

Again thanking yourself and associate ministers on behalf of the membership of the Order of Railway Conductors, and with highest personal regard, believe me, sincerely and gratefully yours,

(Sgd.) S. N. BERRY,
Vice-president O.R.C.

Those communications speak for themselves. I might also quote from the official journals of these organizations. Here is the 'Railroad Trainman,' the official journal of the Brotherhood of the Railroad Trainmen, at page 797 of the September issue, I find the folowing with regard to the setltlement:

The settlement was effected principally through the efforts of the Minister of Labour, Mr. King, assisted by the Minister of Militia, Sir Frederick Borden, to whom full credit is given for their efforts in bringing about the settlement.

Also in the 'Railway Conductor' which is the official journal of the Railway Conductors Brotherhood, I find at page 718 the following passage:

Mr. WILCOX. What date?

Mr. KING. September, 1910. This is what that journal says:

In connection with this settlement the thanks of the Canadian membership and of our entire organization as well, are due and tendered to the Hon. Mackenzie King, Minister of Labour, and Sir Frederick Borden, Minister of Militia, for their untiring efforts on behalf of the men, for the influence they brought to bear on the Grand Trunk Railway management contributed in no small degree in producing a satisfactory result and ending the controversy.

My purpose in reading these resolutions is not in any way to record on 'Hansard' communications which one might be pleased to read concerning his own work, but I am forced to read them in view of the resolution moved. My hon. friend says that no effort was made by the government to put an end to the strike during its continuance. That is the charge which he brings against the government in general and the Department of Labour in particular. In order to reply, I feel it necessary to quote the words of the men themselves who, better than any one else and as well at any rate as the company itself, knew who had rendered them good service.

Not only did the parties themselves believe that the government had rendered the men a service, but the people of the country also. I have a telegram from my hon. friend's own constituency for I believe he is a resident of Belleville. I am not sure whether he is a member of the Board of Trade of Belleville, but on August 3, I received the following telegram from that body:

Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Ottawa.

Executive Belleville Board of Trade thank you for effective work in settlement of strike.

W. B. DEACON,
President.
W. N. PONTON,
Secretary.

Will my hon. friend say that the board of trade in his own town was mistaken when it sent a telegram congratulating the government on its effective work?

Mr. NORTHRUP. They did not understand the facts then.

Mr. KING. I think my hon. friend does not understand them yet. Here is a telegram from the mayor of Hamilton, dated August 3:

Hon. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa.

The city of Hamilton appreciates your earnest efforts to settle strike and congratulate you on your success.

JOHN I. McLAREN,
Mayor.

Does my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) think that the citizens of his city were mistaken in their belief as to the nature of the services rendered?

Mr. BARKER. No doubt they congratulated the hon. gentleman on what they thought was a success. They do not think so now, perhaps.

Mr. KING. I am glad to have my hon. friend admit at any rate that they were sincere when they sent that telegram. I could quote very many others, but I mention only these two. Here is a communication from an important firm of wholesale grocers, representing the business interests of this country, and my hon. friend referred to the business interests. This communication also comes from the city of Hamilton:

Hamilton, August 4, 1910.

The Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa.

We beg to offer you our congratulations upon the success of your efforts in adjusting the differences between the Grand Trunk railway system and the trainmen. It is a great relief to the trade to have this matter settled because, instead of conditions improving, they were gradually getting worse, and had the strike continued for two or three weeks longer the loss to the trade would have been much greater. It may interest you to know that the extra volume of business that was thrown on to the Canadian Pacific railway resulted in a congestion of freight over their system that will take them from one to two weeks to clean up. The Canadian Pacific railway had practically arrived at the point where it was impossible for them to guarantee prompt delivery of goods; delays were becoming general and much longer in extent.

In view of the conditions that were becoming so bad the prompt settlement of this strike has been a great relief, and we thoroughly appreciate the prompt and aggressive way in which you kept at it. It is encouraging to the trade of this country to have a minister to so grasp the situation that realizes the necessity of prompt action in matters that concern the trade and commerce of this country.

Again congratulating you on the successful termination of this unpleasant difference.

We are, yours truly,
W. H. GILLARD & CO.
per H. C. Beckett.

My hon. frined referred to Mr. Trowern, the secretary of the Retail Merchants Association as a man of shrewd judgment. Well, here is a communication from Mr. Trowern, dated August 9, in which he says:

I wish to congratulate you on your success in bringing about a settlement of this unfortunate disagreement.

So I might go on, but I think these are sufficient to show the House that at the time the strike was settled, when the facts were fresh in the minds of the people, there was no doubt on the part of any one—either those concerned in the strike itself or the public most affected by it—as to the service the government had rendered in helping to bring it to a speedy termination.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the government not receive a good many communications complaining about its inactivity while the strike lasted?

Mr. KING. We had a sample of those this afternoon when my hon. friend was reading some communications which he said were sent in—telegrams from different Boards of Trade urging that something should be done; and when by chance I asked my hon. friend to read one, I found it began with these words: 'While appreciating your indefatigable efforts.' Most of the communications received were along those lines.

Mr. BLAIN. I thought it would be only fair to place those on record alongside with the compliments to the minister himself.

Mr. KING. I have no doubt about their going on record. If any can be found, I can trust hon. gentlemen opposite to see that they will all be given a place in the report. But if my hon. friend will look at the press he will find that in practically all the newspapers the government was credited with making every effort possible to bring about a termination of the strike. It was not possible, however, to settle that strike in a day. In the case of a dispute of that magnitude, with the interests involved, with the feeling existing, there is no agency under heaven which could have brought about an immediate settlement of the difficulty. When one considers the nature of the dispute, its magnitude and the bitterness of the parties, the miracle is not that it lasted so long, but that it did not last several months longer. So much for the second part of my hon. friend's resolution.

In the third part he charges the government with having failed to compel Mr. Hays, the president of the Grand Trunk railway to effectively carry out the agreement which he says was made with the government and on the faith of which the men offered to return to service. Well, as already pointed out, this third part of the resolution contradicts the second. He says that an agreement was made on the faith of which the men returned to work; but in the second part he says that the government failed to do anything to terminate the dispute. While I think that in this

third part the hon. member is also mistaken, let me first draw his attention to its wording. He says:

To effectively carry out the agreement made with the government on the faith of which the men at once offered to return to service.

My hon. friend saw that it was necessary to make out a case in that connection, for he spent some time in the endeavour to show that the agreement was with the government and not between the parties. There I take issue with him. The agreement was not with the government, but was between the parties to the dispute, the Grand Trunk Railway Company on one hand and the organizations involved in the dispute on the other. They were the parties to the dispute, and they were the parties to the settlement. The government helped to bring about an agreement—brought the parties together and, through its representatives, assisted the parties in trying to reach satisfactory terms. But the agreement was an agreement between the parties to the dispute, and the best evidence of that is that one party is now saying that the other is not carrying out its agreement.

Mr. BLAIN. Was not the understanding with the Minister of Militia and my hon. friend (Mr. King) a part of the agreement? That is the part that my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) was complaining about?

Mr. KING. If my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) likes to regard it as part of the agreement—

Mr. BLAIN. I am asking if it was not part of the agreement.

Mr. KING. The agreement would not have gone into effect if that understanding had not been given—I will say that. But the question of the understanding having been given is not the question in dispute.

Mr. BLAIN. Did not the hon. minister regard it as part of the agreement, though it was not written?

Mr. KING. I regard it as part of the settlement, certainly; but it is not that part that is in dispute at the present time. I will explain that situation a little more fully. I fortunately happen to have retained a paper which was used during the course of the negotiations, and by a reference to it I think I can make perfectly plain to the House exactly what took place in regard to these words to which reference has been made. I have stated that, on Saturday afternoon—about three o'clock, I think it was—my hon. friend (Sir Frederick Borden) and myself had succeeded in getting the company and the men to meet. Mr. Hays and his officers sat on one side of the board, and Mr. Garretson and Mr. Lee, representatives of the men, on the other. The Minister of Militia and myself, with the solicitor of the company, and Mr. Wainwright, the vice-president, watched the proceedings. We took little or no part in negotiating the terms of the agreement. The award of the Board of Conciliation was made the basis of discussion and the two parties debated every clause in that proposed settlement. They would get to a certain length, and then break up. But we would get them together again, to see if we could not get a little further. By about nine or ten o'clock, it was thought that a settlement had been practically reached. There were only three main questions to decide—first, as to the reinstatement of the men; second, the rate of wages; and, third, the rules of the company and the method of payment. As I remember it, Mr. Hays, as the representative of the company, had a draft made of what was the tentative agreement all were discussing, and typewritten copies were made in his office and brought up and made the basis of further discussion. Copies were handed to the men on one side; Mr. Hays and his officers had copies; and Sir Frederick Borden and myself were given copies. I have here the copy which I had at that time. I will read the settlement in full, because it will make plain the nature of the discussion:

The company will put back as soon as possible the men, other than those who have been or may be found guilty of acts of violence or disorderly conduct, the understanding being that there is to be no coercion or intimidation used towards the new men.

The company will put into effect on May 1, 1910, the rates named in schedule of rates dated July 18, 1910, those rates to be embodied in the present schedules now in effect on this line, it being understood that those rates shall in no instance affect a reduction in any existing rate.

The company will on January 1, 1912, make effective on the Grand Trunk railway the rates of pay and the rules contained in the schedule or agreement on that date in effect on the lines of the Canadian Pacific railway east of Fort William.

Now, I have written in one corner of this document the words used by Mr. Hays to the men when he presented this schedule —'If I take the last two, will you take the first one?' In other words: 'If I give you rates of wages, to go into effect, May 1, 1910, in accordance with the schedule you want, and if I agree on January 1, 1912, to make the rules of my road similar to those of the Canadian Pacific railway at that time, will you on your part accept this clause which says that the Company will put back, as soon as possible, the men who are not found guilty of violence or disorderly conduct?' So, the question narrowed itself down to the acceptance by the men of the first clause on condition that Mr. Hays would accept the

other two. The men asked Mr. Hays what he meant by 'as soon as possible'. They said: 'Do you intend to take all the men back? Mr. Hays said: 'Yes, as soon as possible'. 'What do you mean by that? Do you mean next week, or two weeks?' They wanted to change these words or have them left out altogether. In fact, I think that was the first suggestion they made—to leave out the words, and said that if these were left out they would accept. But Mr. Hays would not agree. Well, to make a long story short, before we broke up we had got this far—that the men would be willing to let these words go into the agreement if Mr. Hays would give them a definite meaning. First they wanted the words left out; then they wanted a definite meaning given to them; in the third place, they said: If you give them a definite meaning, we don't care whether they are in or not. And their last offer was—and I have Mr. Garretson's words written on the other corner—'Satisfy Sir Frederick and Mr. King as to the meaning of: 'As soon as possible.' They said: We will accept your first, provided you satisfy Sir Frederick and Mr. King what these words: 'As soon as possible' mean.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. KING. The Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) is here, and I think he will bear me out.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Quite.

Mr. KING. In other words, on that Saturday night, an agreement had been reached between the two parties. The only question remaining was the meaning of the words: 'As soon as possible.' And the men stated they did not care whether the words were put in or left out, so long as something definite in the way of an assurance was given them as to their exact meaning. They went so far as to say: You will only have to satisfy Sir Frederick and Mr. King, and we will accept that as an assurance. It was not the government making an agreement for the men, or the government making an agreement with the company, but the company and the men making an agreement together, and doing so under terms in black and white, but in regard to the meaning of one of which terms Sir Frederick Borden and I were to stand as witnesses. And we stand as witnesses at the present time. But Mr. Hays would not give a meaning to these words on Saturday night, and because he would not give a meaning to them the strike lasted through Sunday and Monday and Tuesday, for it was not until Tuesday that we could get Mr. Hays to give a definite answer. Hon. members opposite state that we ought to have used the big stick. Did we not use it? I will tell my hon. friends how it was used.

When I left on Tuesday Mr. Hays had not given that assurance. I gave Mr. Hays to understand that unless he gave some meaning to those words 'as soon as possible,' I would see that the people of Canada knew why the strike was not settled, and that it was because he had not defined the meaning of those words 'as soon as possible,' the whole Grand Trunk Railway system was being tied up, and I gave him virtually six hours in which to decide whether or not he would give a meaning to those words. I left him on the understanding that I would come to Ottawa, and would see that the whole transaction from beginning to end was made public in order that the men and the government should not be put in a false light before the country and that the blame should fall where it was due, that there were these three words to which he would not give a definite meaning. I would never have made this statement public if it had not been that so much difficulty has arisen over these words, and that the government is being blamed in a way in which I do not think it should be. Had Mr. Hays followed out, as I think he should have followed out, the agreement at an earlier stage there would not be any occasion to mention this now. Mr. Wainwright came up to Ottawa on a train about the same time as the one on which I came and as vice-president of the Grand Trunk railway he gave me an assurance in the presence of two of my colleagues here that the president of the Grand Trunk railway would consent to giving to these three words 'as soon as possible' the definite meaning of three months which was the time Sir Frederick Borden and myself said we thought would be sufficient. That was exactly the position, and Mr. Hays yielded at this stage in view of a knowledge of the pressure that was being brought to bear on him by the government, and for no other reason. That strike would have continued for weeks and months probably, no matter at what cost to the country or loss to the men, but for the pressure which was brought to bear in that way. Just here I would say a word in behalf of Mr. Wainwright. If any man in this whole transaction is entitled to credit it is Mr. Wainwright. He had a very difficult position to maintain, but I think it was his good counsels and good actions which more than anything else were responsible in the last analysis for the company seeing the wisdom of accepting the settlement.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavoured to place on the government the responsibility for the manner in which one of the terms of the agreement has been carried out. As I have said, the terms of the settlement stated that as soon as possible

all those who had not been guilty of acts of violence or disorderly conduct should be restored to the company's service. The company does not deny having given that meaning to the expression 'as soon as possible.' What Mr. Hays says is that he has carried out that part of the agreement and that the men who are out at the present time, according to the statement of his officers have been guilty of some acts of disorderly conduct. It is one of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties themselves that is causing the trouble to-day, not a part of the agreement to which Sir Frederick Borden and myself are witnesses, but another part, words that were perfectly agreeable to the men themselves, and which they were prepared to sign. The dispute that has arisen to-day is as to the 'as soon as possible' or the three months, but whether the men who are still out have been actually guilty of acts of disorderly conduct.

The government, to my mind, were not obliged to do anything further, certainly the government has never accepted in virtue of the agreement entered into between the parties, any obligation on its part to see that the terms of the agreement were carried out. Were that doctrine once admitted, this government and parliament would be opening the door to a wide obligation, that the government would become responsible for all that grows out of the actions of every person who performs an act on behalf of the government. That, for example, in the case of the Boards of Conciliation appointed by the government the government would become responsible for the way in which the terms of settlement effected by them were carried out, we would be assuming an obligation which I think would be going much further than this parliament ever intended to go, and I do not think that the government would be justified for one minute in admitting any obligation of that kind. However, the government has stood and still stands to do its utmost to further industrial peace, and when after the settlement had been made and three months had gone by, and some of the men had not been reinstated, with the information that this situation was likely to give rise to fresh trouble on the Grand Trunk railway, the government naturally, in the interests of industrial peace, offered to do and has been doing all in its power to awaken a consciousness on the part of one of the parties to the agreement to the necessity of discharging the obligations arising out of the agreement respecting the present dispute, and so the government has in many ways pointed out to the Grand Trunk Railway Company that it expected, in virtue of its being one of the parties to the agreement in the interests of industrial peace, that that great corporation should deal with its men in a manner worthy of a corporation carrying on business to the extent that it does. When my hon. friend says that nothing has been done but to send a letter occasionally to Montreal, I think he can hardly have read over all the correspondence, because he would see in it references to many interviews which have taken place not only between myself and Mr. Hays and other officers of the Grand Trunk railway in Montreal, but between Mr. Hays and the Prime Minister in Ottawa. I think that on two or three occasions the Prime Minister has himself spoken to Mr. Hays on this particular phase of the transaction. Mr. Hays is in a difficult position, I am prepared to admit that. His officers give him certain advice. He feels that, managing a great company, unless he pays attention to the advice of his officers he may not be able to carry on the organization as it should be carried on and so he has tried on the one hand, I think, to carry out the wishes of the government in the matter, and on the other hand to stand back of the officials whom he holds responsible for carrying on the affairs of the road in a certain way. The government gave him to understand clearly that if his officers were making misrepresentations to him, if the men were saying one thing and the officers another, the only fair way to do was to call in some third party and allow the third party to pronounce upon the cases. I made that suggestion first in a communication offering on behalf of the government to pay the expense of an arbitrator. I think the Grand Trunk railway should have accepted that offer, I think it was a small thing to ask a big company to do especially as the men expressed their willingness to do the same. One of the doctrines to which the managers of great corporations seem to hold most strongly is that they are going to manage their own business, and after all what the government was interested in doing was not to antagonize that corporation so that it would perhaps treat its men in a spiteful manner, but rather to facilitate the return of these men to the positions they formerly held. The government intimated that it did not matter what the method was so long as these men were given a fair chance of having their cases investigated. Judge Barron's name had been mentioned because he had acted as chairman of one or two boards in industrial disputes with great satisfaction to both employers and employed, and my hon. friend has paid him the praise which he merits in saying that he feels that in every way Judge Barron will be upright, faithful and trustworthy in the discharge of his duty, and that it would make little difference by whom he is appointed. Judge Barron has been appointed to investigate the

cases of all the men still out in the United States as well as Canada, and the fact that he has been appointed at all, no matter by whom, the government or the Grand Trunk railway, it is pretty good evidence of the pressure which has been brought to bear on that company by the government. Judge Barron would never have been appointed, the cases of these men would never have been looked into, and instead of 200 men being out there would have been 500 or 600 if not more, were it not for the pressure that the government have brought to bear on the situation.

Mr. MADDIN. Who is going to pay Judge Barron for determining who has been guilty of misconduct amongst the strikers?

Mr. KING. I presume the Grand Trunk will pay him for his services. I think my hon. friend will be the first to admit that any man of honour will discharge his duty in an honourable manner irrespective of who pays him. I think that certainly members of this House who have the privilege of knowing Judge Barron will feel that no member of the judiciary is more likely to act in an honest and faithful way than he is and I believe the men have just as much confidence in him as we have. I think it would have been preferable had the company accepted the offer of the government to appoint Judge Barron to make this investigation, but a large company like this prefers to manage its own affairs and the company is determined as far as possible that it is going to conduct its business along its own lines. In the absence of compulsory arbitration you cannot prevent a practice of that kind being followed by a company. I cannot say that I am in favour of compulsory arbitration, nor can I say that I am altogether opposed to some measure of compulsory arbitration where the ends of justice and the public good can be ignored at the will of an individual. This dispute has made me feel that never again, if possible, should this country be brought face to face with a situation such as occurred here through the attitude of any individual or group be they capitalists or workingmen. I think the country as a whole is too important to allow its interests to be sacrificed. I would say to my friends amongst the workingmen and capitalists that if any occurrence of this kind takes place again they can expect, and I think they very naturally would expect, that some action may be found necessary which will prevent the possibility of any further recurrence if a method can be found that will prevent it.

My hon. friend (Mr. Northrup), in the third clause of his amendment, says that the government is responsible for not compelling Mr. Hays to carry out the agreement effectively. I shall answer him, not in my own words, but in the words of the men who are most affected, those who are still out and are members of the organizations that are affected by the agreement not having been lived up to in the way that they think it should have been lived up to. What do they say? My hon. friend read part of one communication this afternoon. Here is a letter signed by Messrs. Berry and Murdock representing the railway conductors and the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen:

Windsor Hotel, Ottawa,
December 13, 1910.

Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour, Ottawa,

Dear Sir:—The committee desire to assure you and through you the government that they deprecate the attitude taken by certain gentlemen, (presumably well intentioned) whereby an effort is being made to hold the government responsible for the failure to apply the terms of settlement made.

We appreciate fully the assistance given both at the time of the strike, and since, by the government in its efforts to bring about on behalf of the Canadian public and the citizens of Canada who are involved in the strike a settlement, and an equitable carrying out of the terms of that settlement. It is definitely understood by the men interested and the undersigned that it is not on account of any failure on the part of the government that the present unfortunate situation obtains, but that the existing conditions are rather the result of the obstinate disregard for contract obligations on the part of Grand Trunk officials.

Mr. NORTHRUP. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. KING. December 13, 1910, at a period some six months after the strike had been settled. Here is a communication of a later date from Mr. Berry:

Toronto, December 31st, 1910.

I herewith acknowledge receipt of your favour under date of the 19th inst., which was delayed in Ottawa several days before being forwarded me. I wish to assure you that the untiring efforts of yourself, other members of the cabinet and members of the Dominion government are appreciated in full by me, and I trust, by the membership of our organization throughout the Dominion of Canada, as well as parts of the United States, where they have had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the actions of our government relative to the Grand Trunk and Central Vermont situation.

There is also a letter dated January 28, from Mr. S. N. Berry, vice president of the Order of Railway Conductors. In this letter Mr. Berry says:

I do not, of course, hold the government responsible for the enforcement of the settlement——

An entirely different point of view from that which hon. gentleman opposite are taking.

——but I incline to believe in view of the fact the men accepted the settlement as it was made, partly to relieve the public of suffering, we can consistently look forward to all assistance possible in having that settlement adhered to by all concerned. We recognize the great help you and other members of the government rendered to the men in connection with the matter, and we appreciate your desire that the settlement should in honour be carried out.

Then, on February 10, hon. members of the House will remember that the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) asked me some questions in regard to the settlement. It appears that on February 7 that hon. member wrote to both the representatives of the conductors and trainmen's organizations and sent them a communication somewhat as follows:

I inclose a copy of questions I intend to ask in the House and would be glad to have your view of the situation. I have for a good many years endeavoured to advance the interests of railway employees where I could, and have been in close communication with the men at Allandale. The railway contention now is that although there was a settlement, the men who came back, came back as new men and were not restored to a claim on pension fund.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) HAUGHTON LENNOX.

That is addressed to S. N. Berry, Esq., 53 Beatrice St., Toronto. These communications were forwarded to me by both the officers of these organizations, without any knowledge on my part of their having received them. They sent them to me, thinking it important that I should be informed of all that had taken place. I will not attempt to read what was said in reply in full. but I will read what Mr. Berry and Mr. Murdock have said in part in reply to the communications of the hon. member for Simcoe. In a letter dated Toronto, February 27, 1911, Mr. Berry writes:

Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir:—

I hand you therewith copy of letter to me from Mr. Lennox, M.P., under date of the 7th instant. I fully intended to inclose a copy of this letter when sending you a copy of my reply to same.

I have no objections to matters of this kind being made public, as I trust all concerned, having nothing but the interests of the unreemployed employees of the Grand Trunk railway who participated in the strike, in view, when making inquiries of this kind.

I wish to assure you my desire is that politics be kept entirely out of this question, and I do hope that any gentleman interesting himself in this matter, does so from the view point that it is justice what we want and hope to get for those men.

I am, yours very truly,
(Sigd) S. N. BERRY,
Vice-President, O. R. C.

Mr. Murdock, vice-president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen sent me the following communication:

Grand Union Hotel, Montreal
February 20, 1911.

Hon. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I inclose herewith copy of letter this day written to Mr. Haughton Lennox, M.P., in answer to a letter that he sent me under date of February 7, requesting certain information, in the form of the following question:

He gives these questions and then adds:

It occurs to me that you might be interested in reading these questions which, I presume, you have heard heretofore, and that you might also like to see the answer that I have made to the questions as asked.

Very truly yours,
(Sgd) JAMES MURDOCK.

The letter to Mr. Lennox is rather long but this is the way it concludes. It is a communication sent in answer to the questions put by the hon. member from the other side of the House, and I think it correctly answers the third part of my hon. friend's amendment in which he expresses regret that the government has not tried to compel Mr. Hays to effectively carry out the agreement. Mr. Murdock in his letter says:

In conclusion, it might not be amiss——

Mr. BLAIN. Why not read the whole letter?

Mr. KING. Very well. I may say that the questions put to Mr. Murdock were in this form:

Was the settlement of July 31 last between the Grand Trunk railway and its employees in train and yard service:

(a) Intended and understood to put an end to all then existing disputes and difficulties.

(b) Was it understood that the men would be put back in the positions they held previous to the strike.

(c) Was it understood that the men would be reinstated.

This is Mr. Murdock's reply:

Montreal, February 20, 1911.

Mr. Haughton Lennox, M.P., Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Your letter of February 7, with which was inclosed three questions relative to the settlement of the Grand Trunk strike, has only just reached me, hence the delay in my replying.

I will answer your questions in order as given.

(a) Yes, most positively hoped for and understood.

(b) Yes, without reservation it was expected that the undertaking that Mr. Hays gave to ministers of the Crown on August 2 as to his intended application of paragraph 1 of the agreement made on July 31, contemplated that all men who had gone on strike

and who had not been guilty of the commission of overt acts would be returned to their former positions, runs, seniority, standing, etc.

(c) Is answered in the reply given to (b).

I am indeed glad to know that yourself and other eminent and representative members of the Dominion parliament are taking such a commendable interest in the welfare of Grand Trunk employees who have not yet been returned to service, or who, having been returned to service, have not been conceded their former positions or runs.

I presume Mr. Murdock had read the debate which took place. I think my hon. friend asked me whether anything was said with regard to the pension, and in reply I said that pensions had not been mentioned, and Mr. Murdock says in this letter:

The question of pensions or of conserving the pension rights of the employees who had been on strike and who were by the settlement to be returned to service was not even considered as a factor in determining the basis of settlement. Representatives of labour and labouring men, generally, recognize the fact that pension schemes, provident fund arrangements and relief associations, inaugurated, fostered and maintained by railroad companies or large employers of labour, without the employees co-operative sanction to the formation of such concerns are usually found to be nothing more or less than a pre-arranged and contemplated outlay or investment on the part of the employer to test the loyalty of the men to themselves, as individuals, and to each other, in the event of just such trying negotiations as preceded the strike of July 18 last.

Organizations of labour in train and yard service have not considered it as a part of their legitimate sphere of effort to make representation to railroad companies or railroad officials as to the basis upon which pension allowances should be inaugurated or maintained, and in the case of the Grand Trunk strike and settlement the question was not given serious consideration by the employees. Any action that the Grand Trunk Railway Company saw fit to take in reference to the pension rights of employees prior to the Grand Trunk strike, they had an absolute right to take and maintain, and they are apparently disposed to exercise the same rights and privileges which they formerly enjoyed in this respect.

From every consistent and logical standpoint upon which the question of pension might be considered, it should surely be recognized that the mere fact of an employee leaving the service for a period of two weeks and thereby breaking a continued service of many years should not be sufficient to debar him from all rights to a pension fund, if that pension fund had been inaugurated and was maintained for the purpose of conserving in old age the rights of an employee who had given to the company many years of faithful service.

The Grand Trunk Railway Company's present attitude demonstrates conclusively that the estimate placed on the average railway company's pension fund has been well founded.

And now comes the conclusion, and it is to this in particular that I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite.

In conclusion, I would suggest that the present attitude of Grand Trunk officials who have violated indiscriminately the first two articles of the terms of settlement is deplorable, but if I might be permitted to do so, I would suggest that some of the hon. gentlemen at Ottawa who are taking such an apparently deep interest in this situation, are, to use the expression attributed to you on page 3480 of 'Hansard,' under date of February 10, 'barking up the wrong tree.'

The agreement made when the strike was called off was under the circumstances equitable, and amply sufficient to conserve the rights and interests of all concerned, public, employer and employee. The deplorable conditions that have existed and that exist at the present time are wholly and solely chargeable to Grand Trunk officials disregard for contract obligations except as expediency suggests.

I trust that the information given above will be looked upon as satisfactorily answering the questions asked in your letter of February 7, at least to some extent.

In conclusion, it might not be amiss for me to advise you in case that I should be looked upon as politically biased, that I was raised in a family Liberal in politics always, but that I have personally voted for the past 18 years as opportunity afforded with the Conservative party. I believe, however, in giving credit where credit is due, and have been deeply disappointed to find that many eminent gentlemen like yourself are apparently disposed to place the responsibility for the failure of Grand Trunk officials to carry out their agreement on the shoulders of some one else.

I remain, very truly yours,

JAMES MURDOCK,
Vice-president B. of R. T.

In view of these several communications which speak for themselves it is not necessary for me to add anything further. It has been shown pretty conclusively that my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) has no ground for the charges he makes in this amendment. It has been proven that as a matter of fact instead of being deserving of criticism and blame on the occasions to which he refers, the government is entitled to credit. If my hon. friend will consider the matter fairly, and if he will consider what is more important, namely, the significance of the discussion of labour matters in this House, he will, I believe, feel that it is at least due to the present situation that he should withdraw this amendemnt. I can say with confidence to hon. gentlemen opposite that in administering the Department of Labour I have tried as between labour and capital to be absolutely impartial; I have tried above everything else to keep the labour movement and labour questions out of party politics altogether, and I think hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will agree that such is the only attitude that can

properly be taken if the cause of industrial peace is to be effectively furthered. Any attempt to make party capital or other capital out of an industrial situation is an extremely dangerous thing. In dealing with these labour questions and the strife between capital and labour you are dealing with a two-edged sword, and as these conflicts are likely to continue and to become more gigantic as the years go on, the only attitude which can in the long run be of service to working men or to capital is that the parliament of Canada should stand for the people of this country as a whole, see that fair play and justice are maintained as between the different parties and that no fear or favour be shown to one side or the other.

Mr. OLIVER J. WILCOX (North Essex). As a number of my constituents are interested in the question now before the House I desire to make a remark or two. I entirely concur in the motion presented by my hon. friend from East Hastings. I believe that the men have not been properly treated by the Grand Trunk Railway Company; I believe that the men have been deceived as a result of the agreement arrived at. In the city of Windsor which is one of the terminals of the Grand Trunk, out of 12 conductors who went out on strike one has returned to work and 11 are still without their positions. I know, as a matter of fact that not one of those men is guilty of acts of violence or disorderly conduct. I do not criticise the Minister of Labour for endeavouring to bring about a settlement between the men and the company; I think that was the proper thing for him to do, as I understand that the Department of Labour was created to assist the great toiling masses of this country in just such cases as this. Now, clause 1 of this agreement which was arrived at when my hon. friend went to Montreal at the request of the men, provides as follows:

> The company will put back as soon as possible the men other than those who have been or may be found guilty of acts of violence or disorderly conduct, the understanding being that there is to be no coercion or intimidation used towards the new men.

The minister knew that under the provisions of that clause the men had absolutely no assurance that they would be given their positions in any definite time. The minister was quite willing that the men should accept that provision, which they refused to do. In a telegram dated Ottawa, 2nd of August, and addressed to S. N. Berry, vice-president of the Order of Railway Conductors, Windsor hotel, Montreal, the minister said:

> Mr. Hays has given Sir Frederick Borden and myself an undertaking that the men will within three months from this date be taken back into service, and within that time be placed in their former positions.

I had occasion about that time to meet about 300 of the men from Detroit and Windsor who met in the city of Windsor. They had nothing but words of praise for the minister up to that time for the part which he and the government had taken in this matter; but it is because he failed to see that the provisions of the agreement were carried into effect that they complain to-day. The minister has quoted a number of resolutions of boards of trade and communications from representatives of the men, all of which were addressed to him before the three months had expired within which the men were to be taken back to work. The 'Labour Gazette' makes this statement:

> A strike of the employees of the Grand Trunk railway system in train and yard services occurred on the evening of July 18, at 9.30 o'clock, as the result of a failure on the part of the employees concerned to agree with the company upon the rates of wages and rules which should govern their employment. The strike in question continued from the date above mentioned until the evening of August 2, at 7 o'clock, when it was announced that through government intervention terms of settlement had been agreed upon, as a result of which the strike was at once declared off and the employees again reported for duty.

The fact is that the men had a just cause to strike, and I believe the public sentiment of this country was with the men.

> From the reports in question it appeared that the demand which was presented to the Grand Trunk Railway Company in January, 1910, for a new schedule of agreement with the employees in train and yard services, was part of a general move by the railway conductors, baggagemen, brakemen and yardmen to secure the adoption of standard rates of pay and rules of employment obtaining on the principal railway systems of the eastern states, and of eastern Canada.

It would seem reasonable that the Grand Trunk railway employees would expect the same rates of wages as those of the Canadian Pacific railway. It would be reasonable to assume that a man engaged as a conductor or a brakeman or in any other position upon the Grand Trunk railway system should be entitled to the same rates of pay as a man in a similar position on the Canadian Pacific railway; and the men formally made their complaint to the company asking for a standardized scale of wages, and Mr. Hays refused it, on the ground that the earnings of the road should be standardized before the company could pay similar wages. He also stated that at some future time he might be able to pay the employees of the Grand Trunk system the same rates of wages as the Canadian

Pacific railway paid. The third reason given was this:

The management will pay the same standard of wages as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as soon as the Grand Trunk Railway Company, through its relation with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, is in a position to participate in the higher rates obtaining on traffic in the Northwest, by reason of the completion of that road and the obtaining of through rail connections between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, which should be accomplished within two years.

I have always had the idea that the object of the government of Canada in constructing the Grand Trunk Pacific railway was to cheapen the rates of this country. It was to be a road which would be in competition with other roads in Canada and for that reason would be the means of lessening the rates. So I do not think either the men or the government or the public of Canada or any one else, took that reason very seriously. I can tell the minister that there are employees in the city of Windsor who have not yet received the positions to which they are entitled under the terms of the agreement which was entered into with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and which provided that they were to be taken back in three months. It was through their trust in the honour of the Department of Labour that the men were willing to accept that condition; but I am of opinion that in that agreement the minister ran up the white flag, that he did not stand by the men. The voice was the voice of Jacob, but the hand was the hand of Esau. The men were looking for bread, but the minister handed them a stone. To-day they have not their positions, and it seems to me that they are justified in taking the position they do, in condemning the minister and his department for not giving to them that service which they had a right to expect from those supposed to be working in their interests.

Amendment (Mr. Northrup) negatived on division.

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

SUPPLY.

Maintenance and repair to government steamers and ice-breakers, $1,000,000.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The amount voted last year was $710,000, and the amount asked for next year is $1,000,000, but this is really not an increase in the expenditure, but results from our intention to pay under this vote a number of amounts which were last year charged to other accounts. We had in the service paid under this vote 11 ships, namely, the 'Aberdeen' the 'Champlain,' the 'Druid,' the 'Earl Grey,' the 'Lady Laurier,' the 'Lansdowne,' the 'Minto,' the 'Montcalm,' the 'Nelson,' the 'Quadra' and the 'Stanley.' Besides these there are several which were paid out of other votes. Let me give a list:

The 'Brandt'	$ 8,466 99
The 'Rouville'	11,950 89
The 'Frontenac,' charged to the St. Lawrence service	19,119 99
The 'Lambton,' paid out of construction	9,213 62
The 'Maisonneuve,' out of maintenance	8,745 64
The 'Newington'	25,641 75
The 'Reserve'	8,139 79
The 'Scout'	12,577 73
The 'Simcoe'	23,440 00
The 'Shamrock'	10,247 35
The 'Verchères,' paid out of construction	8,925 98
The 'Montmagny'	25,000 00
The 'Lady Grey,' out of the St. Lawrence service	60,000 00

Mr. CROSBY. The appropriations will, I suppose, be that much less this year in these other votes?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. How many boats have been in commission this year on the Nova Scotia coast, and what have they been doing? I understood that one of them at least would patrol the coast of Nova Scotia, which would be considerable advantage to the fishermen along that coast in their winter fishing; but I may have been mistaken. If one of these boats were to patrol the coast between Halifax and Canso that would be a great encouragement to our fishermen in the winter season. It will not suffice to have the boat remain in harbour until called for, because she might then very often be too late to be of any use. I would therefore urge on the government to have one of those boats set apart to patrol the coast in order to take care of our fisheries. It is a very rough coast. These boats are comfortable, well manned, well fitted for that purpose. If some were kept in commission it would be a great advantage to our fishermen. I have seen it stated that the United States have ten of their revenue boats patrolling their Atlantic coast during the winter, and in this connection a statement was published showing the number of lives and the amount of property saved by this service. I regret I have not these facts under my hand at the present time. If some such a service were established on our own coast our fishermen would carry on their work with much less danger and with much greater confidence.

Mr. BRODEUR. Some years ago, we had only one boat carrying on the lighthouse and buoy service at Halifax, but of late

we have had two, the 'Lady Laurier' and the 'Aberdeen.' Last fall, however, the 'Aberdeen' had to undergo some repairs to her boilers, and a new boat, the 'Montmagny,' was brought down from Quebec to replace her during the winter. This is a very strong and well equipped boat, and I think it must be giving satisfaction. These boats look after the lighthouse and buoy service primarily; but they have general instructions also to render assistance to the fishermen in case of dangerous storms. Besides, we have a small boat known as 'The 33' which was at Canso. A very serious storm prevailed there for some days, and it was feared that some of the fishermen who had left for the Banks might be overtaken. No loss of life occurred, but it was thought well that we should provide for a similar case, and so we kept 'The 33' in commission.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I desire, on behalf of my constituents, to thank the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the prompt way in which he responded to the call made by myself last fall that 'The 33' should be put on the service at Canso. The winter fishing has not been very extensively carried on in Nova Scotia, but it has been carried on to some extent for some years past. It is one of the most profitable branches of our fishery, for prices are good at that season and the haddock are on the coast. It was dangerous, however, because of the sudden squalls and snowstorms that arise in November and December, and even later. On the 6th of January last year, a serious situation was found to have arisen as a result of which a few of the fishermen lost their lives off Canso and Whitehead in one of these sudden squalls. A number of the boats were driven out to sea. But the marine department fitted out their boats at Halifax, and these scoured the water for two or three days and picked up most of the boats. These were in a sinking condition with ice and helpless. But, by the prompt services afforded by the department from Halifax, the lives of most of the men were saved. At the commencement of this season, the request was made of the department to provide protection by keeping a boat under steam and ready in case of sudden storm to go to the fishing grounds and help the fleet there. 'The 33' did that work during the past year and did it well, on two or three occasions, I am glad to say, rendering good assistance. The vessels engaged in the fishery protection service might very well be employed in this way during winter where winter fishing is carried on. It would give the men a great deal more confidence to go out into these dangerous waters so that they would go out on many days when they would not go without this protection. Most of these vessels are partly idle, and some of them entirely out of commission during the winter; but I believe that some of the officers are under pay, and so it would not cost a great deal of money to keep them in commission at certain ports on the coast where winter fishing is carried on. I hope the winter fishing will increase, and that it will be established at various places on the coast. In that case, this protection would be very important. I understand that similar service has been afforded in the United States during the past two or three years with good results in rescuing vessels in distress on the stormy coast of the New England States. This work could be done on the coast of Canada, especially the Atlantic coast, not only for the benefit of the fishermen, but for the coasters. I only rose mainly to thank the minister for the prompt way in which the department responded to the request of the fishermen of Canso last year, and I trust that the policy of the department will be to continue this work.

Mr. CROSBY. There is no doubt that whenever an application is made to the department, they have been very prompt in sending assistance to fishermen. I have not a word of complaint to utter on that point. On the western part of the coast of Nova Scotia, that is, Halifax and west of Halifax, the craft that go fishing are better equipped, more of the schooner rig, better prepared to take care of themselves, than the vessels that fish from points east of Halifax, particularly from my hon. friend's (Mr. Sinclair's) riding. I have not a word to say with regard to the promptness of the Marine and Fisheries boats in getting out, they are always ready and anxious to be of help, but I believe the time has come in the interest of the fishing industry, which is increasing rapidly and becoming very profitable, that such a patrol as has been suggested should be maintained. The boats employed in the industry are not of a class to withstand a heavy sea or to remain long in the open. The establishment of a patrol system would not cost a great deal, and as the member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) stated, the additional cost would be slight compared with the encouragement to the fishermen. As the coast is a dangerous one, good comfortable boats should be employed for patrol purposes, and I urge on the minister to try and establish such a system during the next season.

Mr. BRODEUR. Some time ago we were informed that some fishing vessels had been caught in the ice in Lunenburg harbour. We immediately despatched the 'Stanley' to break the ice to release them in order that they might carry on their work. They were released, but it cost the government something as the 'Stanley' met with an accident. I thank my hon. friend for his expressions with regard to the wish of the department to do all in their power

to help the fishermen. That has always been our policy and we will continue to do everything in our power.

Mr. JAMESON. Would the minister state what has been done to improve the life saving service in the Bay of Fundy?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have now two boats there instead of one, the 'Stanley' and the 'Lansdowne.' They are attached to the port of St. John, but they have instructions to place themselves at the disposal of the fishermen anywhere when required for their protection.

Mr. JAMESON. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) said that a request he made to the minister last year received prompt attention and I have no doubt the suggestion I am about to make will be similarly treated. Winter fishing has been prosecuted in the Bay of Fundy for many years, many people are interested and high class boats are used in carrying on this very valuable industry. Although the boats are of a high class, it is impossible to guard against the perils of the sea, and in a number of cases recently, fishermen have been blown off the shore and have experienced great hardships attended in one or two instances with loss of life. I would suggest to the minister that as he has two of these ships in St. John, it would be advisable to transfer one across the bay to the eastern side and to station her at Digby where she would be available on short notice to the fishermen of Annapolis, Digby and Yarmouth counties. In that way a great deal of valuable time would be saved. With the boat at St. John it would be necessary to telegraph to that port and there would be considerable delay before she would reach the scene of the disaster. We cannot overestimate the courage and endurance of the men prosecuting the winter fisheries; it is practically their only means of securing a livelihood, and they have to battle against great hardships and difficulties and are to-day doing a very flourishing business. The ship could be safely accommodated at Digby as the port is open the year round, and it would not cost more than to maintain the ship at St. John.

Mr. BRODEUR. The two ships now in St. John are supposed to be attached mainly to the New Brunswick side. Unfortunately, I find that there has been a system in the department for many years by which the Bay of Fundy is divided into two parts for the lighthouse and buoy service. The Nova Scotia side is supposed to be kept up by the vessels from Halifax and the New Brunswick side by the vessels located at St. John. The department is considering the question whether it would not be advisable to put the Bay of Fundy entirely under the control of the St. John division. The control of the western part of Nova Scotia, and the eastern part of that province will be looked after by the boats located at Halifax. We have always divided the lighthouses situated on the Nova Scotia side from those on the New Brunswick side and we have had them looked after by the boats from Halifax. Of course, that is a drawback from the departmental point of view and if the committee should be of opinion that it would be better to re-divide the agencies it would be in accordance with the views which I hold. I do not know that there will be any feeling against it in the different provinces. I do not know what the people in Halifax would say if we should give the supervision of the lighthouse on the Nova Scotia side to the agency in New Brunswick. If that could be done it would, to a great extent, meet the views which have been expressed by the hon. member for Digby.

Mr. JAMESON. I cannot see what difficulty the minister would have to face. The fact that the agency at Halifax has been in control of certain work in the Bay of Fundy on the Nova Scotia side would seem to indicate a system which it would be better to get away from. Halifax is very remote from the Bay of Fundy as compared with St. John. St. John and Digby are both on the Bay of Fundy facing each other and ships from these ports will be able to cover the bay very expeditiously. I do not wish to refer to any matter which will suggest an unpleasant reminiscence but I remember that when the question with regard to the loss of the 'Hestia' was up the St. John agency had charge of the ships and there was considerable loss of time. I am sure that if one of these vessels had been stationed at Digby a great deal of time would have been saved. I think the minister will find he will be able to accomplish very admirably the work which he has in hand by making the change that I suggest. I hope the minister will take it into his serious consideration and that it will not be lost sight of because sometimes these matters which are brought up in the House, although they are very favourably received at the time, if we do not get a very solid expression from the minister, are apt to be side-tracked later on. We have not on this side of the House the same advantage that hon. gentlemen have who occupy seats on the other side with regard to approaching ministers. The only opportunity we have to approach a minister is on a formal occasion like this when estimates are up, or when we bring some matter up in the House, and we have to

depend on the statement which the minister makes rather than upon any political pull or influence as supporters of the government. If the minister desires to improve the efficiency of the department there should be no reason why this suggestion should not be carried out.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have an agency in New Brunswick which controls the Bay of Fundy on the New Brunswick side and also looks after the lights and buoys on the north shore of New Brunswick. It is very far away and it is very difficult to carry out the work we have to do there. If we came to an arrangement such as that suggested we would, of course, have to transfer the supervision of the lights on the north shore of New Brunswick to the agency in Prince Edward Island. The agent in Prince Edward Island has charge of the lights in Northumberland strait on the island side, and he might more easily look after the lights on the New Brunswick side than the agent at St. John. As to the question of the Bay of Fundy, I am very glad that my hon. friend seems to agree with the views that I have expressed as to the possibility of putting the whole of the Bay of Fundy under the agency of St. John. If that meets with the general approval of the committee I would be very glad to take it into my serious consideration. My hon. friend says that this is the only occasion when hon. members can approach the minister. Let me tell him that the minister is always open to conviction and open to representation in every case and that all the members of the House will always be welcome to discuss with him public questions and especially any question which appertains to the administration of the department with which he is now concerned.

Mr. JAMESON. I am glad to hear it. Will the minister just say what committee he refers to when he speaks of the committee consenting to this?

Mr. BRODEUR. This committee.

Mr. JAMESON. I do not think there is any trouble here.

Mr. CROSBY. If I understand my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson), his desire is to have a boat placed at Digby during the winter season?

Mr. JAMESON. Yes, that is it.

Mr. CROSBY. I do not know that it will be an advantage to take the supervision of the lighthouses of Nova Scotia from the agency at Halifax and place the supervision of the whole of the western part of the province under the agency of St. John. My hon. friend wants to get a boat at Digby and no doubt he would like to have it come from St. John. I do not think it would make any difference to him whether it came from Halifax or St. John during the winter season. It would be of no advantage to Digby if the supervision of the western part of Nova Scotia were placed under the agency at St. John, if they did not send a boat over to Digby. I apprehend no difficulty about the whole of Nova Scotia being fairly well looked after from the port of Halifax. There is no place in the Dominion where the Department of Marine and Fisheries has more accommodation than in Halifax and it does not cost very much either. There can be no reason to suggest that Digby would be any better off by the fact of the agency for the western part of Nova Scotia being transferred from Halifax to St. John if they did not get a boat at Digby. I quite agree with my hon. friend that it would be well if the minister could see his way clear to place a boat at Digby because quite a large fishing business is done there. Its geographical situation is rather peculiar and sometimes in the great Bay of Fundy there are difficulties to overcome. These boats are always ready to render any assistance in the saving of life and property and it would be a great advantage to have one of them at Digby during the winter. I think the minister should consider how he could meet the views of my hon. friend from Digby whose request would also apply to the counties of Annapolis and Yarmouth, the county of Yarmouth being a very important one in the fishing business. I think that the placing of a boat at Digby during the winter season would meet the desire of my hon. friend from Digby.

Mr. JAMESON. Yes, it is a central point.

Mr. CROSBY. Therefore, I do not think there would be any great necessity for changing the agency at all.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think my hon. friend will admit that the lighthouses on the Bay of Fundy can be better looked after from St. John than Halifax.

Mr. CROSBY. I would not like to admit that without consideration. The coal is purchased from the Dominion Coal Company, and there is no place where you can get your supplies so easily as in Halifax, and no place so pleasant to come to and to remain in. Before the minister makes a change of that kind I would like him to take into serious consideration the disadvantage it would be to those who have been furnishing supplies for years. It seems to me that the demand made by the hon. member for Digby might be endorsed by the hon. members for Annapolis and Yarmouth. I can see no reason why, in the

winter time, a boat should not be placed in the vicinity of Digby to render aid to shipping that might require it. I am quite sure that if the Halifax agency has a spare boat she would cheerfully be sent to Digby for the winter season.

Mr. BRODEUR. The department has not reached a decision with regard to the change, and I was simply wishing to get an expression from the committee with regard to it. I will take into serious consideration what the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) has said.

Mr. JAMESON. I hope the minister does not lose sight of what I consider to be the chief point in this matter. I am not interested, as my hon. friend from Halifax is, in the maintenance of the agency there in its present status, but I am very much interested in seeing that one of the two vessels now at St. John should be placed at Digby. I mention Digby because it is a central point, lying between the counties of Yarmouth and Annapolis, which are largely interested in fishing. Digby has an excellent harbour and a vessel located there would be available for the needs of shipping in these counties. In the Bay of Fundy shipping is increasing, and the aids to navigation are increasing in importance and number, and we hope to see St. John one of the great national ports. I do not think that the status of the agency at Halifax or at St. John would be at all altered by stationing one of the boats at Digby, and my only wish to-night is to have an expression of opinion from the minister on that point regardless of whether he is to change the agency at St. John or Halifax in a minor way. I am not concerned at this moment with the convenience or profit of gentlemen living on shore. My concern is for the safety, welfare and comfort of those engaged in fishing and shipping on the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. BRODEUR. These two ships are mainly devoted to the lighthouse and buoy service on the New Brunswick side of the Bay of Fundy down as far as Grand Manan. They must be located at St. John for the present. Digby is connected with the Halifax agency, and those two boats are under the control of the St. John agency. When we come to the consideration of the question of dividing the agencies the suggestion made by my hon. friend (Mr. Jameson) will be considered.

Mr. JAMESON. Are we to conclude from the remarks of the minister that if it is not possible for him to make some such change as he suggests it will not be possible to place one of these boats at Digby? The hon. member for Guysborough was pleased to say that the minister had acceded cheerfully and promptly to a request he made last winter for a vessel for the purpose of assisting in saving life and property when such assistance was needed. I made a similar request to the minister on behalf of the fishermen of western Nova Scotia and the Bay of Fundy. If the minister can not have one of the vessels at St. John transferred to Digby will he make provision that some other vessel should be placed there? The hon. member (Mr. Crosby) has suggested that a boat for this service might be found at Halifax, and while I do not know how many boats are available there, yet, as the Bay of Fundy portion of Nova Scotia is under control of the Halifax agency the minister might be able to supply the needs of the people from that point. I appeal to the minister to have a boat stationed at Digby during the winter season so that the fishermen on that coast may have reasonable assurance that in the event of an accident they will at least have a chance for their lives.

Mr. BRODEUR. The situation on the Bay of Fundy is not the same as at Canso. On the Bay of Fundy, as my hon. friend is aware, we had formerly only one boat. We have two now; so that if anything should happen to the fishermen there, it would be only necessary to acquaint the agency at St. John of the fact, and these boats would be available. While they are primarily for the buoy and lighthouse service, they have instructions also to look after the protection of the fishermen. As St. John is not very far from Digby, I do not think there is the same difficulty there that there is at Canso, which is so distant from Halifax that it was considered advisable that a small boat should be placed there. If I saw the same necessity of placing a boat at Digby, I would certainly do it immediately; but in view of the fact that on the opposite side of the bay there are two boats which can be called upon at a moment's notice, I think the fishermen operating in the vicinity of Digby are sufficiently protected.

Mr. JAMESON. How many boats are at Halifax?

Mr. BRODEUR. Two.

Mr. JAMESON. As I feared at the outset, I am afraid the minister does not take very kindly to the suggestion I made, and it is perhaps as well that we should understand where we are in this matter. I do not agree with the minister that the fishermen on the Nova Scotia side of the Bay of Fundy are sufficiently protected by the boats at St. John, which is 45 miles from Digby. I do not know that these boats steam over nine knots an hour, and would mean several hours delay, and every person familiar with the conditions of fishing in the Bay of Fundy knows that such a delay might mean the loss of the lives of the people exposed to danger. The minis-

ter knows that the Bay of Fundy is a very tempestuous piece of water, and I would earnestly urge him to have one boat stationed on the Nova Scotia side of the bay if he can do so without disarranging the service of the very important branch which these boats are supposed to look after. I do not think the people of this country are concerned about the expenditure of a few dollars or a few thousand dollars when it comes to the saving of the lives of the inhabitants of this country. I believe that our fishermen are worthy of every care and attention that the government can bestow upon them. It is the duty of the department, apart altogether from the convenience of the service, to render these people all the assistance they can, and not to be niggardly in the matter of expenditure for keeping up boats for life-saving purposes. I cannot urge this too strongly on the minister. In view of the fact that he has made provision for the eastern part of the province, and the fact that he has two boats at St. John and two at Halifax, I think he might under the circumstances furnish one for the Nova Scotia side of the Bay of Fundy where there is more winter fishing than in all the rest of Nova Scotia. I thought this matter should be placed before the committee, and I trust that the minister will be able to comply with the request that I have made.

Examination of masters and mates, $11,400.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote provides for the maintenance of a staff of examiners for the holding of examinations for masters and mates at various points throughout the Dominion. The amount to be voted this year is the same as that of last year.

Mr. CROSBY. I notice in the Auditor General's Report that a very small amount is paid to the examiner at Halifax. As we have now a technical college there, the Dominion government might provide a substantial amount for an examiner and a teacher in that college. I have no doubt that a good arrangement could be made with the local legislature. I have always thought that the Dominion government should pay at least 25 per cent of the upkeep of those technical colleges, for the reason that navigatioin is a branch of education in which the Dominion government should be particularly interested. I do not think there is anybody in Halifax at present teaching navigation.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is one in the technical college.

Mr. CROSBY. Is the Dominion government making any arrangement to assist that teaching?

Mr. BRODEUR. The same education will be given at the naval college.

Mr. CROSBY. You may teach seamanship without teaching navigation, but if you are going to teach navigation at the naval college, that would obviate the difficulty.

Mr. BRODEUR. The training that is going to be given at the naval college will give an opportunity to the young men there to become educated in everything that they may require later on, after they have finished their service, if they should want to join the mercantile marine. It happens very often in England, and I suppose will happen here also. Outside of that, it is proposed to provide for schools of navigation at certain places for the purpose of giving lectures to masters and mates. We have not got as many masters and mates as we should have.

Mr. CROSBY. I do not know that the merchant marine men are taught in the navy schools in Britain. Am I to understand that a man serving on board a merchant ship may apply to the naval college and be educated there?

Mr. BRODEUR. He would have to enter as a cadet.

Mr. CROSBY. My hon. friend knows well that the mates on merchant marine ships, and those who aspire to be captains would not be satisfied to enter a naval college as cadets. What is required is some means by which our marine men may be educated in that line of navigation.

Rewards saving life, including life saving stations, $96,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is an increase of $56,000 in this item for the purposes of building some new life saving stations. We intend to build several new stations, which will cost $19,000. Then we are asking for $25,000 for motor boats and for the purpose of putting motor engines into some of our existing boats. The estimated price of a motor is $720. We are including in this vote the sum of $12,000 for the upkeep of the St. Paul and Sable Island stations, which are really life saving stations. These were formerly paid out of the vote for maintenance.

Mr. CROSBY. Where will the new stations be?

Mr. BRODEUR. At Victoria Beach, Nova Scotia, Grosse Isle, Magdalen Islands, Wolfe Island, Parkers Cove, Amherst, Cranberry head and Mud Island. It may be found advisable, when the commander has made his report, to make some changes.

Mr. CROSBY. How far apart are Victoria Beach and Parkers Cove?

Mr. BRODEUR. Ten miles.

Mr. JAMESON. I would suggest that there should be another station further

down on Digby Neck or that the minister should take one of those proposed motor boats and put it down there. I think there is a station at Westport, and a long stretch of 45 miles to Victoria Beach. It is but 10 miles to Parkers Cove from Victoria Beach, so that there is an inequality there. If it be desirable to have a continuity of service covering the whole coast, better make a more equitable distribution. There is a place called Centreville about 15 miles below Victoria Beach, which would make it about midway between Westport and Parkers Cove. It might be possible to get some place which would suit better, but I think Centreville would be very suitable. Only a few months ago some fishermen were blown out from there clear across the Bay of Fundy to the New Brunswick coast, and were rescued only when in the last stages of exhaustion. A year or two ago several men were drowned near there simply because life saving appliances were not at hand. If the minister is going to put up these stations along the coast, he should do so with some regard to uniformity so that the coast will be covered and the fishermen given a fair degree of protection. It will not do to have life-saving stations within 10 miles of each other and then have a long stretch of 45 miles without any protection.

Mr. BRODEUR. We are not absolutely committed to these particular places, and I shall not fail to call attention of Commander Thompson to the representations made by my hon. friend.

Expenses of schools of navigation, $8,000.

Mr. CROSBY. I would like to have the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) take into consideration means of establishing at some central place in Nova Scotia, say Halifax, as I suggested before, a technical college, an institution in which our men could be educated in navigation.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have a school at Halifax. In fact, we maintain schools at Halifax, Yarmouth, Canso, North Sydney, Midland, Collingwood, Vancouver and Victoria. It is proposed also to establish schools at Lunenburg, St. John, Canso, Quebec, Montreal, Kingston and Toronto. These, with the ones already established, will bring the expenses of salaries up to $3,500. Capt. Lugard is in charge at Halifax.

Mr. CROSBY. What salary does he receive?

Mr. BRODEUR. For taking charge of the school, $250; but as my hon. friend knows, he is also examiner of masters and mates and takes charge of the investigation into wrecks. My hon. friend is aware that he is an absolutely well qualified man to take charge of this school.

Mr. CROSBY. Oh, yes. I have not a word to say against Capt. Lugard. But I think the school is not being carried on as well as it might be. That is not finding fault with Capt. Lugard, because he is not given sufficient salary to enable him to keep the school. Besides, he has to make examinations all over the province, I think?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. That is the reason I suggested something more. As the minister is aware, we are looking for masters and mates for our mercantile marine, and means should be taken to encourage young men to receive an education. I suggest that some one else should be appointed to help Capt. Lugard so that the work may go on even while he is absent. I am glad that schools are to be established at Lunenburg and Canso. Nevertheless, I think there should be a technical school at Halifax so that men can receive a thorough education to fit them to take charge of any kind of ship in any part of the world.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is in charge of the school at Collingwood?

Mr. BRODEUR. George C. Coles.

Mr. JAMESON. Last year, when a similar item was before the committee, I drew the attention of the minister to the desirability of establishing one of these schools of navigation at Digby. I pointed out that there were a number of young men, very estimable young men, who would like the opportunity of taking a course in navigation, but had not the means to leave home and take up residence in Yarmouth for that purpose. The minister will see that imposes considerable expense on a young man to leave home and locate in a town 70 or 80 miles distant where he must pay his living expenses while he takes his educational course. I see by the report of the Auditor General that the expenses of these schools of navigation last year amounted to $1,828.58. I think the minister took a vote of $8,000 last year for this purpose. Seeing that the committee and parliament were so generous to the minister, and seeing that there is such crying need for the extension of the system, I do not see why so little was done as to call for only this small expenditure. The minister said last year that he would take into consideration the suggestion I made to open a school of navigation at the port of Digby. It would seem that he did not find a special reason for opening that school. Did he ask for any report as to the necessity of the case, or was the matter simply overlooked?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is true, I am sorry to say, the people have not taken advantage of these schools as quickly as I thought they would. I am very anxious to have these schools established in different parts of the country. But the difficulty we experience is to find men to give these lectures. I do not know whether there is anybody in Digby whom we could secure. I will give the matter most earnest consideration, and will see to it that Digby is not forgotten.

Mr. CROSBY. I believe there are a number of competent men who could be got at Halifax, Lunenburg, and all over the province. But these men cannot be secured for a few dollars. I see that the minister has been running this part of his department very carefully—I do not say that he is not running the rest in the same way, but I think that a little money spent on these schools would be a great advantage. As I have said, we find it difficult to get masters and mates. Very often we have vessels in Halifax for whom it is very difficult to get men with certificates. If the minister will take the matter up and not be too careful in the expenditure, I think he could succeed. I think parliament would be better pleased to have this $8,000 spent than to have so much of it remain in the public treasury while we know that not as much is being accomplished as should be accomplished.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not our fault. The people do not seem to take advantage of these schools. Let me give an instance. Lately I tried to open a school in Montreal, but, though that is so large a centre, only two or three came to attend the course which was given there. We are trying to popularize the system we have introduced in respect to these courses of navigation, and I would be glad if the members would take up the question in their constituencies, and in every case where it is found there are people willing to follow the courses I would be glad to spend the money necessary to establish them.

Mr. CROSBY. I would be glad at any time to assist the minister at any time in that way. I am sure that in our province we could get many men competent and willing to do the instructing although, of course, that class of work should be well paid.

Mr. JAMESON. How often are the lessons given and how many students would be necessary for the establishment of a class?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no fixed number of students or number of lessons. The lecturer goes to a place, advertises the lectures, we pay the rent of the room and supply the necessary instruments and the students go there to hear the lectures. Generally the lecturer stays in each place about three months, after which time it is expected that those who have been following the courses, will be sufficiently qualified to pass their examination as mates or masters. The lectures are given about three times a week.

Mr. JAMESON. How many would be necessary for the opening of a school?

Mr. BRODEUR. We are not very particular in that respect. If there are five or ten people we would be glad to send a lecturer. If my hon. friend thinks that he can in Digby get ten men I will take the necessary steps to send a man there.

Mr. SPROULE. Were lectures given in Collingwood last year?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How much money is paid to each lecturer?

Mr. BRODEUR. $250.

Mr. JAMESON. I do not want the minister to set a pace that we cannot live up to in the small towns. He told us if there were 5 or 10 students he would be willing to open a school. I cannot guarantee him that there will be ten or nine in Digby, but if he would place the number of students at 5 to start, I think there would be no difficulty in getting that number at Digby and increasing the number as time went on. Of course if after the school was started, there were not enough students to make it worth while continuing it, it could easily be dropped. As only $2,000 were spent last year out of a vote of $8,000, it would be well, where a few could be got together, to afford them an opportunity of hearing the lectures.

Mr. BRODEUR. I expect that in such a town as Digby, we would have not far from ten students. I shall report these facts to the captain in charge of the School for Navigation and urge upon him the advisability of putting Digby on the list of places where schools are maintained.

Registration of shipping, $2,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is required to pay the expense of keeping a complete list of all vessels registered in Canada.

Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, $20,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is required to remove any wrecks or obstructions found in navigable waters. Immediately after a wreck is reported we bring the matter to the attention of the owner of the vessel and he is called on to remove the wreck. If he does not, we call for tenders and

give the contract for the removal to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. CROSBY. It seems unfair that the Canadian owner who loses his vessel in a position where she is an obstruction to navigation, should be compelled to pay for her removal, while a foreign owner under similar circumstances is not required to do so, the department bearing the cost of removal. If a foreigner comes into our waters and by some accident loses his vessel and it becomes an obstruction to navigation, the Department of Marine and Fisheries has to remove it and there is no way of making him pay a cent, whereas, if the vessel owner is living in Canada, the department may go to him and say: You must remove this vessel or we will remove it and charge you for it. I do not think that is a very good law, and I think that both should be put on the same footing. The man who owns a ship in Canada should not be compelled to pay for the removal of the obstruction when the foreigner cannot be compelled to assume that responsibility.

Mr. BRODEUR. The expense which is incurred for the removal of a vessel is taken from the wreck itself, if an obstruction to navigation is caused by the presence of the wrecked vessel, a claim is made upon the vessel itself so that in that case foreigners are on the same footing as Canadians are. If a foreigner should come into this country we might collect from him, but in most cases we succeeded in having wrecks removed by paying a very small sum provided the wreck becomes the property of the man who removes it. We had a law passed last year for the purpose of giving greater power than we had before and which will have the effect of saving the department a considerable expenditure that we formerly had to bear. Foreigners and Canadians are exactly on the same footing.

Mr. CROSBY. Of course, you do not interfere with a ship that is not an obstruction to navigation. There are not so very many men, foreigners or Canadians, who would leave a ship that is worth anything, if she is worth anything, they are going to sell her. It is only in cases where a ship becomes of no value whatever and is an obstruction to navigation that the department intervenes. My hon. friend knows very well that he cannot go to a United States ship owner and say: You left one of your vessels in Sydney harbour, or some other place. I want you to come back here and take her out, or I will take her out and make you pay for it. He would find it very hard to collect the money. On the other hand, if a ship is owned by a person in Canada, he may go to him and say: I want you to remove that wreck.

Mr. BRODEUR.

If the owner does not remove it, he removes it and charges the expense to the owner. Where any craft becomes an obstruction to navigation it is the duty of the Marine Department to remove it and get all they can out of it. I do not think it is fair that they should come back on the person who happens to be the registered owner. Somebody may have a mortgage or somebody may have collected the insurance while the registered owner would be the man that the Department of Marine and Fisheries would come on for the cost of removing the ship.

Winter mail service, $7,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for a boat service for carrying the mails between Prince Edward Island and the mainlands at times when the winter steamers are held up by ice and cannot make a crossing. Each boat has a coxswain and five men. There are also boat house keepers employed on both sides of the straits. The expenditure depends on the severity of the winter, and it is, therefore, necessary to provide for meeting the cost of the service. This sum has never yet been expended. I do not think that we spent over $300 last year.

Mr. JAMESON. This has been a very severe winter, and I understand this service has been in operation. My hon. friend from Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. Fraser), who is not present, would like to have something to say with respect to this item, and if the minister would reserve that right when his estimates are up for further consideration, I think he would appreciate it.

Mr. BRODEUR. He may bring up the question on any item.

Salaries and expenses of cattle inspection, $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you have this here? Does it not come under the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the purpose of looking after the inspection of cattle on ships. We have regulations providing the space which shall be given to cattle on board ship, and how they shall be fed and treated during the voyage. This service appertains to the Department of Marine and Fisheries rather than to the Department of Agriculture. This is not for the inspection of the cattle, properly speaking, but to see that there are cattle men on board, and that the regulations are carried out. We have cattle inspectors at Montreal and St. John.

Mr. SPROULE. Then this does not properly describe it because it is not to inspect cattle, but to inspect the equipment for carrying the cattle.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, that would be more proper.

To continue the subsidy for wrecking plant in Quebec, maritime provinces and British Columbia, $30,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This amount is paid for the purpose of fulfilling the contracts which we have with three companies that maintain wrecking plants—the Davie Company on the St. Lawrence, $10,000; the Dominion Coal Company at Sydney, $10,000, on the Atlantic, and the British Columbia Salvage Company on the Pacific Coast.

To provide for the maintenance of vessels employed in patrolling the waters in the northern portion of Canada, also for establishing and maintaining police and customs ports in the mainland or islands, as may be deemed necessary from time to time, $59,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Arctic,' under Captain Bernier, is engaged in this service. Captain Bernier's instructions were to try and make the northwest passage and before he left he expressed the belief that he would be successful. He will go to the mouth of the Mackenzie river, where it is supposed that American fishermen are carrying on whale-fishing operations, and he will collect fees from them.

Mr. JAMESON. Have customs ports been actually established by him in these northern waters?

Mr. BRODEUR. A customs port was established on the north shore of Hudson bay some years ago. In other cases Captain Bernier collects duty on the goods he finds in the ships and makes them take out fishing licenses.

Mr. JAMESON. What revenue has so far been derived from this service?

Mr. BRODEUR. Last year he brought back $500. It is not so much the amount of money as the assertion of Canadian authority. As there might be dispute some day about these islands being part of Canada, we thought we should assert our sovereignty.

Mr. JAMESON. No one will object to proper expenditure for the purpose of asserting the rights of Canada in these northern waters, but my reason for asking about the revenue was to enable us to determine if possible how much actual work had been done in the way of bringing poachers to account. The minister has not told us how many American vessels have been overhauled and how many fines have been imposed. I do not know that the attempt to make the northwest passage will in any way strengthen the claims of Canada in these northern waters and islands, though possibly it may. It may also be that it will jeopardize the ship and possibly the lives of the crew, but the minister will have his own opinion as to that. I am informed that Americans are conducting fishing operations in that territory and that they have in many cases evaded the 'Arctic.' Of course, whether the one ship can prosecute a voyage of discovery and at the same time be in any way seriously effective in preventing poachers is another matter.

Mr. BRODEUR. The question of making the northwest passage was left largely to Captain Bernier's own judgment. Of course it would be ridiculous for us to force him to make it if he found it was impracticable or exceedingly dangerous. It is of great importance that he should assert the rights of Canada in this northern territory.

Mr. JAMESON. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODEUR. I believe that the fact that Captain Bernier took possession of these northern islands last year in the most formal manner will in the future serve the interests of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be desirable if Captain Bernier had any authority, but that is very questionable. It is five minutes past twelve and I think it is time to adjourn.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.06 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 22, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

NEWMARKET CANAL.

*Mr. WALLACE:

1. What was expended on the Newmarket canal in 1910 and what was the estimate?
2. How much was spent on above canal during each year since the work was commenced?
3. When does the government expect to have the canal completed, what is the total estimate for such work, and what was the first estimate?
4. What is the estimate for work for this year?
5. Who are the contractors?
6. Has an estimate been made by the government as to what amount of business will be carried on by this waterway?
7. Has the government the report of an engineer with regard to the water supply? If so, will such report be furnished to members on application?
8. Has the government any petitions or letters asking that such a canal be built?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The amounts spent on the canal during the fiscal year, 1910-11 to date, are as follows:

York Construction Company's contract section No. 2	$103,110 00
Cement	16,452 45
H. B. Collier's contract for lock operating mach	7,880 00
Valve gates for head of lock	1,212 65
Engineering expenses	7,237 71
Land	Nil.
Total	$135,892 81

The amount alloted for 1910-11 for section 2, Holland River division out of appropriation for 1910-11, was $150,000. The expenditure for other items was embraced in the allotments for staff, cement, lock gate machines, &c., for the canal in general.

Contracts, &c.	1906-7.	1907-8.	1908-9.	1909-10.	1910-11 to Feb. 28, 1911.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Sec. 1, L. Sim. Dr. Co		1,680 00	785 20			2,465 20
Q. Rd. Br. D. Conroy & Sons	5,570 00	5,790 00	6,852 00			18,212 00
Dom. Br. Co	4,872 00					4,872 00
Sec. 2, York Con. Co			142,360 00	60,200 00	103,110 00	305,670 00
Ham. Br. Co			5,400 00	1,082 00		6,482 00
Lock gate mach., H. B. Collier				3,990 00	7,880 00	11,870 00
Cement Lake P. Co			5,402 30	17,906 02	16,542 45	39,760 77
Canada Cement Co. land		2,162 50	26,592 25	6,073 00		34,827 75
Valve gates					1,212 65	1,212 65
Engineering expenses	2,678 74	8,247 94	7,805 31	8,290 69	7,237 71	34,260 39
						459,832 76

3. It is expected that the canal will be completed in 1913. It is estimated that the total cost of this canal including conservation works, will be $1,100,000. The first estimate made was incomplete, and was for a canal in which wooden structures were largely employed. This estimate was based upon preliminary plans, placing the cost at $328,000.

4. The proposed allotment of the 1911-12 appropriation for section No. 1, is for $40,000, and for section No. 2, $125,000; the expenditure for cement, bridges, engineering, &c., will be about the same as last year, and will be embraced in the allotment for those items for the canal in general.

5. For section No. 2—The York Construction Company, Limited. For bridges, the Hamilton Bridge Works Company, Limited. For cement in 1910, the Canada Cement Company. For section No. 1, not under contract.

6. The records do not contain such estimate.

7. All reports, papers and petitions were laid on the table of the House in a return prepared by the department on the 4th March, 1909. There appears to be no objection to a copy of these reports being furnished members of parliament on application.

8. Yes; several petitions were received, copies of which were included in the return.

Mr. WALLACE.

OWL'S HEAD LIGHTHOUSE, N. S.

* Mr. CROSBY:

1. When is it the intention of the government to commence the construction of the Owl's Head lighthouse at Owl's Head, N.S., and when will a lightkeeper be appointed?

2. Is it the intention of the department to consult members representing the county with regard to such an appointment?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. When the necessary information has been obtained. It has been found impossible to visit the place during the winter but a report will probably be obtained early this spring and plans will thereafter be prepared. A lightkeeper will be appointed when the buildings are completed, probably next autumn.

2. The department will always be pleased to receive any representations from the members representing any county.

DARTMOUTH, N.S., INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY WHARF.

* Mr. CROSBY:

1. Has the Minister of Railways received a petition from the people of the town of Dartmouth asking for the construction of a railway wharf for the Intercolonial railway terminus at Dartmouth, to be so constructed that it may be used as a public wharf?

2. Is it the intention of the government to so construct a wharf at Dartmouth?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes, a petition was received, signed by the mayor, the Board of Trade and the business men of Dartmouth, representing the citizens generally.
2. The matter is under consideration by the department.

SCHOONER 'CRISSIE TOOMEY.'

* Mr. CROSBY:

1. When was the schooner 'Crissie Toomey' purchased by the Marine and Fisheries Department, what was she purchased for, what was the price paid, and to whom was it paid?
2. What amount of money was expended on her after she was purchased?
3. What amount has been expended on her since she was purchased up to the present date, and where is the vessel now?
4. What does the department intend to do with her during the coming summer?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. 23rd May, 1910; hydrographic survey work at Port Nelson, Hudson bay; $9,000 paid to Robert Moulton of Burgeo, Newfoundland.
2 & 3. $1,781.47; Halifax dockyard.
4. Going back to Port Nelson.

BOATS OF MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT.

* Mr. CROSBY:

1. Where have all the boats of the Marine and Fisheries Department of Nova Scotia been all winter?
2. Have they all been in commission? If not, what boats have been laid up, and what have those that have been in commission been doing?
3. What boats have been patrolling the coast this winter and what parts of the coast?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. 'Lady Laurier,' in the Halifax agency. 'Montmagny' in the Halifax agency, 'Aberdeen' in the Halifax agency until the 13th December when she was laid up for repairs.

2. All the boats have not been in commission. 'Aberdeen' laid up on the 13th December for repairs. Boats in commission were engaged as follows: 'Lady Laurier' lighthouse and buoy work in Halifax agency. 'Montmagny' lighthouse and buoy work in Halifax agency. 'Aberdeen' lighthouse and buoy work in Halifax agency until 13th December. 'Stanley' belonging to St. John agency was employed during February and part of March releasing vessels from the ice in Nova Scotian ports.

3. The steamers 'Lady Laurier' 'Montmagny' and 'Stanley,' have been moving along the Atlantic coast of Nova Scotia during the present winter. The 'Thirty Three' was kept in commission at Canso until the end of January for the purpose of being available for the relief of fishermen in cases of emergency while the haddock fishery was prosecuted.

THE 'WANDA.'

* Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. What was the length over all of the boat 'Wanda'?
2. What is the motive power, electric or steam?
3. What is the size of the engine?
4. Was the usual ship's transfer register filled in on the government form when entered at port of Brockville?
5. If register was filled in, what are the particulars?

Mr. BRODEUR:

'Tenno' formerly 'Wanda.'
1. Registered length 64 feet.
2. Steam.
3. Triple expansion. Three cylinders, 6 in, 10 in, 16 in, 9 in stroke.
4. The steamer was duly registered at Brockville on the 20th day of October, 1909.

PROPOSED ARBITRATION TREATY BETWEEN THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FOWKE:

Has the attention of the government been called to the recent speeches of Sir Edward Grey and President Taft in reference to a proposed arbitration treaty between the British Empire and the United States, and is the government prepared to express any opinion on the subject?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The attention of the government, and, it may be added, of the whole people of Canada, could not fail to be attracted to the proposition, now being discussed by Sir Edward Grey and President Taft, of a treaty of arbitration between Great Britain and the United States which would secure for them and their respective peoples the blessings of perpetual peace.

Whilst the government of Canada could have no direct voice in the negotiations, it can be safely asserted that there is no part of the British Empire where such a treaty would be more welcome than in the Dominion of Canada, which is so closely connected with the United States by geographical proximity and ever-increasing trade relations, and which is still more intimately connected with Great Britain by the strongest bonds of devoted allegiance.

LAND PATENTS.

Mr. STAPLES:

1. Has a patent been issued for S.E. ¼ of section 6, township 7, range 8, W. 1?
1. If so, to whom? If not, why not?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. No patent has been issued.

2. By order in council of the 3rd November last, authority was given for the sale of this land. No payments have yet been reported on account of such sale, and therefore no action has been taken to issue a patent.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Has the contract for the Quebec bridge been let?
2. If so, is there a fair wage clause attached to said contract? If not, why not?
3. If so, what is the minimum rate of wages for all branches of trades in connection with the erection of the bridge?
4. Is it the intention of the government to decide before the work is commenced the rate of wages to be paid per hour in the erection of same?
5. What will be the attitude of the government in case of a dispute or discontent relating to wages and hours?
6. What will the government classify as a dispute?

Mr. KING:

1. No.

2. It is proposed that a Fair Wages Clause for the adequate protection of the labour to be employed on this work shall be embodied in the contract.

3, 4 and 5. It is provided in the Fair Wages Clause which formed part of a draft contract upon which tenders were invited for this work that all mechanics, labourers and other persons who perform labour in the construction of this work shall be paid such wages as are generally accepted as current for competent workmen in the district in which the work is to be performed, and if there is no current rate in such district then a fair and reasonable rate, and shall not be required to work for longer hours than those fixed by the custom of the trade in the district where the work is to be carried on, except for the protection of life or property or in the case of other emergencies.

It is also provided in the draft contract that in the event of a dispute arising as to what is the current or a fair and reasonable rate, or what are the current hours fixed by the custom of the trade, it shall be determined by the Minister of Labour, whose decision shall be final.

No schedule of the rates of wages to be paid in the erection of this bridge was inserted in the draft contract because, upon inquiry, it was ascertained by the Fair Wages Officer who visited the locality for this purpose that there was no work of a similar nature being carried on in the district upon which a schedule could be based.

6. On receiving any representations which are shown clearly to be made on behalf of workmen concerned, and at their instance, indicating that different views prevail as between contractors and the workmen 'as to what is the current or a fair and reasonable rate of wages, or what are the current hours fixed by the custom of the trade,' inquiry will be immediately made by the Department of Labour, and subsequent action will be guided accordingly.

THE NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE AND THE CORONATION.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. LAKE. About a fortnight ago, when the question of the coronation contingent was brought up, I asked how many men of the Northwest Mounted Police would be sent. Is not the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) prepared to make a statement as to the number and as to the method of selection?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is proposed, but not definitely arranged, to send 75 men and five officers of the Northwest Mounted Police.

THE CORONATION AND BANK HOLIDAY.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I see by the proceedings in the Imperial Parliament that it is the intention there to make the day appointed for His Majesty's coronation a bank holiday throughout the United Kingdom. Have the government given any consideration to the carrying out of a similar idea in Canada?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to inform my hon. friend that the matter has not been considered.

THE SECRETARIAT IN LONDON.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to ask the Prime Minister if he has thought to inquire whether there are any papers or information that could be given with reference to the Secretariat in London. He will remember that I spoke about it six or seven weeks ago, and he told me he would look up the matter and see if there was any additional information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that I had forgotten the matter. But I am to have an interview with the Under-Secretary of State this afternoon, and I will call his attention to it.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. PORTER. I desire to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur.) with regard to a return to an order granted by the House on 27th February last, in regard to appointments to the fisheries service. When may I expect the return?

Mr. BRODEUR. The report was brought down a few days ago.

SUPPLY—ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk). Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered last year I called the attention of the House to the manner in which the surrender of the St. Peter's Indian reserve had been secured. At that time I pointed out that the Indians at St. Peter's alleged that they had been practically cheated out of their reserve. I pointed out that the methods employed by the government agent had been anything but creditable to the government. The hon. Superintendent General of Indian Affairs (Mr. Oliver) replying to my remarks, said, at page 7071 of last year's 'Hansard':

I am sure the House will not expect me—at this stage of the session, would not wish me—to make a detailed criticism of the four hours' speech made by my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) at the close of the last sitting of the House. My hon. friend is entitled to the credit, if credit it be, of having made the longest speech of the session. May I add my humble appreciation by saying that I believe never, since this chamber was erected, has there been delivered in its walls such a persistent and sustained tirade of unfounded assertion, of unwarranted insinuation; a tirade that, in its gratuitous inexactitude, is an offence against the privilege of parliament and an insult to its intelligence.

This is the language with which the hon. the Superintendent General opened within a three and one half hour's speech which was intended no doubt to destroy the force and effect of one of the most serious indictments ever delivered against the Indian Department of this country. After such a tirade of carefully prepared criticism of my humble efforts to discharge a duty which I felt imperative on me as a representative of the part of the country where this outrage occurred, I think I had a right to expect, and the House had a right to expect, that the hon. gentleman who started out with such a flourish of trumpets would have at least made good his reckless assertions; it was surely his bounden duty to demonstrate to this House the correctness of his bold and I think reckless statements in justification of the use of language verging on what would be considered unparliamentary, and which was certainly undignified and hardly worthy of a minister of the Crown.

You can read the minister's speech from end to end without finding one fair or intelligent argument to justify his opening criticism of my speech. Neither can you find one fair or one intelligent argument in rebuttal of the serious charges preferred against his department by the Indians, his wards. It is true the hon. gentleman has denied in a general way the correctness of those statements, but he failed to adduce one tittle of evidence to sustain his denial. He seems to expect this House and the country to accept his bald statement as against the sworn statements of dozens of the wards of this country, men who are living on the ground, who know the circumstances, I am sure I will be pardoned when I say, that I prefer to take the sworn statements of the men who suffered, and the men who knew what they were talking about, when they made these declarations, which formed the serious charge against the administration of the Department of Indian Affairs. The hon. Superintendent General, has demonstrated very clearly to me, that he was entirely ignorant of the real facts with regard to this scandalous transaction, and sooner than admit that ignorance he was advancing arguments to save the face of his department, arguments no doubt furnished to him by officials some of whom at least were very much concerned and interested in his success in convincing parliament and the country that there was nothing wrong in this surrender and nothing to investigate. But after an heroic effort sustained for three and a half hours by the hon. minister, and after his reckless statements he left unanswered entirely this serious inditement. Therefore we see clearly the unfair and uncandid methods employed by the minister to counteract the damaging effect of the serious charges made by his wards, the Indians of St. Peter's. That speech also shows how unfair the minister was in his opening attack on me at the commencement of his long and somewhat laboured speech.

In order that the House may understand the position to which I was referring last year which called forth this criticism from the hon. minister, and that the House and the country may understand that the minister failed entirely to meet these serious charges, and left this indictment standing as strong against the Indian Department as on the night on which I delivered my remarks, I wish to recall to the House a few of the charges to which I referred and which the hon. minister failed entirely to meet or to explain. For instance, I stated that the notices calling a meeting to consider the surrender of the homes of nearly 1,300 souls was posted in four or five places on the reserve and were not seen until Sunday about noon, the meeting being called for Monday at 11 o'clock, giving less than twenty-four hours' notice for this all-important meeting at which this band of Indians were supposed to decide whether they would surrender the reserve on which their grandfathers before them had lived. How does the hon. gentleman meet and dispose of this serious indictment? This charge was not made on hearsay evidence, it was made on the strength of sworn declarations from dozens of Indians, wards of the people of this country.

The hon. gentleman met this indictment in this way at page 7083 of last year's 'Hansard':

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend said last night that only one day's notice was given for the gathering of the band. My information in that regard, as I am sorry to say in so many other matters, is quite different, it is that some three or four days' notice was given.

The hon. Superintendent General, in face of the sworn statements from the country's wards which I submitted to this House, and which he had before him when he made his remarks, showing that only one day's notice was given for this meeting, has the temerity to make the statement I have just read from 'Hansard' without advancing one tittle of evidence to substantiate that statement. He contents himself, with saying that he was informed that three or four days' notice was given, then endeavours to lead the House to believe that ample notice was given of this all important meeting. The hon. gentleman's information no doubt came from the officials who were guilty of this contemptible piece of sharp practice. Here is one of the original notices that was posted calling that meeting. It is dated December 20, 1907. The meeting was called on Monday the 23rd, but while the person who issued this document, gave about three days' notice, it was not posted or seen until 24 hours before the meeting was held. I have many sworn declarations showing that this is one of the four notices posted up on the reserve and that not one of them was seen before Sunday about 11 o'clock, or less than 24 hours before this meeting was convened. When you consider that this reserve is about 80 square miles you can easily imagine, how many voters there were who did not hear of this meeting, advertised as it was by four small typewritten notices not more than four inches wide posted 24 hours before the meeting was called. Surely, in the face of this fact, which cannot be disputed fairly, I was justified in characterizing the method of calling this meeting a contemptible piece of sharp practice on the part of those who were guilty. Yet, the minister treats this matter lightly and asks the House to believe his bald statement that ample time was given, instead of the sworn statements made by his wards whom he is supposed, by virtue of his office, to protect, guide, and watch over. These men now allege that they were cheated out of their birthright by methods of this kind. I am sure I will be pardoned if I say I prefer to take the sworn statements of these men, to my hon. friend's statement, because I am satisfied that he is in total ignorance of the real facts, while these men are living on the ground and are suffering the awful consequences of the methods employed by his officials. I will quote here one or two declarations which I submitted last year to prove to this House that the hon. gentleman had this evidence before him when he rose in his place to speak and made the statement which he did regarding this transaction. I will quote from John Flett, one of the most intelligent Indians on St. Peter's reserve, and this is what he says about it:

Statutory Declaration.

Dominion of Canada, Province of Manitoba,
In the matter of the vote for surrender of the Indian lands in St. Peter's reserve, taken on September 24, 1907.

To Wit:

I, John Flett, of the parish of St. Peter's, in the province of Manitoba, Indian, do solemnly declare that I am a member of the St. Peter's Band of Indians; that the notices calling the meeting at which the vote surrendering the reserve was taken, were not posted up, nor did the Indians know anything about such a meeting until Sunday, the twenty-second day of September, A.D., 1907, just one day prior to the date of such meeting. The meeting was held on Monday, September 23, and duly adjourned until the next day, Tuesday, September 24, but at the time of such adjournment no notice was given that the vote would finally be taken on Tuesday. Many of the Indians did not see or hear about the notice, and in consequence were not present at the meeting, and did not have a chance of expressing their views or voting. I believe that had ample time been given and the matter properly explained to the band, that many who were at their homes would have turned out and voted against the surrender of their reserve; many of the young men of the band were away from home working at various occupations and did not know or hear anything about a vote going to be taken owing to the shortness of the time given. That I have been told and believe that some non-treaty men and some minors were counted amongst those voting for the surrender. That in my opinion the vote was most irregular and improper and was not taken according to the regular custom of our band.

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

Declared before me at the parish of St. Peter's, in the province of Manitoba, this 24th day of March, A.D., 1910.

(Sgd.) ROBERT G. McDONALD,
Commissioner in B. R., etc.

(Sgd.) JOHN FLETT.

I also wish to put on record a telegram I received at that time which was placed on 'Hansard' last year, and which was brought to the hon. gentleman's notice when he delivered that speech:

Selkirk, Manitoba, January 26, 1910.

G. H. Bradbury,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Band received one day's notice of meeting September 23. Notices, three or four posted on Sunday, September 22.

WM. ASHAM.

Then I have a letter from the same man inclosing this original notice which I have already presented to the House:

Dear Sir,—The inclosed is the original copy of the notice that was posted one day previous to the time of meeting for the surrender of St. Peter's reservation, effected September 24, 1907.

In face of these very clear and distinct sworn statements, which were before the hon. gentleman when he made his speech, I feel justified in saying that the minister could not expect this House and the country to take him seriously when he was speaking on this matter. Without any intention of being offensive, it was an insult to the intelligence of this House and the country to expect them to accept the hon. gentleman's explanation, and his flippant reply to such a serious charge as that which had been preferred against his department by his wards, the Indians of St Peter's. This is one of the charges that I preferred in my speech, and which the hon. gentleman characterized as a tirade of unfounded assertion and gratuitous inexactitudes. If the rest of the hon. gentleman's speech was as inexact and unfair as it was in connection with this charge, then I say that the hon. gentleman was unfair during the whole time of his reply to this very serious indictment. I desire to call the attention of the House to another of these charges. These are very serious charges; these are not charges to be dealt with lightly, to be passed over in the flippant manner in which my hon. friend dealt with them last year. When the hon. gentleman was replying to the charge that the Indians had been induced to vote by an offer of money, the statement I made being that just as the Indians were about being divided one of the agents said: You who want $90 go to that side, and the others go to the other side, my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) made the following interjection:

Mr. HUGHES. If I heard the hon. member for Selkirk aright, he pointed out that the call was not to those who were for selling the lands and those who were against it, but the call was for those who wanted the $90 to take one side, and those who did not want it to take the other side. I know the minister has overlooked that.

The hon. minister replying to that statement said:

Mr. OLIVER. No, I have not overlooked it. I can only say that I did not wish to be discourteous to the hon. gentleman, and question the validity of the statement he put forward. I am merely generalizing in order to save his feelings, and I may be pardoned, I presume, for again generalizing, and again saying that ofter a question such as that had been under discussion for so long a time, when it was a question of such importance, it did not matter what was said in regard to the vote. Those Indians knew what the vote was for, and they voted for or against with full knowledge of what they were doing, and why they were doing it. I do not wish to bring in personal matters, but my hon. friend followed by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) has seen fit to mention the name of Mr. Semmens.

Mr. HUGHES. I never heard of him.

Mr. OLIVER. If he had listened to the speech of the hon. member for Selkirk last night he would have heard of him, because it was Mr. Semmens who was said to have made this announcement. Now, the suggestion is that Mr. Semmens was a party to an impropriety in which the interest of the Indians was not preserved. Now, I may go, perhaps, so far as to say who Mr. Semmens is. I happen to know Mr. Semmens ever since 1873, when he was a Methodist minister in the city of Winnipeg, and at that time he was considered to be a young man of very considerable promise in the ministry, and ever since then he has devoted his life to the advancement and the betterment of the Indians.

It will be noticed how carefully the hon. gentleman evaded the serious charge made by myself and suggested in the question interjected by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton. The hon. minister did not deny that charge; he contented himself with pointing out who the agent was—the Rev. Mr. Semmens, who had been guilty of an impropriety if nothing worse. To make this matter perfectly clear, I desire again to place on record one or two paragraphs from the affidavits which I submitted last session. On page 7059 of 'Hansard,' in a declaration by John Flett, he says:

Just as the vote was going to be taken, I heard Mr. John Semmens, Inspector of Indian agencies, state loudly in the Cree language to the Indians present: All of you who want $90 go to that side, indicating with his arm where the chief and councillors were standing. I am satisfied that these two statements, the one by Mr. Frank Pedley, and the other by Mr. John Semmens, influenced many to go on the side with the chief. The majority of the Indians did not know that they were voting to surrender their homes, as I am sure they did not wish to do. They were not asked the question: You that are in favour of surrendering the reserve, go to that side Many did not realize that the vote was whether or not they should surrender the reserve, I am satisfied that if the question had been stated fairly the vote would not have been carried.

On page 7062 this declaration is made by Wm. Sinclair, an educated Indian, who was used as an interpreter by Mr. Williams, the minister's agent, who was sent

to Manitoba last year to make an investigation:

I am a member of the St. Peter's band of Indians, and that I was present at the time of the surrender of the St. Peter's reserve, and declare that when the vote was just about to be taken to decide whether the reserve should be surrendered or not, I heard John Semmens, inspector of Indian agencies, make a short speech in the Cree language, and said to all those present, that those wanting the $90 to go over there, indicating the place where they should stand who favoured the surrender.

In the face of these sworn statements, the hon. minister has endeavoured, more by insinuation or assertion than by argument, to leave the impression on the House that the charge which I made on the strength of these affidavits was unfounded; but he stated that out of consideration for my feelings he was only generalizing. The consideration of the hon. gentleman was wonderful. Perhaps he was only generalizing when he began his remarks with the attack he made on me. I can only say to the hon. gentleman that his methods deceive no one, not even himself, in his rather clumsy effort to cast ridicule upon my attempts to secure justice for the Indians and to discharge a very important duty which I owe, not only to the Indians, but to myself as a man. I believe every word that I stated in this House to be absolutely true. I believe that if I had not brought this case before parliament as the representative of that district, I would have been unworthy of the position I occupy as a member of this House for the county of Selkirk, in which this matter occurred. The hon. minister, in his attempt to minimize the disgraceful deception practiced on the poor Indians, did not dare to deny the serious charge that one of his officials, just as the Indians were to be divided for a vote, made use of the following language in Cree: 'All you that want $90 go to that side,' indicating where the chief and council were standing. The hon. minister evades this charge by pointing out who the official was, and stating that he was a Methodist minister and had the welfare of the Indians at heart. This, Mr. Speaker, is surely no answer to such a serious charge. The fact that an official is a Methodist minister does not lessen the seriousness of the offence against everything that was fair and decent. To my mind it rather intensifies the meanness of the trick played on the poor unsuspecting Indian to secure his consent to that vote. That the Indians were tricked into the vote by methods of this kind is to my mind beyond any doubt and it is beyond my conception to realize that a man in the position of Mr. Semmens should have lent himself to such a shady transaction.

But, Mr. Speaker, there may be an explanation of the action of this gentleman, and I think there is. The fact that the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, Mr. Pedley, was himself present in charge of this meeting, would I submit suggest the probability that when Mr. Semmens spoke as he did he was simply carrying out part of a well-laid scheme arranged beforehand to secure the necessary votes to assure the surrender. I cannot think that Mr. Semmens ever made that statement as he did, and just at the physicological moment, without some distinct prearrangement and without some instruction from his superior officer. I am satisfied that this whole matter was arranged and that when Mr. Pedley went to Selkirk he went there determined to secure that surrender by fair or foul means, and he secured it to suit himself. But, Mr. Speaker, I intend later on to refer to the fact that while he secured that alleged surrender which seems to satisfy the minister, I contend that today there is no surrender of St. Peters Indian Reserve according to the true meaning of the Indian Act. During the hon. gentleman's long speech, he did not deny, and in fact he did not refer to the more serious charge which was supported by many sworn declarations, namely, that the Deputy Superintendent General himself just on the eve of taking the vote and a few minutes previous to the instructions given to his agents to which I have just referred, endeavoured to bribe the Indians by an offer of money. The meeting was in session and the Deputy Superintendent General stated:

It is time to take the vote. I have $5,000 here in my valise. If you agree to this surrender this money will be divided among you, but if you don't agree to the surrender, I will take my satchel and go home, and you won't get a cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that there may be no misunderstanding I wish to refer to one or two of the declarations that I placed on record last year, and which were before the minister when he made his remarks. These declarations are so long that I will not weary the House by reading them all, but I shall quote from them a few paragraphs. William Asham, says, speaking at the meeting:

Now, soon after this, we were in the heat of a hot discussion in the matter regarding the surrender. Mr. Pedley during his speech at this time said I have $5,000 here, pointing to a satchel at his side. If you agree to this surrender this money will be distributed among you, but if you don't agree to the surrender, I will take my satchel and go home and you won't get a cent. Then we were told the time had come to take a vote.

You notice Mr. Speaker, how these two offers were arranged. First it was the $5,000, and then he says:

Up to this time fully half of the band present had not been able to get into the building, and did not hear what had taken place. The building being too small to take the vote in, we were asked to go outside. Then Mr. John Semmens, the inspector of Indian agencies, spoke loudly in Cree, saying, 'All you that want $90 go to this side, indicating where the chief and council were standing, the others go to the opposite side.' The crowd separated under great excitement, a great many not knowing what they were doing. After they were separated, some of them moving from one side to the other, not knowing what they were doing. Mr. Semmens and myself started to count the votes that were against, but when we got through counting we turned around to count the other side. I was told then that the other side was counted. I did not know who counted the other side, and they claimed they had a majority of seven. I was astonished to hear this, and sized up the two sides and satisfied myself that there were a larger number standing on my side than there was with the chief and council, but I had no opportunity whatever of counting the number that stood with the chief and council. I protested to Mr. Semmens, saying to him that he should not have said that you who want $90 go on one side, but you should have said you that want to surrender the reserve go to one side, and you that don't want to surrender the reserve go to the other side, then the people would have understood what they were voting for.

I declare that I consider the vote irregular and improper, as it was not stated fairly to the people, nor was it fairly counted as it was counted by different parties.

I would like the hon. minister to listen to this declaration from this man because it is very serious. He says:

When Mr. Pedley read the surrender that he had with him prepared, he read it in English, and fast, that even I who understood English, found it difficult to understand the terms of the surrender. This was not interpreted to the band in their own language, consequently very few, if any, understood the conditions of the surrender. I am satisfied that Mr. Pedley and the others came determined to secure the surrender. The surrender was all prepared without any consultation with the band, and they brought the $5,000 with them. Without this money on the ground, I am satisfied they never could have secured the support they did in favour of the surrender.

I wish to place on record another short declaration by William Sinclair, who is an interpreter and whom the government employed as such on several different occasions. William Sinclair says in the middle of his declaration:

I further declare that I heard Mr. Pedley say that he had $5,000 in his satchel which he would divide among the Indians, providing they would make a surrender of the reserve, if not he would take the money back.

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

Declared before me in the town of Selkirk, in the province of Manitoba, this 22nd of January, 1910.—C. R. Smallman, commissioner.

Well, Mr. Speaker, judging from the manner in which the hon. minister dealt with the serious indictment against his department last year, I had good ground for feeling that he did not meet the charges fairly and that he begged the question from beginning to end. Especially in his opening remarks was the minister entirely unfair, and he failed to demonstrate during his whole speech any justification for the language with which he prefaced his remarks. That is a sample of the methods employed by the hon. gentleman in answering this indictment which is laid at his door, not by me, but by his wards, the Indians. It will be remembered that I made a statement last session regarding the signing of the receipts for the patents, and this is perhaps one of the most serious phases of the whole question because probably more hinges on it than hon. gentlemen in this House can possibly conceive at present; whether the minister does or not. I submitted at that time many declarations from reliable Indians showing that they had never received or even seen their patents and that they had never, knowingly, signed any receipt for the same. This fact did not, however, trouble the Minister of the Interior who is responsible to this House for the management of that important department. He contented himself by saying that he had laid on the table receipts for most of the patents duly signed. These receipts were no doubt sent to him by the agents who had been parties to this scandalous transaction; but it never seemed to dawn on the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, as the legal guardian of the Indians, that it was his duty to investigate the allegation made by dozens of his wards, and if forgery had been committed, as seems quite probable, it was his duty to punish those guilty, and to rectify the great wrong done these wards of the people.

Here I intend to submit one or two declarations simply to sustain this charge. They have already been placed on 'Hansard,' but I desire that there should be no misunderstanding as to the minister having had the facts before him when he made his speech last year. I refer to the affidavits on page 7408 of last year's 'Hansard.' The affidavits state distinctly that those who made them had never seen their patents and had never given any receipt for their patents. This matter was brought to the minister's attention from time to time before he made his speech last year.

I myself called his attention to what I considered an outrage on our Indian wards, and I confess frankly my surprise that the hon. the superintendent general (Mr. Oliver), who is responsible for the condition of affairs which exists on St. Peter's reserve, has not seen fit to take drastic measures in order to ascertain the truth or falsity of these serious charges. I requested last session that the hon. minister should have a thorough investigation made; and before I take my seat to-day I intend to give him another opportunity of appointing a Royal Commission to investigate this whole matter.

There is another charge I made which I wish to recall to the attention of the hon. minister. I said last year that the chief and four of his councillors had received more than 100 acres of land over and above what they were entitled to. The minister replied to that charge in the following language, as will be seen by referring to page 7094 of last year's 'Hansard':

My hon. friend last night said something about a man named Raynor who had a bill against the government for $500 which bill was not paid by the government and Mr. Raynor has not pressed for payment. I do not know anything about Mr. Raynor, who he is, or what he is, or on what ground he presented such a demand. All I know is that his bill was not paid, and, therefore, if Mr. Raynor bribed any of the Indians he bribed them at his own expense and at his own cost. My hon. friend explained that Mr. Raynor had got back the extra money that he had paid to the Indians, because the chiefs had got a certain proportion more land than they were entitled to under the terms of the surrender. That is to say that Chief William Prince got 20 acres more, and the several councillors a certain number of acres more in the neighbourhood of 20 apiece over and above what the terms of surrender called for. Chief William Prince was entitled to 212 acres by reason of his extra allowance as chief, and by reason of the number of members in his family, and he received actually 215·53, that is 3⅓ acres more than his allowance. Councillor Harper was entitled to 232 acres, and he got 233·16. Councillor James was entitled to 200 acres, and he got 206·88. Councillor Henry Prince was entitled to 168 acres, and he got 172·50 acres. John Prince was entitled to 136 acres and got 136 acres. The explanation is that in the laying out of the lands when the survey was made, the lots ran into one or two acres more than the allowance called for, and the block was allowed to go as it was surveyed. My hon. friend stated last night that these people received in the neighbourhood of 20 acres at least more than they were entitled to, and that this extra allowance of land was in some way, which he did not explain, used to repay Raynor the money that he said it was rumoured had been paid to the Indians.

Mr BRADBURY. The minister has given the amount of acreage. I would like him to tell the House how many of a family each man had.

Mr. BRADBURY.

Mr. OLIVER. Chief William Prince had two of a family, Councillor Harper seven, James William five, Henry Prince three, and John Prince one. My hon. friend said last night that these men got about an average of 20 acres apiece more than they were entitled to. The figures I have given the House are the figures given to me by the officers of the department, and I am sure my hon. friend will pardon me if I say I am rather willing to accept their figures than the figures he has given, and that I ask the House to do the same.

Last year, a day or two after the hon. minister had made these statements and had practically contradicted what I said, I came across a number of returns which the hon. gentleman had himself brought down. Among them was the report of the St. Peter's Indian band, among whom Mr. Pedley distributed that $5,000 that he promised after they had voted for the surrender, and I find that when I said these Indians had received about 100 acres of land more than they were entitled to, I was entirely too modest. The return proves that they received 174 acres more than they were entitled to; and I do not see any other purpose why that land was given these Indians than to make good the money which had been promised to them for betraying the trust reposed in them by the members of their band.

I wish to put on record the facts shown by the sworn return of J. O. Lewis, Indian agent. The minister said that Chief Prince had two of a family and got 215 acres. But the records of the band show that he had only one of a family and was entitled to only 196 acres, so that he got nineteen acres more than he was entitled to. William C. Harper, the hon. minister, stated had seven of a family, and had received 233 and two-thirds acres. William Harper, according to the sworn return of the Indian agent, had only two of a family and was entitled to only 152 acres, so that he received 81⅓ acres more than he was entitled to under the terms of the treaty. The minister stated that James Williams had five of a family, and had received 206 acres. James Williams, according to the sworn return, had only four of a family and was entitled to only 184 acres, so that he received 22 acres more than he was entitled to. Councillor Henry Prince, according to the minister, had three of a family and received 172 and one-half acres. According to the sworn return of the minister's agent, Henry Prince had only one of a family and was entitled to 136 acres, so that he received 36½ acres more than he was entitled to. John Prince, according to the minister, had one of a family, and received 136 acres. According to the sworn return, John Prince had no family. The fact is, he was a very old man, He received 16

acres more than he was entitled to. So, according to the minister's statement, these men got 962 acres of land amongst them, though they were entitled, under the terms of the treaty, to only 788 acres, so that hey received, as I have stated, 174 acres more than they were entitled to. They had already got nearly twelve times as much land as the ordinary Indian for agreeing to this surrender, and in addition to that they are given 174 acres, without authority. I do not know where the minister or his officials got the authority to give this extra 174 acres. Speaking on this question last year, the minister drew my attention to the fact that these men could not receive one acre of land without the vote of the band. I believe he was right. The band never voted to give these men 174 acres. Last session the minister made the emphatic statement that I was in error in this charge, and that he would take, and would ask the House to take, the statement of his officials in preference to the statement I made. In view of this fact, and of the statement I laid before the House, which, I presume, he has verified—I placed it on 'Hansard', on a question of privilege—he owes it to himself, and he certainly owes it to me, to make some explanation of how these Indians got these lands. When he speaks, I hope he will inform the House who gave authority to his agents to give these Indians 174 acres more than they were entitled to under the terms of the treaty.

Now, I have given these as fair specimens of how the minister has justified his virulent remarks regarding my speech last session. I may be pardoned, if I say that after three and a half hours of evading the charges made by me he has left unanswered the most serious indictment ever preferred against the Indian Department of this country, and that his speech—I do not mean to be offensive—was replete with misleading and inaccurate statements that are very difficult to reconcile with a desire on his part to be fair or frank in this matter. 'Inexactitude' would be a mild word for me to use if I were to attempt to characterize the speech the hon. gentleman made in reply to my speech of last session. The minister has not adduced any evidence in rebuttal of the charges of maladministration made against his department by the Indians—the men who have suffered through this transaction—many of which charges I laid before the House last year and supported with sworn declarations. I feel that the minister has begged this question almost in every case; and he still has the temerity to stand in his place and ask the House to believe that there is nothing in the statements that I have made, nothing in the sworn indictment laid at his door by his own wards, the Indians. The statements of the minister are not elevating, and not encouraging to the country, nor do they justify his opening, well-prepared criticism which, I am sure, the hon. gentleman himself could not expect to be taken seriously either by myself or by the country. It was the old trick, a little play to the galleries in the hope of drawing the attention of the House and the country away from the serious indictment he was endeavouring, as best he could, to evade or distract. After plenty of time to investigate and consider my remarks of last session, I wish to emphasize the absolute correctness of these charges made against the Indian Department. Every charge then made regarding the treatment of the St. Peter's Indians was supported by sworn statements which have since been verified by reliable men who were on the ground and knew the facts. But, instead of meeting these serious charges fairly and frankly, the minister responsible to this House for this outrage contents himself with hurling at my head his opening criticism, and then evades as many of the charges as possible, and denies the correctness of others, but in no case adducing any evidence to substantiate his denial, or in rebuttal of the sworn declarations of his wards which he asks the House to disbelieve. Surely, the House has a right to expect the minister appointed by this government as Superintendent General, the guardian of the Indians, to rather take the side of the Indians in a matter of this kind than to take the side of the men of whom the Indians complain and whom they blame for the transaction I have tried to lay before the House. The Indians state distinctly, in language more forcible than I am permitted to use in this House, that they have been practically buncoed out of a reserve worth a million and a half dollars. I do not think it is any exaggeration to state that that reserve is worth every cent of a million and a half of money, and the Indians have not one dollar to-day to show for it. I do not know what is to their credit, but I have not the slightest doubt that it is a very small amount. The Department of Indian Affairs is wholly responsible, and must accept the responsibility, for having allowed these Indians to be practically cheated out of that valuable reserve.

Now, I felt that I could not, in justice to myself, allow the hon. gentleman's speech of last session to go uncorrected. I felt that I owed it to myself, to my friends and to the country, to point out as clearly as I could, that the hon. gentleman had failed entirely to answer the serious indictment laid at his door by the Indians through me in this House last session. Therefore, I have taken up this much of the time of the House for that purpose.

I intend now to refer to another phase of this question which I believe is the most

serious part—the question of the legality of the whole transaction. Last session I stated that I believed the surrender was illegally obtained, that clause 49 of the Indian Act had been violated. That section reads:

Except as in this part otherwise provided, no release or surrender of a reserve, or a portion of a reserve, held for the use of the Indians of any band, or of any individual Indian, shall be valid or binding, unless the release or surrender shall be assented to by a majority of the male members of the band of the full age of 21 years, at a meeting or council thereof, summoned for that purpose.

This clause is very clear and bears out my contention of last year that it means that a majority of the qualified vote of the band must be secured to legalize a surrender, and that vote must be taken at a public meeting properly called for that special purpose, and not at two or three different meetings. The minister said in reference to this:

It is true that the surrender was carried by only a small majority; the vote, I am informed, was 107 to 98. But it was a majority of the voting members of the band who were present there, and the Indian Act recognizes that a surrender agreed to by a majority of the voting members of the band is a legal surrender.

Mr. BRADBURY. The hon. gentleman says that the Indian Act provides that a majority present at the meeting may dispose of the Indian reserve. Now, if that is a proper interpretation of the Act, and if there were only 20 Indians present out of 289, would the hon. gentleman say that the majority of these 20 had a right to vote away the inherited rights of all other Indians?

Mr. OLIVER. As I understand the law, they would have the legal right, but I would not consider they had the equitable right. But I do not think that under the law, when there are 205 out of 289 present, they have not only the legal but the equitable right to decide.

The minister's contention is unwarranted, unbusinesslike, unfair, and far from the spirit or even the letter of the Indian Act. The Act distinctly provides that a majority vote of the male members of the band of the full age of 21 years must be secured to legalize the surrender of a reserve or any part of it, and also provides how that majority shall be obtained. In the case of the St. Peter's Indians there were 289 qualified voters, but according to the minister's statement there were only 205 present at the meeting, and after two days' active canvass on the part of the government and the open bribery already referred to, by the government's agents, they managed to squeeze out nine of a majority or less than 38 per cent of the qualified vote of the band, which was not sufficient to make it a legal surrender under the Indian Act. I am convinced that the surrender was not legal and would not stand the test of any properly constituted court in Canada. The minister talks about the equitable right to make the surrender. Let us look for a moment at this side of the question. There were absent 84 voters, nearly one-third of the total vote who had not been notified and consequently could not have known anything about the meeting. Fully 90 per cent of the absentees were the younger men, the backbone of the band and its most intelligent members. They were the support of their respective families, men who were away working on Lake Winnipeg in the fisheries, and some in the harvest fields and some in other parts of the province. They knew nothing in regard to this meeting which was called to vote away their birthright, their inheritance. That is one reason why I contend that this was an illegal surrender. Considering these facts and the further disgraceful fact that only one day's notice was given of the calling of this important meeting, and that nearly one-third of the qualified voters were not notified, and knew nothing about the meeting until weeks after it had taken place—and I am informed by many of these young men that had they been at the meeting they would have voted against the surrender as they were not in favour of it—the action of the department was entirely unjustifiable. Although I am not a lawyer I must take issue with the minister when he makes the assertion that he considers that the Indian Act gives his department power to accept a surrender with less than a majority of the qualified vote of the band. If the hon. gentleman is correct in his interpretation of section 49, the Indians would have no protection whatever against a dishonest or crooked Indian agent who could put up just such a scheme as apparently was put up on this occasion to rob the poor Indian of his inheritance by a snap verdict in favour of the surrender which apparently had been done in this case.

After close investigation of this matter I am firmly convinced that the St. Peter's Indians have not surrendered their reserve on the Red river according to the true meaning and intent of the Act, and further that everything that has been done to move the Indians or to alienate the land has been done illegally. The whole transaction was illegally and unjust, worse to my mind, even than the deporting of the Acadians by King George's men. There was perhaps some excuse for that cruel act, but there was no excuse for the cruel act which this government has perpetrated on this band of Indians except it may be that the friends of the government required these lands and they got them.

As is well known the titles of these lands have been withheld. In Manitoba we have

a Torrens system, and when application is made for the title for land, the government on issuing the title guarantees every title they issue. The purchasers of this land made application to the Registrar General of Manitoba for Torrens titles and he refused to issue certificates. I have in my hand the report of the Registrar General to his minister giving the reasons why he refused to issue certificates on those transactions. It is as follows:

Winnipeg, Nov. 3, 1910.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 26th of October last referring to lands in St. Peter's Indian reserve, and to make the following report as to my reasons for delay in issuing certificates of title therefor to purchasers from the Indians.

One difficulty met with has been in regard to surveys, or more properly speaking, in regard to the plans which have been filed showing these surveys. I have reason to believe that representations have been made that this office has condemned in toto the surveys made by the Dominion government of this reserve as being entirely below standard; but such is by no means the case.

In 1909, when first we were asked to issue titles according to recently filed plans, these plans on being examined did not appear at all satisfactory, and consequently I obtained a report on them after an inspection had been made on the ground by a surveyor employed by this office. Referring to the parish lot surveys, this report has the following statement: 'In fact, with regard to the parish survey, I see no objection to its being used as a basis for the issue of titles, provided proper plans are prepared and filed.'

Referring to the survey of the rest of the reserve, the surveyor making this report draws attention to what appears to have been an incorrect retracement on the ground of the boundaries of the reserve at the southeast corner, but approved of by far the greater portion of the work done on the ground, adding: 'Except for the points referred to, the survey of the reserve outside the parish limits appears to be satisfactory throughout; but here again plans are far from satisfactory.' Summarizing, he says: 'The plans as a whole cannot in any sense be considered as completed plans of survey, but rather as sketch plans, prepared apparently rather to show ownership than to define boundaries.' Acting on this report, I have refused to issue titles until such time as proper plans are filed of the surveys made; and in all of the several interviews on the subject which I have had with representatives of the Indian Department, or applicants for titles, I have distinctly stated that with the comparatively small exception referred to, the surveys made are in themselves satisfactory to me, but that I do ask that plans properly representing those surveys should be filed before titles issue.

After such correct plans are filed here, I may find it necessary to ask the Indian Department to call in all patents issued according to the incorrect plans, and to issue new patents according to the corrected plans. As to this, however, I cannot speak definitely until I see the new plans.

Another difficulty is that the double question has been raised before me: Firstly, of the validity of the surrender itself; and secondly, of the validity of each separate purchase from the Indians. As regards the first of these, a caveat has been filed as the foundation of a test case before the courts to try the validity of the surrender; and until that caveat and test case are disposed of, I am prohibited from dealing with any of these titles.

On the second of these questions it is alleged that the dealing with the Indians in most cases has been of such a questionable character that in itself it amounts to fraud. Were such dealings with a white man, I could dispose of the question by serving notice upon the grantor in each case, and if he did not choose to act upon the notice and contest the matter, I would be justified in considering the transaction a bona fide one and proceeding accordingly; but in the case of an Indian, I am satisfied that such service of notice would be held by the courts to be of no effect whatever, and I would be left exactly where I am now with the question of fraud unsettled. If there were only a few isolated cases, even though dealing with an Indian, I would be disposed to make such inquiry as I personally could and act upon the result of my inquiry, taking whatever chances were to be taken; but in the case of this Indian reserve there are hundreds of these cases involving property to the value of a million or more dollars. If I issued certificates of title for this land, all these titles would be guaranteed by the province, and in the event of the titles being successfully attacked on either of the grounds mentioned the province would be liable to pay the whole present value of the lands, amounting to a million or more.

Under the circumstances, I decline to assume any such responsibility.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) W. E. MACARA,
Registrar General.

It is evident that the government itself is directly responsible for the tangle that exists relating to these titles. Although four years or more have elapsed since the surrender was taken the government has not yet filed proper plans of this survey. This fact makes it absolutely impossible for the Registrar General to issue certificates of title. The government, in its desire to assist its political friends to get hold of these Indian lands, wrote the following letter, which was published broadcast and which had the effect of frightening away the general public:

Ottawa, January 21, 1908.

In connection with Indians disposing of or pledging their holdings, I beg to say that no transfer nor pledge by any Indian will be in any way recognized by the department, and when it has been determined what land each Indian is entitled to receive, a patent for the same will be issued to such Indian, without regard to any claims by white men or others.

It is necessary to make this position of the department clear and as widely known as possible, as any recognition of rights by

transfer would cause endless complications, and in order to prevent same it is incumbent on the department to issue grants only to the Indians found entitled to receive same.

F. PEDLEY.

In face of this letter and nearly a year before the survey was made or patents were issued the government officials were active in assisting the speculators who were buying lands to locate them by the use of the old parish plans. It was the use of the old parish plans that was the cause of the delay on the part of the Registrar General. He dare not take the responsibility of issuing certificates on those plans. The surrender was obtained on the 24th of September, 1907, and the land speculators began buying Indian allotments a very short time after, nearly a year before any survey was made or patents issued. The government through its agents at Selkirk, was apparently so anxious to assist the men who were getting the Indians' lands that they located and described these lands from the old parish plans, which act has really caused all the delay in the issuing of the titles by the Registrar General of Manitoba. After the new survey was made it was found by the Registrar General of Manitoba that the old parish plans did not fit in with the survey. So, he refused, and quite correctly, to issue certificates until a proper plan was filed, which has not been filed up to the present time, and as he pointed out it may make necessary the recalling of all patents that had been issued. Something over 400 patents—I think I speak advisedly and the minister can correct me if I am wrong—have been issued and apparently issued on plans that were improper and consequently he would likely find that the descriptions of these separate lots would be entirely wrong. The Registrar General points out that it will likely be necessary to ask the government to recall all these patents and to make them out under a proper survey. This state of affairs was brought about, as I have said before, by the government's anxiety to get the lands away from the Indians and into the hands of a few friends.

The government through its agents assisted the land speculators at every turn to get the Indian allotments and this fully a year before the patents were issued, although Mr. Pedley the Superintendent General had written the letter I referred to, warning the general public that the Indian had nothing to sell until his patent issued. After that letter was written and after it was published broadcast and after the public were frightened to invest a dollar, being told plainly the Indian had nothing to sell until his patent issued, in face of that, the government's agents with the three or four men in whose favour this deal was apparently intended, immediately went to work and in the face of that warning began to buy up these allotments through the assistance of the government agent at Selkirk, and some of them have become rich through this deal. I state now that the government has not dealt fairly with the men who were allowed to get these lands. It persuaded these men to take these lands and helped them to get possession of them and now when the government is itself, in a hole, it leaves these men in a hole and refuses to furnish proper plans to enable the Registrar General of Manitoba to give these men the titles to the lands they purchased. No doubt the government realizes the position they are placed in, and realizes too that this whole transaction is illegal. I understand the plan has been made for that survey and has been lying in the department for months completed, and has never been forwarded to the Registrar General that he might be enabled to grant titles to these men who secured these lands. I say that the minister is responsible for this delay in the holding up of these titles to all of these lands. That is another phase of this question which demands a thorough investigation. I see no other way to settle this transaction than the appointment by the government of a royal commission to go into the whole matter. There is another very important phase of this question to be found in the report of Chief Justice Howell, which no doubt the minister knows about. In that report Chief Justice Howell points out clearly to my mind that these Indians were the absolute owners of the old parish of St. Peters regardless of their rights as Indians. Under the Manitoba Act they were the owners of these lands according to Chief Justice Howell's report, if I understand it aright. To make myself clear, I had better read a few paragraphs from that report, and if the minister has not already read it, I would like him to listen. Chief Justice Howell says:

Pursuant to the commission above mentioned, I commenced investigation of the matters therein referred to by holding a first meeting at Selkirk, on the 24th day of December, 1906, in the presence of Mr. Clark, counsel for the Indian band and Mr. Heap, appearing for various claimants.

I have never said one word about these counsels that were employed, but I would like to ask the minister what Mr. Clark did to protect or save the Indians. He was appointed by the government and paid by the government something like $1,800 to protect the rights of the Indians and there is not a word of protest from Mr. Clark that I have found in all the correspondence, against this rascally transaction. I do not understand what his duties

were, but if he had any duties in the shape of protecting the Indians, I am satisfied he failed entirely to look after their interests. The Chief Justice says:

Before reporting upon the various claims for patents to portions of this reserve, I think it well to consider the environment at the time of the treaty and also to discuss some points of law.

At the time of the treaty and for a long time previously, the territory along the Red river from Winnipeg northward, was divided into parishes by the church of England, the boundaries of each of which were well defined. Reference to volume 1 of H. Youle Hind's work, published in 1860, being a report of his own observations, will show at page 173, that at that date the parishs of St. Andrews and St. Peters were adjoining, and there was then no St. Clements.

It further shows that the southerly limit of the parish of St. Peter's was south of Sugar Point, and included all of the present town of Selkirk.

The evidence given before me established that at the time of the treaty the southerly boundary of the church parish of St. Peters was in the same place.

At that date the survey by the Dominion government of the Red river belt, north of Winnipeg had not yet begun. See Vaughan's evidence. So of course, when in the treaty the following language is used, 'beginning at the south line of St. Peter's parish, the church parish, and not the Dominion survey parish of St. Peter's must have been intended.' According to the language of the treaty then, the reserve should have its place at the beginning at the south side of Sugar Point, nearly a mile further south than its present boundary and including the fine lands of the town of Selkirk and the lands to the westward and eastward thereof.'

Then, Mr. Speaker, further on, the Chief Justice points out in the following language:

It seems to me clear that the south line of St. Peter's parish referred to in a treaty of 1871, does not correspond with the south line of St. Peter's parish according to the Dominion government survey, and in this respect, the terms of the treaty were not carried out.

Another paragraph later on, Chief Justice says:

It does seem to me that the limits of the reserve were settled ex-parte by the government without the concurrence of the Indians, at all events, there was no pretense before me of any participation in the selection by the band.

The Indians claimed before me that the southern boundary of the reserve should have been at Boilleau's lot, south of Sugar Point, nearly a mile further south than as ultimately fixed.

The report further on says, at the time of the treaty, the Manitoba Act, 33 Vic., chap. 3, was in force. Section 32 gives rights to parties under the sanction of the Hudson Bay Company, which rights were extended by 37 Vic., chap. 20, section 3, and the method of providing or ascertaining these rights was facilitated by 38 Vic., chap. 52, section 1, which seems to be retroactive.

It seems to me clear that the Manitoba Act applies to Indians, half-breeds and whitemen alike, and that if an Indian proves possession and title sufficient to come within section 32 of the Act and amendments, he is entitled to a patent, notwithstanding, the purity of his aboriginal blood. See Totten v. Watson, 15 U.C.R., 392.

The treaty provides that if there are any settlers within the bounds of any lands reserved by any band, Her Majesty reserves the right to deal with such settlers as she shall deem just, so as not to diminish the extent of land allotted to the Indians. The question at once arises as to the meaning of the term settler. Does it mean a mere squatter who has come to this country and has settled on the land prior to surveys, but after the 15th of July, 1870, the date of the transfer, or does it refer to those having rights under the Manitoba Act, above referred to?

The mere setting aside of a tract of land for an Indian reserve by the treaty could not deprive any person of a statutory right to any lands which he then had on any portion of the reserve.

The various members of the band who are in possession of their separate parcels, and owners nearly all claiming titles through Peguis or Princes, were recognized in the locality as separate owners and had their rights marked out as separate lots, fronting on the river by Vaughan in his survey commenced in 1873, completed in 1874. And following the variable practice of the department of the Interior in this country, which is well known to me, if this parish of St. Peter's had not been made a part of the reserve, it seems to me that patents would have issued to the occupiers of this land as in other parishes.

It is argued, however, that because of provisions of the Indian Act, these people lost their rights. However startling it may be, there was no Indian Act in force in this province at, or for some years after the treaty. It is further argued that because the Indians made a treaty, which provides that a reserve be set aside, beginning at the south boundary of the parish, they each individually, agreed to abandon separate and private property to the government so as to establish a reserve. In other words, by the law of estoppel, these wards of the government were prevented from setting up their individual rights against their guardian.

The Indians claim, and there is a good deal of evdence to support it, that at the treaty they were told that each was to retain his private property, and holdings and were to get a reserve in addition thereto.

Another paragraph, the Chief Justice points out the following:

The Indians claim that each is entitled to a patent under the Manitoba Act of the land occupied at the transfer by themselves of their ancestors, and that, therefore, the reserve was not originally large enough to satisfy the terms of the treaty.

It will be seen that this report of Chief Justice Howell points out clearly to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs

first, that the boundaries of St. Peter's parish should be a mile farther south than they are. This, he points out, would include the beautiful town of Selkirk and the magnificent lands lying east and west for two miles on each side of the river. He points out, secondly, that the St. Peter's Indians own every acre of the old parish of St. Peter's and are entitled to patents for the same, as this parish was included in the reserve by the government wrongfully in 1874, as it was the private property of this band under the Manitoba Act. Chief Justice Howell points out to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, that after depriving the Indians of their rights as settlers to this magnificent estate, he proceeds to make a bargain, not with the band, but with the chief and his four councillors for the surrender of the reserve, and in doing so placed the following clause in the agreement:

The surrender shall release lands in the present reserve from all claims of the band and from each individual thereof, from all or any claims, under the Manitoba Act, or the Indian Act, and each member of the band shall sign a release to this effect when he receives his patent.

This is a phase of the question which I have tried to emphasize, in the earlier part of my remarks, by pointing out that these Indians declared that they had never signed any receipt for their patents or any release of their rights under the Manitoba Act. The band also claim that the terms of surrender were never explained to them in their own language, and that they did not know what they were doing. We have the affidavits of William Asham and other Indians which I have quoted to this House, and which state distinctly that when Mr. Pedley came to the reserve with the agreement of surrender all prepared, without any consultation with the band whatever, he arranged the matter with the chief and his councillors, who had been bribed to agree to the surrender—that he came there and read that surrender in English, and read it so fast that even those who understood English hardly followed it or grasped its meaning. This is a serious state of affairs, and something that this parliament ought to take cognizance of, and that in the interest of everything that is fair to the Indians, ought to be thoroughly investigated. I do not see how hon. gentlemen can contend for one moment that justice has been done or that any attempt has been made to do justice by the minister who is responsible for this outrage.

Now I wish to refer for a moment to a report made by the Rev. Dr. MacDougall. I want to say frankly that I hardly consider the report worthy of mentioning in this House, as I regard it as a fiasco. The hon. minister sent the Rev. Dr. MacDougall to make a report on what he found on the St. Peter's reserve. The hon. gentleman seems very fortunate in getting hold of these clerical gentlemen to pull his chestnuts out of the fire. I will read the instructions to the Rev. Dr. MacDougall:

Department of Indian Affairs,
Ottawa, 27th September, 1910.

I am directed to request that you will be good enough to proceed to the St. Peter's Indian reserve and also to the new reserve set apart for these Indians at Fisher River, and ascertain the general condition of these Indians and the progress that is being made in the removal to the new reserve. The Department would like to be advised as to the number of Indians that have removed and what steps should be taken to facilitate further movements, and how such removals can best be accomplished and at what time.

I can tell what will facilitate removal—do justice to the Indians.

The Indian agent has been instructed to hold an election of chief and councillors for these Indians but no report has been received in connection therewith. It would be well to ascertain what progress has been made in this matter, and report.

This is another of the outrages that have been perpetrated on this band of Indians. They were practically taken by the throat by the Indian agent at Selkirk, as must have been reported to the Deputy Superintendent General or to the minister. They have refused to allow this band of Indians to have an election ever since that surrender was made—why? Because they realized that as soon as an election took place the chief and council, who had betrayed the band, who had sold themselves to the government to agree to this surrender, would be put out of office, and another class of men would be put in office, who would contest this surrender at every inch of the way. For that reason these Indians have been denied the right which they have enjoyed ever since they were a band of having an election every two or three years. In any case they were entitled to an election the year after this surrender took place, but they have never been able to secure consent to have an election since, so that those men who betrayed the band and who sold themselves to secure this surrender still hold office.

Referring to this report, I would like to ask why was it necessary to choose the Rev. Dr. MacDougall to find out how many Indians had been removed from the old reserve to the new? Why, we have two Indian inspectors in Winnipeg and one in Selkirk, the Rev. John Semmens, drawing $1,200 to $1,500 each per year, and one or two others drawing the same salaries. The Indian agent in Selkirk could have got that information, but the minister sent out the Rev. Dr. MacDougall to make an investigation. Dr. MacDougall went out first to the new reserve and held a meeting

there. Every statement which I made last session was repeated to him in St. Peter's Indian Reserve by the Indians themselves. After holding the meeting in the new reserve, he ascertained that only 162 Indians out of 1,300 had been moved from the old reserve to the new, after an expenditure of $30,000 or $40,000 for legal expenses and building houses and moving those 162 people. In other words there were over 1,100 people yet in possession of the lands on the old reserve which had been wrongfully taken from them. But when Dr. MacDougall came back to Selkirk to the old reserve, I must give him credit for one thing. He acted fairly in calling a meeting. He did not do as the Deputy Superintendent General had done. He did not spring a trap on the Indians by giving them only 24 hours to come and vote away their birthright. He gave 10 days' notice that he was going to hold a meeting, and he held not one but two meetings. The first lasted over three hours. The Indians asked me to attend but I refused to go simply because I wanted to give Dr. MacDougall a fair chance. I met him and talked the matter over with him; and I said to him that I would not go to the meeting because I had every faith that he would give a fair and honest report of what took place. I did not go near the meeting, but two reporters from Winnipeg attended and made a full report of what took place. That report is in this House at present and will speak for itself. I am not going to read it, but I have a letter here from one of the Indians, Mr. William Asham. I have said before in this House, and my statement was ridiculed, that Mr. Asham is one of the most intelligent and eloquent Indians in Canada, and I do not believe that I exaggerated in making that statement. Mr. Asham knows what he is talking about, and he addressed this letter to myself:

St. Peter's, January 14, 1911.

Geo. H. Bradbury, M.P.

Dear Sir,—In the matter of Rev. John MacDougall visiting St. Peter's reserve last fall, held a public meeting with the Band of St. Peter's Indians, said that he was sent to hear the grievances in general, as well personal grievances, if there were any. Amongst other things, the following were the grievances that were laid before him:

1st. Rev. John Semmens, Inspector of Indian Agencies, was accused of saying in Cree language, just at the time when the vote was to be taken for the surrender of the St. Peter's reserve, 'Those of you that want $90 (ninety dollars) go that side,' indicating to where the chief and councillors stood. This matter was proved by the meeting before Mr. John MacDougall that such words were used by Mr. Semmens. Of course, without doubt, these words were misleading.

2nd. That a big percentage of the treaty Indians never applied for their patents, nevertheless the patents were issued, but the owners of same never saw them. Rev. John MacDougall, to satisfy himself, put the following question to the meeting, 'If there are any that never saw their patents let them stand up.' Although the attendance was rather small, quite a number stood up. This matter was also proved before Mr. MacDougall that it was really the fact of the case.

3rd. The curtailment of the privilege that the Indians of St. Peter's enjoyed for many years prior to the time of the surrender of the St. Peter's reserve. The Indians were allowed to have an election of chief and councillors every three years, being the term allowed by law (Indian Act). The present so-called chief and councillors are not recognized by the band of treaty Indians as chief and councillors, knowing that their term of office expired on the 4th day of July, 1908. The Indians of St. Peter's are fully aware if the election of chief and councillors had been granted when it came due, considerable trouble would have been avoided. This matter was also proved to Rev. John MacDougall.

4th. There were also a few personal grievances that were laid before him. There was a certain woman that laid her complaint. The following was to the nature of same. That her husband was blind, and it was only her that could do anything for the family. When the patent came she went to the Indian Office at Selkirk and asked for the patent. One of the so-called councillors defied her by saying, be damned to get your patent. At the time she didn't get the patent. She also went on to explain how she was roughly handled by the Indian agent.

Many more things could be added, but we think this will be quite sufficient and worthy for consideration.

We are indeed surprised to read an account of the report of Rev. John MacDougall, why not a word is said of the grievances that were laid before him. We can now understand, unless a proper commission is appointed, the truth will never be known.

Your Obdt. Svts,

WILLIAM ASHAM,
WM. SINCLAIR,
his
JOHN X FLETT.
mark.

I hardly know how to characterize a report of that kind coming from a man like the Rev. John MacDougall. I cannot believe that he edited that report of his own volition, but am inclined to give credence to a statement made in one of the papers that when he came to Ottawa the Indian Department claimed the right to edit his report before it was laid on the table. I have no doubt that Mr. MacDougall gave a full and fair account of what he found in that reserve, but that account we do not find in the document I hold in my hand and which purports to be the report of the Rev. John MacDougall. Mr. MacDougall heard from the men who had sent their allegations and affidavits down here what their grievances were. He told me himself, when taking

the train in the town of Selkirk where I met him, that there could be no doubt that the Indians had been the victims of the white man's cupidity. I appeal to the hon. minister (Mr. Oliver), who is responsible, to remember that at one time this band of Indians was strong and mighty in the land, and they did not mete out the kind of justice to their white brethern that we are meting out to them to-day in this House.

Now, I would like to say a word or two regarding this band of Indians. They are the descendants of the band who were the first to offer the right hand of fellowship to Lord Selkirk's hardy settlers who landed in the Red River district in 1812, and were allotted land at Kildonan. The property of the settlers and their animals were safeguarded by these Indians. The word of Chief Pegeus and of Prince was the law all over that country, and the rights of the settlers were protected by this very band that have been treated in the manner I have shown by this government. During the first Riel rebellion, where do we find these men? Every one of them loyal to the flag. When Riel had Dr. Schultz a prisoner under sentence of death, this band sent word to Riel to release Schultz or they would attack the fort. Schultz was released, but was taken again a few days later, after Riel had been reinforced by French halfbreeds. But Schultz made his escape, and was kept in hiding among these Indians until he could get out of the country, which he did by the assistance of Joseph Monkman, a grand old native of the country. Later, when good men were needed by Great Britain on the Nile for the expedition sent for the relief of Gordon, among the best of the rivermen sent out from Canada were to be found twelve or fifteen of the St. Peter's band. And, later still, during the last Riel rebellion, some of the best scouts the government had were St. Peter's Indians. This band was loyal at all times, although tempted by those who were leading the rebellion against the Canadian government. These are the men who have been practically thrown to the wolves by this government; these are the men who have been deprived of their inheritance, and upon whom this government has allowed its officials to perpetrate what I believe to be one of the most rascally transactions ever perpetrated in this country in connection with the Indian Department. This transaction reeks with dishonesty to my mind, and I think that if the minister did not think so too we should have had a fuller investigation long ago. But he seems to be afraid to touch this question—afraid to let in the light. Surely it is the duty of the Superintendent General, as guardian of the Indians, to protect these men, to protect them even from themselves if necessary, and especially protect them from the public, and to take their side in such questions as this. I should not be required to stand in this House, and contend for the Indians; that is the duty of the hon. gentleman who is the guardian of the Indians. This matter has been brought before him in as forcible a manner as I am capable of doing. I am sure he has had plenty of opportunity to take the right course. I could tell the hon. gentleman of letters he has received from his old political friends, strong men, men occupying prominent positions in the city of Winnipeg who have verified a good deal of what I have told him to-day. So this is not a political matter with me. There is no politics in this; it is a matter of justice to the poor unfortunate Indians, men whom we ought to protect.

An hon. MEMBER. They have no votes.

Mr. BRADBURY. No, they have no votes. I contend that this treatment of the St. Peter's Indians is a blot upon the escutcheon of Canada. Up to the time this government came into power, it was the proud boast of Canadians every where that we had treated our Indians well, and that our Indians were satisfied. But now the cry goes up from this band for British justice. These men tell me in private conversation, 'This is not what we expected from Great Britain.' Many of these men do not realize the difference between Great Britain and this government. But there is a difference, thank Heaven! They appeal to-night for British fairplay, and that is all I am asking. I ask that this royal commission shall be granted. I have tried to be fair, I have tried to discharge my duty as the representative of the part of the country in which this transaction has taken place; and I now urge the government to grant this royal commission.

I move, in amendment:

It is the duty of the government forthwith to appoint a Royal Commission for the purpose of making a prompt, thorough and complete investigation in the negotiations which resulted in the surrender of the St. Peter's Indian Reserve, and into the said surrender and all circumstances connected therewith, and into the price or other consideration received by the Indians for lands allotted to them under the terms of the said surrender, and into the price or consideration received by the government for lands included in such surrender and afterwards disposed of by public auction, and into the locating of the said Indians on other lands and generally speaking into all matters and transactions in any way connected therewith or relating to the said surrender and everything leading up thereto and resulting therefrom.

And that counsel selected by the said Indians should be permitted to appear for and represent them before the said Royal Commission throughout the said investigation, and that the fees, charges, and any expenses of the said counsel should be paid by the government.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I am sure it would not be the wish of the House to deprive my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) of his privilege of an annual speech on the St. Peter's Indian reserve. Still, it must have been with some disappointment——

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It ought to be made monthly.

Mr. OLIVER. The House has become very tired of it yearly, and it would be much more weary if it were made monthly. I say, it must have been with great disappointment that the House heard to-day that the expectation it had cherished for some time that the fact of my hon. friend having already had his speech published in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' was not going to relieve it of being burdened with that speech on this occasion.

Mr. BRADBURY. I did not want to deprive the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) of the opportunity of hearing it.

Mr. NESBITT. He published your speech too.

Mr. OLIVER. He was good enough to read my speech, or part of it, along with his own. I wish he had read more of it; for, I must say the more frequently he gives the House the benefit of the few remarks I was able to preface my speech with on that occasion, the more convinced I am of their aptness and appropriateness.

I am very sorry, and I am sure many members of this House are very sorry, that my hon. friend sees fit to recur to this matter in the altogether unfair and uncalled for manner in which he does. The problem of dealing with Indians and Indian lands in Canada is a very important one touching closely a very large number of important communities in the country. The government has to meet many difficulties in handling these matters, and when we are met by such absolutely unwarranted misrepresentation of facts and circumstances and motives as my hon. friend produced in this discussion the tendency is to prevent, so far as my hon. friend can prevent, the proper dealing with those cases.

Mr. BRADBURY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to accuse me of misrepresentation; he has not demonstrated any misrepresentation.

An hon. MEMBER. Wilful misrepresentation.

Mr. OLIVER. I said unwarranted misrepresentation.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the word misrepresentation is parliamentary. I suppose wilful misrepresentation would be unparliamentary.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not say wilful, I said unwarranted misrepresentation.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think that is unparliamentary.

Mr. OLIVER. I hope to keep within the rules of parliament, but I must admit that in making adequate reply to my hon. friend it is exceedingly difficult.

Mr. FOSTER. You must have meant more than that.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is at liberty to give his own interpretation. I was trying to say that there are many important communities in Canada whose progress is seriously interfered with by the contiguity of Indian reserves while at the same time the advantage of the Indians is just as seriously interfered with by the situation of their reserves. The government are anxious to meet the wishes of the progressive people of the country and at the same time to protect the rights and interests of the Indians, but when a responsible member of parliament will, year after year, use his position as a member of this House for the purpose of making difficult a proper and satisfactory readjustment of such conditions, may I be permitted to say that he is not acting in accordance with the duties of the position which he occupies or the responsibility which he is expected to discharge to the people of this country in his capacity as a representative. I would think, with all due deference, that a member of this House could find some other occupation than to make difficult the proper and satisfactory adjustment of such a delicate and vexed question. I expect within a very short time to have to bring before the House a Bill to sanction a transaction for the surrender of an Indian reserve that is absolutely and altogether outside of the terms of the Indian Act, but the circumstances are such as to make it desirable, both in the interests of the Indians and of the white people concerned, that such action should be taken. But my hon. friend if we were to pay the attention to his views that he seems to think he is warranted in expecting, would prevent us from dealing with that case or other like cases.

My hon. friend demands the sympathy of the House for this particular band of Indians on account of the action that was taken by the government. He may appeal to the people of his constituency, to the people of the town of Selkirk, to the clergymen who minister to those Indians, to the Chief Justice of Manitoba, who negotiated the terms of surrender, to all the parties interested and concerned in this matter, and I am safe in saying he will not find one who will not say that the best inter-

ests of that band of Indians have been conserved by the transaction that was entered into and which he criticised so severely. How is it to the interests of the town of Selkirk, we will say, that an area of land adjoining that town, containing 80 square miles,—my hon. friend said 80 miles square, which is as near the fact as he generally gets—should be held from effective cultivation and development by the occupation of a band of so-called Indians? And how is it to the interests of the Indians that these men who, before the town of Selkirk was there, at the time to which he has alluded so effectively, were there, not as Indians, but as halfbreed settlers in the Red River valley, holding their rights in severalty, and discharging their duties as citizens of the country at that time. Those men who were in that position thirty years ago are to-day admittedly degenerates to a very large degree because of their continued residence under conditions which are not suitable to their better development. My hon. friend is the enemy of the Indians of St. Peter's when he insists that they shall retain their location under conditions which have caused their degeneration from a responsible and respectable body of citizens of Canada to the conditions which he himself pictures to the House, that they are absolutely irresponsible and unable to transact their own business in the smallest degree.

Mr. BRADBURY. I shall not allow the hon. gentleman to put words in my mouth which I did not utter. I did not state that I wanted the Indians to retain those lands. What I contend for, is that you have done an injustice to the Indians, that you have allowed them to be robbed of the valuable lands belonging to them, when your duty, as guardians was to take care of them.

Mr. OLIVER. I understood my hon. friend to insist that the people were being robbed of their lands.

Mr. BRADBURY. That is right.

Mr. OLIVER. Because the lands were being sold?

Mr. BRADBURY. Because they were not being sold, they were just being taken from the Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is very uneasy. I would like him to permit me to make my remarks. I did not interfere with him and certainly I think I had as much cause to protest as to the inaccuracy of the statements that he made as he has to protest against the inferences that I desire to draw. The Indians, he says, are being robbed. These Indians, in exchange for this reserve which they occupied to their own detriment a reserve of 48,000, are receiving a reserve of something like 74,000 acres of as good, or better land and very much better suited to meet their requirements, moral, social and material, than the St. Peter's reserve. Besides that they have got the full market price of their reserve at the time the reserve was sold. It is true that the land has appreciated in value since that time. So have town lots in Winnipeg, so have town lots in every city in the west, so have farm lands, but when my hon. friend suggests that because this land would only bring $5 or $5.50 an acre at auction four years ago and it was worth $20 or $25 an acre now, that therefore the Indians were robbed, he is trespassing upon the intelligence of the House, and he is not warranted in making such a suggestion. The Indians agreed to the disposition of their land at a certain time under certain conditions, those conditions were fulfilled, the Indians received the price for their land, they received a new reserve in exchange and I submit that the hon. gentleman is absolutely misrepresenting the facts when he uses the word 'robbery' in that connection.

My hon. friend laid some stress upon the conditions surrounding the surrender; that is that sufficient notice was not given of the vote that was to take place. My hon. friend knows—he knew when he said that to the House—that the question of surrender by the Indians on this reserve was under consideration by them for weeks and months before that time and that the matter was canvassed individually and collectively and the terms set practically before the meeting was held at all. Now, he knew that when he tried to make this House believe that the Indians had only one day's notice of this meeting.

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but if he insists on making statements that are absolutely incorrect I have to set him right. I did not know that, and the hon. gentleman did not know it because it never took place.

Mr. OLIVER. Well then it is a question of fact between the hon. gentleman and myself, and I will put it to the House in this way: He knows, as I know, and he knew then, as I knew then, that Mr. Justice Howell was commissioned to negotiate with these Indians for the surrender of their reserve. He knew then, as I knew then, and he knows now, as I know now, that Mr. Justice Howell had carried on these negotiations for weeks and months before this surrender took place.

Mr. BRADBURY. Will the minister tell me who with?

Mr. OLIVER. With these very Indians.

Mr. BRADBURY. With the chiefs and council who were purchased to betray the band.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend admits that these negotations have been going on for that length of time. As to the allegation of bribery of the chiefs, there was a man named, I do not know what, who presented a bill to the department and the bill was not paid, but my hon. friend undertakes to make the House believe that the land that the chiefs got in some way or other paid this man's bill. Whether the chief got much land or little land, whether they got what was coming to them or got more or less according to the vote of the band, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that they got that land and that if they were like any other Indians I know of in the world they kept the land or they kept the price of it, and they certainly did not give it to this gentleman whom my hon. friend suggests received his money back in that way. The hon. gentleman is suggesting something that is utterly absurd as everybody in the House knows, and he speaks of this as an instance of bribery just as he speaks about the giving to the Indians of a reserve one and a half times as great as the one they had abandoned, besides the price of the one they had abandoned, as robbery of the Indians.

I do not know that it is worth while to consider the repetition that he gave of the allegation made last year in regard to Mr. Semmens or in regard to what Mr. Pedley said at the meeting. He is not prepared to accept Mr. Pedley's word and he is not prepared to accept Mr. Semmens' word.

Mr. BRADBURY. The minister has never denied that fact to the House, Mr. Pedley has never denied it, and there is no denial because Mr. Pedley wrote it in his own letters.

Mr. OLIVER. With regard to what Mr. Pedley said to the Indians, when Mr. Pedley is alleged to have said: I have $5,000 in my valise; if you vote 'yea' you will get it, and if you do not vote 'yea' you will not get it, this is what Mr. Semmens says on oath:

Province of Ontario, county of York, to wit.

I, John Semmens, of the city of Winnipeg, province of Manitoba, inspector of Indian agencies, make oath and say:

1. That I have read the speech of Mr. Bradbury, member of parliament for Selkirk, Manitoba, delivered in the House of Commons on the 30th day of April, 1910, with reference to the surrender of the St. Peter's Indian reserve, and with particular reference to the statements alleged to have been made by the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, as contained on page 7191 of the House of Commons Debates.

2. That I was present during the whole of the meeting referred to and heard what was said by the Deputy Superintendent General with respect to the proposed surrender, and in answer to the various questions by the Indians.

3. That the following statement which the hon. member said he was informed was made by the Deputy Superintendent General, namely, 'I have $5,000 here in my satchel; if you vote for this surrender to-night I will distribute this $5,000 amongst you; if you do not vote for this surrender, I will take my bag and go home, and you won't get a cent,' was not made by the Deputy Superintendent General as quoted, but as explained in paragraph five hereof.

4. That the document containing the terms of the surrender was read and interpreted to the Indians at the meeting referred to, and the whole matter was discussed and explained, the Indians taking great interest in the proceedings.

5. That during the discussion of the following cl[illegible] the department shall advance at the time of the surrender the sum of $5,000, to be repaid out of the first moneys received from the sale of the lands,' some one asked if the $5,000 would be distributed among the Indians if they did not surrender, and he was informed by the Deputy Superintendent General that this could not be done, as under the law the $5,000 would be paid only on surrender being given and in accordance with the terms mentioned in the surrender. The Deputy Superintendent General further explained that the law allowed the advance to be made at the time of surrender, and that whatever money was so advanced would be charged against the funds of the band.

(Sgd.) JOHN SEMMENS.

Sworn before me at the city of Toronto, in the county of York, this 17th day of January, 1911.—R. J. Gibson, a commissioner in H.C.J.

My hon. friend has the evidence on that point at any rate, and he will recall, I think, that the statement that Mr. Semmens said to the Indians: Those who want $90 go to one side and those who do not want it, go to the other side, was denied in this House last year, and if it was not denied then I, on the authority of Mr. Semmens, take the fullest responsibility for absolutely denying it now.

My hon. friend is anxious to have an investigation. An investigation of what? The facts are all here. The reserve has been sold, the purchasers' names are on the table of the House, the price paid is in the hands of the House, the Indians are receiving their money as it is paid in. What, I ask you, is there to investigate?—nothing except the unfounded allegations that my hon. friend has made, in support of which he has not been able to bring a scrap of evidence even at the third attempt before this House. When the sales by the individual Indians were made there was a question as to whether they were receiving payment or not. The law clerk of the Indian Department was sent to Winnipeg and he took up on behalf of these Indians the question of the sale and saw that the terms

of the sale were carried out in each individual case.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was the law clerk?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Williams, and the papers and particulars of all these cases have been laid on the table of the House.

Mr. BRADBURY. Where did Mr. Williams get his information? Was it not from the books of the men who got these lands and not from the men who sold them? He says himself that he saw the books of so and so, and so and so.

Mr. OLIVER. Why would he not see the book of so and so, and he saw the Indians as well.

Mr. BRADBURY. The Indians do not verify that.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend knows differently, why under Heaven has he not informed the House? Why has he not given us the benefit of the knowledge he has if he has such knowledge? He certainly has occupied enough time, and although time has been occupied the alleged facts have not been brought forward. I notice that my hon. friend questions the legality of the form of taking the surrender. I am not learned in the law any more than he is, and I do not know whether we were right in the form in which we took that surrender or not. I do not know whether we ought to have a majority of the whole of the members of the band or only a majority of those who were present and voted; but I do know that all the surrenders that the Indian Department are taking now or have ever taken have all been taken on the same principle, and I assume, therefore, that it has legal sanction, and, in all this succession of Ministers of Justice of Canada since we have been handling Indian affairs it was not left for my hon. friend—with his, may I suggest, perhaps somewhat limited knowledge of law—to find that they were all wrong and that he is the only man possibly right.

Mr. BRADBURY. Was the Department of Justice ever consulted as to the legality of this?

Mr. OLIVER. I assume so. I cannot imagine that such an important question as the validity of title to millions of dollars worth of land which would depend upon the validity of surrender would have been in doubt for all these years until my hon. friend made his marvellous discovery. I think we are safe in believing that the title of the land is secure so far as that feature of the case is concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. But the minister does not know really whether the Justice Department was consulted or not?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not. I do not know in regard to this particular transaction. Then, my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) was worried a great deal about the fact that the purchasers of these lands were not able to get Torrens titles, and part of the blame was laid upon the Indian Department for having furnished an incorrect plan. There is a difficulty about the plan and the difficulty is this: that the original survey did not accord absolutely with the original plan that was filed. When our surveyor made his survey he made a plan that did accord with the survey upon the ground. There was a conflict between the two plans and there was some difficulty about the registration on that account, but I understand that the difficulty—it was a mechanical difficulty so to speak—has been gotten over.

Mr. BRADBURY. If the hon. gentleman says that the plan was made for the new survey and filed with the Registrar General of Manitoba, he is incorrect.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, possibly he is incorrect, but I do know that the survey was made, and I do know that a plan was made which was in accordance with that survey, and I do know that that plan did not accord with the old original plan already filed, and I am credibly informed that the old original plan was not in accord with the actual survey on the ground. That was the mechanical difficulty that occurred and for which certainly this government was not responsible.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister remember when the last survey was made?

Mr. OLIVER. It was made in connection with this transaction, I think, in 1907; the old survey was made in 1873. As to the attitude of the registrar of titles in Manitoba I have nothing to say. It is none of the business of the Department of Indian Affairs what the registrar of titles for Manitoba may see to be his duty in the matter of either granting or refusing these titles. That is a matter for the purchasers who are citizens of Manitoba to settle with the government of Manitoba. We have made a survey, and we have granted a title which enables the purchaser to transfer his rights. It is for those purchasers who desire to have their property placed under the Torrens title, to settle it with the Manitoba government; we have no responsibility for or interest in it. I do not think it is to the point that I should detain the House by going at any great length into this matter. My hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) has repeated, and repeated, and repeated, and I do not think he has given us any new material to-day that I recall beyond the statement of the Manitoba registrar; and his peroration. But I notice that he shifts his ground a little. Last year he was very strong on the point that these Indians should not have

been given title in severalty for a portion of the reserve, but to-day he works himself into an agony almost because they have not been given titles to the whole of their reserve. He read what Chief Justice Howell had to say on that point. These people possibly had rights as individuals besides their rights as Indians, and the effort of Chief Justice Howell in making the transaction was to wipe out both their individual right and their Indian right in the one transfer, and hence the granting to them of a portion of the land in severalty, and hence the ground of the complaint that my hon. friend urged last year so strongly as to the morality of the transaction and as to its legality. This year he finds his strongest argument against the surrender of the land as Indian land, in the fact, as he asserts, that it was really half breed land and not Indian land at all.

I will not follow my hon. friend in his flights of oratory as to the merits of these people and as to their various achievements. I have already said that it is a matter of historic record that they were better men 40 years ago than they are to-day; that they have lost and not gained by their close association with civilization; that it is absolutely in their interest that they should be removed to another locality more suited to their mode of life, and where the temptations of civilization will not be constantly before them; that the conditions and terms upon which this arrangement was made have been absolutely according to law and according to precedent, except in its extraordinary liberality, and in the fact that it extinguished the half-breed rights as well as the Indian rights. The people of the town of Selkirk and the people of my hon. friend's constituency are beyond any question largely benefited by the arrangement which has been made, and by its being carried into effect. The Department of Indian Affairs, in this transaction, from beginning to end, has not had anything to conceal nor to apologize for. All information has been placed at the disposal of the Honse and of my hon. friend. We have asked on previous occasions, and we ask again, for the support of the House to this transaction on its merits as an act of sound public policy in the interest of the Indians of St. Peter's, and of the white people of Selkirk, and as the carrying out of a principle which is for the good of the Indians and the white people all over the Dominion of Canada.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. T. W. CROTHERS (West Elgin). I venture to believe, Mr. Speaker, that an intelligent and unprejudiced jury, listening to the hon. minister, would convict him on his own statement, because his manner and words, as he followed my hon. friend from Selkirk, (Mr. Bradbury) bore all the earmarks of guilt. The evidence adduced by my hon. friend from Selkirk this evening, was brought to the attention of this House a year ago, and a portion of it, if I remember right, two years ago. No attempt was made a year ago to contradict that evidence and none has been made to-night. Let us see what a portion of that evidence is. The affidavit of William Asham will be found in 'Hansard' of last year at page 7055, a very lengthy affidavit, and I shall quote a portion of it. Speaking of the meeting to consider the advisability on the part of the Indians of surrendering St. Peter's reserve, Mr. Asham said:

> The meeting was held in an old schoolhouse on the reserve, too small to hold more than half of those present. Those present representing the government were Chief Justice Howell, Frank Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, S. J. Jackson, M.P., E. Raynor of Selkirk, John Semmens, Inspector of Indian agencies, J. O. Lewis, Indian angent, and Dr. Grain.
>
> When the meeting was called to order, Frank Pedley was selected to take the chair, and I was called in from the outside and requested by one of the gentlemen to act as interpreter. This I declined to do, stating that I wanted a free hand, but William H. Prince, one of the councillors, acted as interpreter, and interpreted parts of the proceedings.
>
> As soon as Mr. Pedley took the chair, I immediately stepped forward and asked if this was a public meeting. The chairman said, certainly. Then I said it was free for every one to express his opinion on the subject before the meeting, and Mr. Pedley replied, certainly. Mr. Pedley started to explain the conditions of the surrender, informing the meeting that he was sent there by the government to arrange for the surrender of the reserve. Mr. Pedley explained to the meeting what the government was willing to do if we would agree to surrender the reserve. One proposition he made was that the chief would receive 180 acres of land, and each councillor 120, and each Indian would receive only 16 acres of land. I immediately demanded the reason why the chief and council should receive more land than the ordinary Indian. Mr. Pedley replied that they were getting the extra land for their recognition. I then stated the only recognition they had was the coat they wore and the extra money they receive annually. I also stated that they were not entitled to one acre more land than the ordinary Indian would receive, but as the agreement of surrender was already prepared there was no change made at the time.
>
> I further declare that at least two-thirds of the Indians present did not understand the conditions as stated by Mr. Pedley. I, understanding the English language, did most of the talking against the surrender of the reserve, and after talking several hours back and for-

ward, I demanded that a vote be taken. At this time there was no question that a large majority of the band that were present were against the surrender, and expressed themselves loudly at times to this effect. Mr. Pedley and the council and others interested refused to allow the vote to be taken that night and the meeting was adjourned until ten o'clock the next day at the same place.

At ten o'clock next morning the meeting was again opened by the same parties representing the government present. I was surprised to find that some of those who had supported me strongly against the surrender the day before had been changed during the night. What caused the change, God only knows, I don't. But after a great deal of talk we adjourned to have lunch. I was invited by W. D. Harper, councillor, to have lunch with him at his house. After lunch, sitting in the room with others, Harper slipped a piece of paper into my hand with the following words written in lead pencil by himself to this effect: 'What would you think if you were to be made equal to a councillor,' meaning, of course, that I would get as much land as a councillor if I would agree to the surrender. I stated that I could not possibly agree. Before going into lunch, James Williams, councillor, came up and giving me a nudge whispered, 'Go and see Chief Justice Howell.' I replied, 'No, I would not go near him.' After coming out of Harper's house somebody approached me and told me that Mr. Jackson the member wanted to see me, and I said I did not want to see him, but after a while Mr. Jackson edged his way into the crowd where I was standing and pulling my coat indicating that he wanted me to step out of the crowd. I did so with him, then he said to me: Mr. Asham, you are strongly opposed to the surrender. I said, yes. Then he said, what would you think if we were to make you equal with the council, and stated I will promise you to obtain a patent for the land in about six weeks. To this I replied that I could not possibly agree. I declare that if I had agreed I would have felt that I would be accepting a bribe to desert my friends who were protesting against the surrender.

Now, soon after this, we were in the heat of a hot discussion in the matter regarding the surrender. Mr. Pedley during his speech at this time said I have $5,000 here, pointing to a satchel at his side. If you agree to this surrender this money will be distributed among you, but if you don't agree to the surrender, I will take my satchel and go home and you won't get a cent. Then we were told the time had come to take a vote. Up to this time fully half of the band present had not been able to get into the building, and did not hear what had taken place. The building being too small to take the vote in, we were asked to go outside. Then Mr. John Semmens, the inspector of Indian agencies, spoke loudly in Cree, saying, 'All you that want $90 go to this side, indicating where the chief and council were standing, 'the others go to the opposite side.' The crowd separated under great excitement, a great many not knowing what they were doing. After they were separated, some of them moving from one side to the other, not knowing what they were doing. Mr. Semmens and myself started to count the votes that were against, but when we got through counting we turned round to count the other side. I was told then that the other side was counted. I did not know who counted the other side, and they claimed they had a majority of seven. I was astonished to hear this, and sized up the two sides and satisfied myself that there were a larger number standing on my side than there was with the chief and council, but I had no opportunity whatever of counting the number that stood with the chief and council. I protested to Mr. Semmens, saying to him that he should not have said that you who want $90 go on one side, but you should have said you that want to surrender the reserve go to one side, and you that don't want to surrender the reserve go to the other side, then the people would have understood what they were voting for.

I declare that I consider the vote irregular and improper as it was not stated fairly to the people, nor was it fairly counted as it was counted by different parties. When Mr. Pedley read the surrender that he had with him prepared he read it in English, and fast, that even I, who understood English, found it difficult to understand the terms of the surrender. This was not interpreted to the band in their own language, consequently very few, if any, understood the conditions of the surrender. I am satisfied that Mr. Pedley and the others came determined to secure the surrender. The surrender was all prepared without any consultation with the band, and they brought the $5,000 with them. Without this money on the ground I am satisfied they never could have secured the support they did in favour of the surrender. Immediately after the vote was taken, the treaty was signed, and they commenced paying the money out.

Now, I want to read a sentence from the original affidavit, made by the same man, Asham:

I am a member of the St. Peter's band of Indians. The notices calling a meeting at which the votes surrendering the reserve were taken, were not posted, nor did the Indians know anything about such a meeting until Sunday, the 22nd of September, 1907, just one day prior to the date of such meeting.

Now, these affidavits were brought to the attention of the House a year ago. I think they were brought to the attention of the House two years ago also, but I am not quite sure. The minister has known for two months that this matter was coming up again. Now, the men who know best whether the statements of Asham and others are true or not are Chief Justice Howell and Frank Pedley. Frank Pedley has been in this city, I believe, for the last year. He was in the gallery while this matter was discussed a year ago, and heard these affidavits read. These affidavits have been looking the minister and Frank Pedley in the face for the last twelve months. I think it fair to assume that if either Chief Justice Howell or Frank Pedley were in a position to deny any statement made in these affidavits, we would have had their

denial here. We have had no such denial. So, I think we may fairly assume that the statements set forth in these affidavits are absolutely true and reliable. If they be true, and considering the character of Indians—their incapacity, simplicity and improvidence—I think we may fairly assume that when Frank Pedley said to these Indians: There is $5,000 in my satchel; if you will agree to the surrender of this reserve I will distribute it amongst you—that was, in substance and in fact, a bribe to these Indians. And, in bringing on that meeting at one day's notice and conducting it as the evidence shows that meeting to have been conducted, I submit, this government, instead of protecting the Indians, as, under their oath of office they were bound to do, were conniving at the plundering of these Indians. Now, the minister did offer one little reason for desiring to remove these Indians from St. Peter's reserve. He told us a year ago, if I remember aright, that there was no demand or request from the council of the town of Selkirk, from any clergyman in Selkirk or any citizen of Selkirk, or from any one at all except the defeated candidate Mr. Jackson, that these Indians should be removed. It was not, therefore, a case of the white people finding fault with the Indians being in their neighbourhood. No request whatever was made, according to the minister's statement last winter, that these Indians should be removed except that of Mr. Jackson. We have the minister to-day, with a good deal of warmth giving us a reason why these Indians should be removed, that they were degenerating, deteriorating morally; that they were worse than they had been forty years before. Well, I have looked into the reports of some of the inspectors of Indian agencies, and, with your permission, I will read some extracts from some of these reports. I have here the reports made by the late Ebenezer McCall to the government, dated 31st July, 1900. Mr. McCall was appointed to this position by the Liberal government. He says, amongst other things:

> There seems to be a growing tendency among the Indians to attend divine service. Their interest in such matters was quite evident to me at St. Peter's.

That is where this band resided.

> During the time we were there paying annuities, when religious services were held every evening in the adjoining chapel. These services, I noticed, were all well attended, and were attentively and respectfully listened to. It is almost a quarter of a century since I first visited these reserves, and in that time I have seen some marked changes. Twenty-five years ago St. Peter's was nothing but a string of huts and tepees, scattered along the banks of the Red river. The people were living upon fish, and spent their time hunting and trapping small game. Their most pretentious vehicle was the Red river cart, whose creaking could be heard for miles crossing the silent prairie. To-day there are very few, if any, thatch-roofed houses. The buildings are shingled, well fenced, surrounded by gardens, with stables and storehouses adjoining. Twenty-five years ago the small house had but one room, in which all lived and slept, regardless of relationship. Now, the houses are divided into compartments. There has been an almost incredible advance made along the line of moral reform.

Although the minister tells us they had been degenerating morally for the last forty years.

> Nearly all are united by our ceremony of marriage. I had not a single case of drunkenness while on my rounds. The fact that there is so little drunkenness among them generally, speaks well for the Indians.

Now, I have reports from several other inspectors along the same line, showing the rapid progress made by these Indians. The latest I have is that of Indian Agent J. O. Lewis, dated August 1, 1906. Speaking of these Indians, he says, amongst other things:

> The St. Peter's Indians, as a class, are good labourers and expert with the ordinary implements of industry, handy men on boats and steamers. Last year one held the position of master on a large steamer, and another on a smaller steamer, while many hold subordinate positions. But whatever their success may be as wage-earners, frugality is characteristic of a few. . . . .Out of a population of about 1,300, there are not many drunkards, and the band may be said to be temperate.

These are some testimonials from officers of this government, appointed by this government, testimonials as late as 1906, showing that these Indians on the St. Peter's reserve were making rapid progress morally, instead of degenerating morally as the minister would have us believe.

Now, the facts as established by affidavits filed by my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) show that St. Peter's reserve is a strip of land on either side of the Red river and somewhere about twenty-five miles from Winnipeg, extending up to the boundaries of the town of Selkirk. These inspectors tell us that it is all first-class land. This same man Jackson, Liberal member at one time, says in his report dated September 28, 1903, speaking of the land:

> It is all first-class land; rich, black soil of great depth.

A strip four miles wide on either side of the Red river within 25 miles of Winnipeg, a trolley car running five and six times a day from Winnipeg to Selkirk adjoining this reserve, a steam railway on either side of the river with trains two or three times a day, land the best in Manitoba—what was

it worth in the year 1907? Was it worth $25 an acre? It could not be bought to-day for $50 an acre. About 40,000 acres of it dissipated, 21,000 of it given to these Indians, 15,000 acres of it sold; the Indians have sold the land for what they got patents, most of it at $5 an acre, some at $2 an acre. The government sold 15,000 acres at about $5 an acre, and when the costs of dissipating this reserve is paid very little if any money will be left to put into the treasury of the Indian fund. This parliament, recognizing the inability, incapacity, simplicity and improvidence of the Indians has constituted them wards of this government, making this government guardians of the Indians. It is the duty of a guardian to deal with the property of his ward just as a prudent and far sighted individual would deal with his own private business, but with even greater restraint. That is not a hard proposition in which to put a guardian, to say that he shall deal with the property of his ward as a prudent and far sighted individual would deal with his own private business. I ask, have the government in this case dealt with this property, which was the property of the Indians of the St. Peter's band, as a prudent and far sighted private individual would have dealt with his own private business? You all know that a guardian is not permitted to hand over the property of a ward to the ward, and if he did so and the money was dissipated by the ward the court would make him restore to the ward the property so handed over and dissipated. The Indian Act provides the circumstances under which the government may make a patent of land to an Indian. The process of making a patent is an elaborate one. Section 108 of the Indian Act and the following sections read:

108. Whenever any male Indian or unmarried Indian woman, of the full age of twenty-one years, makes application to the Superintendent General to be enfranchised, the Superintendent General shall instruct the agent of the band of which the applicant is a member, to call upon the latter to furnish a certificate, under oath, before a judge of any court of justice, by the priest, clergyman or minister of the religious denomination to which the applicant belongs, or by a stipendiary magistrate or two justices of the peace, to the effect that to the best of the knowledge and belief of the deponent or deponents, the applicant for enfranchisement is, and has been for at least five years previously, a person of good moral character, temperate in his or her habits, and of sufficient intelligence to be qualified to hold land in fee simple, and otherwise to exercise all the rights and privileges of an enfranchised person. R.S., c. 43, s. 83.

109. Upon receipt of such a certificate, the agent shall, with the least possible delay, submit the same to a council of the band of which the applicant is a member; and he shall then inform the Indians assembled at such council, that thirty days will be given within which affidavits made before a judge or a stipendiary magistrate will be received, containing reasons, if any there are, of a personal character affecting the applicant, why such enfranchisement should not be granted to the applicant. R.S., c. 43, s. 84.

110. At the expiration of the thirty days aforesaid, the agent shall forward to the Superintendent General all affidavits which have been filed with him in the case, as well as one made by himself before a judge or a stipendiary magistrate, containing his reasons for or against the enfranchisement of the applicant.

2. If the Superintendent General, after examining the evidence, decides in favour of the applicant, he may grant to the applicant a location ticket for the land occupied by him or her as a probationary Indian, or for such proportion thereof as appears to the Superintendent General fair and proper. R.S., c. 43, s. 85.

Thus the Indian Act requires that the Indian shall satisfy the superintendent that he is a man of good moral character, temperate in his habits and sufficiently intelligent to hold a piece of land in fee simple; that he has borne such a character and such habits for five years, and that must be certified to by a judge or a clergyman; then he is put on approbation and he has to live up to that standard for three years longer before the government will give him a patent to a piece of land as an enfranchised Indian. So he must have been a man of good moral character and temperate in his habits for eight years as certified to the satisfaction of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and even at the expiration of that eight years when he gets his patent there is a provision that he shall not have the power to sell, lease, or otherwise alienate the land except with the sanction of the Governor in Council. In the face of these provisions of the Indian Act this government issued patents to these Indians, according to the Minister of the Interior without taking the precaution made necessary by this statute, of lands amounting to 21,000 acres.

They issued those patents with the view of their dissipating that land and selling it to white men in a very short time. The Deputy Minister, Frank Pedley, in his report to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, tells him that no doubt in a very short time all those lands will be conveyed to the white men. We have this government, instead of guarding the property of these children of nature, conveying all of these 21,000 acres of as good land as lies under the sun, in anticipation of the Indians conveying it all away to white people in a very short time. Is there an hon. member within the sound of my voice who approves of that, who believes that, had these 300 male Indians been Galicians, Doukhobors or Hindoos, having the franchise and having 300 votes

in that constituency, they would have been so treated? They had no votes, they had no friends, they had no influence at headquarters. Friends of the government desired to get their reserve at the nominal figure of $5 or $5.50 per acre, if I remember aright. They desired to get it, they did get it, and the Indian was paid, in so far as he was paid at all, as the evidence put on file by my hon. friend for Selkirk shows, in truck, by giving the Indian a dollar or two and an old wagon or a cow. When he comes back for the balance of the price of his farm he is told that he has been paid in full—the wagon was worth so much, the old cow so much, you got $2 or $3 in cash, and I do not owe you anything more. The area of 36,000 acres of land, 21,000 deeded to the Indians, and 15,000 sold, has been nearly all dissipated, and when the costs of the proceedings come to be paid in full there will be very little, if anything, left to put into the Indian fund. That is what the evidence seems to show. The evidence is uncontradicted you will remember, by the men who best know, if it be not true, uncontradicted by Chief Justice Howell. uncontradicted by Frank Pedley, and therefore, I think, believed to be true by every hon. member of this House. If it be true then I think we should have a full and fair investigation of this matter by a capable and trustworthy commissioner appointed by this government. We have never ascertained, in so far as I have been able to find out, the particular instructions that were given to the commissioner appointed by this government, namely, Mr. Justice Howell. I have seen what purport to be particulars of these instructions, but they are of the most general character. If I remember aright the Minister of the Interior admitted in this House a year ago that part of the instructions were given by him orally and not in writing, and I can well understand that, because I do not believe that the chief justice would have done what he did do on the meagre instructions given him in writing. I submit that the evidence shows that no sufficient reason existed for the attempt to remove these Indians from the reserve that they had occupied since the year 1871, away back to a new place on the Fish river. There were eight day-schools and five churches with clergymen on this reserve. Many of these Indians had expensive farm implements, binders, seed drills, a large number of cows and horses and here we have a meeting called on a day's notice at which about one-third of the male members of the band did not attend, only two-thirds present, half of them outdoors and the other half in the building, two-thirds of the Indians told by the officer of this government: 'I have in my satchel $5,000; I will not distribute it in case you vote in favour of the surrender, and if you do not I will take it home,' that statement under oath being corroborated by the man who is said to have made it—'those of you who want $90 stand over there; those who do not want $90 go over there,' instead of saying to these men: Those of you who desire to surrender your reserve and get a new reserve a hundred miles away on the Fish river, stand over there, and those who wish to remain where you have been living for forty years and enjoy the homes you have constructed here, go over to that side. The statement made to them, as I said a moment ago, considering their character, simplicity and improvidence cannot be regarded in any other light than that of a bribe. So, we have the officers of this government bribing the innocent, ignorant, incapable Indian to surrender his home of forty years and go away back 100 miles away to Fish river.

Mr. BRADBURY. They had been there for 100 years.

Mr. CROTHERS. I was under the impression that they had settled in 1871, but my hon. friend from Selkirk says that they have been there for 100 years. We must not forget that there were amongst these two hundred a number of scallawag Indians as distinguished from the better class of Indians, and you had a lot of toughs thus voting away the homes of men who were industrious and sober. It seems that this government had determined, by hook or by crook, to get rid of this St. Peter's band of Indians, that were living on that reserve although they had no good reason for it. I think I have shown to the satisfaction of every hon. member of this House that these Indians instead of having degenerated in the last forty years had rapidly improved morally and spiritually, if the reports of the inspectors of the government are to be believed rather than the statements made by those who really do not know anything about it.

They were among these Indians and they noticed the improvement they were making materially, morally and spiritually and they reported to the government that this band of Indians were rapidly advancing to a state equal to that of the white man. One of the inspectors says that among 1,300 of them there were very few drunkards. Why, Mr. Speaker, that is almost as good a character as we could get of 1,300 members of parliament. And still, the minister tells us that although nobody complained, although the council of Selkirk did not complain, although the clergymen who were going in and out among the Indians day after day in the five churches on the reserve did not complain, and although the teachers who were filling positions in the eight school houses on the reserve never suggested that the Indians should be with-

drawn from the demoralizing influences of the white man, there was one single individual and one only, who, as it transpired afterwards had some personal interest in the matter, desired that efforts should be made to remove these Indians, and that one man was a defeated Liberal candidate. It seems to me we have made out up to the hilt a case for a thorough investigation so that the people of this country may know the true inwardness of the dissipation of the 40,000 acres of Indian lands, worth, I think I am putting it at a moderate rate, $25 an acre.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina). I desire at the outset to set my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) at rest by telling him that I have in my hand the affidavit of Mr. Frank Pedley, Inspector General of Indian Affairs, giving an absolute denial to all the charges made in this debate with respect to his action in connection with securing the surrender of the St. Peter's Indian reserve. Before placing that affidavit before the House I desire to call attention to a few points in connection with this case as they appear to me. One argument used by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), is that the meeting was called on a very short notice, but. we have the evidence from the hon. gentleman's own speeches that the meeting was held on that reserve for a period of two days before the vote took place, and it would seem to be a most peculiar thing if the Indians on that reserve did not know that the meeting was going on. There is not so much doing on an Indian reserve that those living on the reserve would not know that a meeting was being held for the purpose of determining whether they would surrender their rights to their reserve and obtain another reserve from the government. The Indians certainly would be anxious to find out what the terms of the surrender should be. I should think it reasonable to suppose that the fact that a meeting for such a purpose was held on the reserve for two days would be ample notice to all the Indians as to what was taking place. Let me on this point read a clause in the affidavit of Mr. Pedley—I will put the whole affidavit on record later on—in respect to that meeting:

I do solemnly declare: That I was present during the whole of the meeting referred to and submitted the terms of the surrender clause by clause to all the Indians assembled, and each clause of the said surrender was carefully explained to the Indians both in the English language and in the language of the Indians by an interpreter acceptable to the Indians, and I firmly believe that every Indian present at that meeting thoroughly understood the terms of the surrender.

The said meeting lasted for two days and during that time a full discussion took place in which a great many of the Indians participated, and any Indian who desired to ask for information was given the fullest opportunity of doing so. On the day when the vote was taken it was decided by the meeting unanimously, just before the noon adjournment, that the vote should be taken at a certain hour in the afternoon of the same day. This was done, and out of a possible vote of 270 in the entire band there were 205 votes cast on the question of the surrender. The vote was counted by the Indian agent and the inspector of Indian agencies and was checked over by Wm. Asham, who was opposed to the surrender, and by one other whose name I do not remember. Not one objection was raised either to the vote itself or to the method of taking it.

I submit, in view of this evidence that there cannot be any honest objection taken to the method of conducting the meeting.

Mr. FOSTER. What did he say the majority was?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). He does not say in his affidavit, but I understand it was a close vote, 107 to 98, or something like that. It has also been argued that there has been no protection given to the Indians in connection with the dealing with these lands, but I would like to point out that in the original draft surrender it was proposed to permit no Indian to dispose of any particular parcel of land which he got as part of the terms of surrender without the consent of the department, and the Indians absolutely refused to surrender their rights at all with that clause inserted, and at the request of the Indians themselves that clause was struck from the surrender.

Mr. CROTHERS. Does the hon. gentleman think that it was a proper thing for the government to yield to the request of the Indians that that clause should be taken out of the agreement and that they should be allowed to sell if they thought fit. Would you do that with a child?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). If my hon. friend knew anything about western Canada at all he would know perfectly well that no town in western Canada wants to be along side of an Indian reserve.

Mr. CROTHERS. That does not answer the question.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). In dealing with a band of Indians in connection with obtaining the surrender of a reserve some inducement of some kind had to be held out to them to move away from the town of Selkirk. I do not know as much about the town of Selkirk as my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) does, but if I am correctly informed, every man in the town of Selkirk wanted the St. Peter's reserve moved away. I agree with the minister that as a matter of public policy and in the in-

terests of the Indians as well as in the interests of the white people it was proper that the reserve should be moved to a part of the country more remote from the white settlers. I have here a letter written by Mr. Pedley to the Indian agent instructing him in respect to the issue of the patent to the individual Indians, and it shows that the government took every means to prevent any possible fraud upon these Indians.

This is dated January 21, 1908, and is addressed to J. O. Lewis, Indian agent at Selkirk. It says:

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 12th instant, in connection with the location of Indians on the St. Peter's reserve, in accordance with surrender given by them a short time ago, and in reply beg to say that action is being taken with as much expedition as possible to locate the Indians on the land to which they may be found entitled, and you should notify them that there will be as little delay in arranging the matter as possible.

In connection with Indians disposing of or pledging their holdings, I beg to say that no transfer or pledge by any Indian will be in any way recognized by the department, and when it has been determined what land each Indian is entitled to receive, a patent for the same will be issued to such Indians, without regard to any claims by white men or others.

It is necessary to make this position of the department clear and as widely known as possible, as any recognition of rights by transfer would cause endless complications, and in order to prevent same it is incumbent on the department to issue grants only to the Indians found entitled to receive same.

The representatives of the Indians and the department will deal with all claims to land in accordance with the provisions of the surrender.

My contention is that the department could not protect the Indians in any other way than they did, by enacting in their regulations with regard to this surrender that they would not recognize any assignment, and that every patent must be delivered direct to the Indian to whom it belonged. As a matter of fact, I think the department insisted on getting receipts from the Indians for their patents. My hon. friend from Selkirk says that some of these are forgeries. I believe that some 400 receipts from Indians were received, and some 15 patents are still uncalled for. If my hon. friend from Selkirk has any evidence of any Indian's name on a receipt being a forgery—and he has produced no evidence yet on this point—I will join him in asking the Minister of the Interior to prosecute the forger, and I have no doubt the minister will agree with us in that.

Mr. BRADBURY. I read a declaration in which a man stated that his own son was on Lake Winnipeg and that he went and asked for his patent, and he was told that it had not arrived yet. When his son arrived, he took his son to the Indian agent, and he told him he had not the patent. He went to a real estate agent, and found the patent in his possession with the receipt signed by another man for the son.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Whose declaration was that?

Mr. BRADBURY. It was signed by one of the Ashams, I think.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). That had escaped my notice. I was under the impression that the hon. member had presented no evidence of any forgeries. However, if my hon. friend can produce any evidence which will satisfy any legal practitioner, I will join him in asking the department to prosecute any man who forged an Indian's name.

Mr. BRADBURY. My hon. friend knows that the declarations produced here show that at least 50 men swore that they never signed a receipt for the patents. Who did?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). All I have to say is that I do not believe those declarations. The instructions to the Indian agent were that he was to get those receipts direct from the Indians, and the agent sent them in as coming direct from the Indians.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the date of Pedley's affidavit that my hon. friend read?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). The 22nd of March, 1911. I may say, in justice to Mr. Pedley, that last year when this debate was before the House, he handed me an affidavit to be used in the debate; but owing to the fact that I did not address the House, the affidavit was not used, and I got this affidavit from Mr. Pedley to-day. With further reference to what the hon. member for Selkirk has said with respect to these alleged forgeries, I would like to ask him why these men who claim that their names were forged do not prosecute the forgers.

Mr. BRADBURY. That is very easily answered. Some of these men have applied to the government for assistance to prosecute these cases. One man applied to the minister for assistance to prosecute a man named Funk who, he said, had taken his land from him fraudulently, and the answer of the department was that they could not see their way clear to giving him any money for the prosecution. Consequently the prosecutions dropped, because the Indians could not afford to press them.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). My hon. friend knows that these prosecutions could have been carried on by the local government, in whose hands is the administration of the

criminal law. I am also informed by the Minister of the Interior that no such application was made to his department by anybody. Two statements were made by the hon. member for Selkirk both last year and this year, which are to my mind the crucial part of this matter. One statement, made last year at page 7035 of 'Hansard,' was:

Pedley said: I have $5,000 here in my satchel; if you vote for this surrender tonight I will distribute this $5,000 amongst you; if you do not vote for this surrender I will take my bag and go home, and you won't get a cent. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he considers that bribery?

The other statement is to this effect, that the Inspector of Indian Agencies said: 'All you that want $90 go to this side,' and they were counted in favour of surrender. Both of these statements were contained in the affidavit or declaration of Wm. Asham filed by my hon. friend; and on these statements the hon. member for Selkirk and the hon. member for West Elgin based the contention that bribery was used. I want to point out to these hon. gentlemen that the giving of money in advance in order to obtain the surrender of Indian reserves is no new thing. I am informed that every year $50,000 is voted by this House for the purpose of obtaining surrenders of Indian reserves, and it is the custom to pay some small proportion of the money available at the outset for the purpose of binding the bargain, as it were, or beginning the completion of the surrender. Let me call my hon. friend's attention to section 89 of the Indian Act, which provides for this, so that it is not at all a bribe, but is provided for by the law of the land. Section 89 says:

With the exception of such sum not exceeding fifty per centum of the proceeds of any land, and not exceeding ten per centum of the proceeds of any timber or other property, as is agreed at the time of the surrender to be paid to the members of the band invested therein, the Governor in Council may, subject to the provisions of this parliament, direct how and in what manner and by whom the moneys arising from the disposal of Indian lands or of property held or to be held in trust for Indians, or timber or Indian lands or reserves, or from any other source for the benefit of Indians, shall be invested from time to time, and how the payments or assistance to which the Indians are entitled shall be made or given.

So that provision is made in the Indian Act itself for giving to the Indians at the time of surrender a small portion of the expected proceeds from the sale of these Indian lands. With respect to these two statements made by the hon. member for Selkirk last year and this year, the hon. Minister of the Interior read an affidavit of Semmon's, the Superintendent of Indian Agencies, denying absolutely that there was any foundation for any allegations. In the affidavit of Mr. Pedley, which I have in my hand, he makes no reference to the last statement, but I can assure hon. members, on my word as a member of this House that Mr. Pedley said to me there was absolutely no foundation for any such statement.

With respect to the $5,000 alleged bribe, as the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) was pleased to call it, this is what Mr. Pedley says in his affidavit:

With reference to the payment of a sum of $5,000 to the Indians, referred to by Mr. Bradbury, I positively state that the Indians were informed by me that in case of a surrender of the reserve being taken, the department proposed to advance the Indians the amount of $5,000 in accordance with the terms of the surrender and as allowed by law.

The surrender itself provides for the payment of $5,000 on the acceptance by the members of the band. What bribery was there in that? The next clause of the affidavit says:

I did not use the words attributed to me by Mr. Bradbury, namely, I have $5,000 here in my satchel; if you vote for this surrender to-night, I will distribute the $5,000 among you. If you do not vote for the surrender, I will take my bag and go home and you will not get a cent.

Here is the last clause of the affidavit:

During the discussion of the clause of the surrender referring to the advance of the sum of $5,000, I was asked by some one if this sum would be distributed among the Indians if they did not surrender.

That was a very natural question. What other reply could Mr. Pedley give than the one he did?

To this I replied that this could not be done as this sum could only be paid on a surrender being given in accordance with the terms of the document providing for the surrender.

Surely that affidavit of Mr. Pedley with respect to those two statements, and also the fact that in the Indian Act there is a provision made for the advance of a certain sum of money, disposes, in the minds of all reasonable men, of the question of bribery altogether.

My hon. friend says that the Indians were badly used. Well, there were 48,000 acres in the reserve. Of these 21,000 were distributed among the Indians—180 to the chief, 120 to each councillor and 80 to each Indian. In addition 3,000 acres were set aside for hay lands for the use of the Indians, and the balance, 24,000 acres, were sold by public auction, and the proceeds used for Indian purposes. In addition the Indians were given a new reserve of 75,000 acres further north in Manitoba and that

land was chosen for them by Dr. Grain and Ernest Rayner, of Selkirk, men selected by the Indians themselves. How can it be said that the Indians were wrongfully used?

It has been hinted that there was collusion in connection with the sale of the land put up at public auction. What foundation is there for any such insinuation? The sale was advertised in the usual way, in some five or six newsappers, the Toronto 'Globe', the 'Free Press', a Winnipeg paper and a Selkirk paper and another journal. It was advertised under order in council passed by the Dominion government in 1894; and for the purpose of my argument, I desire to call attention to that order in council because it has been alleged that the sale was not properly advertised. The order in council was dated May 8, 1894, and I believe a similar order was made on December 12, 1896. The order in council of May 8, 1894 reads as follows:

Advertisements should not be inserted in any books, pamphlets or periodicals other than newspapers published weekly or more frequently, and all advertisements should be limited to the maximum of six insertions in daily or weekly papers.

The sale of these lands was, therefore, properly advertised and there was a fairly large attendance at the auction. The lands were purchased by 24 different buyers—I do not know, nor do I care, whether Liberal or Conservative. Surely no one will say that there was collusion at that auction sale. Under ordinary circumstances collusion at an auction sale is very difficult. The lands were sold at an average price of $5.70 per acre. Compare that with prices realized for the sale of other lands in that district. In June, 1909, six months later than the sale of the Indian lands, certain school lands were sold in the same locality. Three-quarters of section 29, township 14, range 6, east first meridian, sold at $5 per acre at public auction; southeast quarter of section 29 was offered for sale at an upset price of $5, but there were no bids. Section 11, of township 14, range 6, one-half section sold at $5 per acre and one-quarter sold at $5.50 per acre. The fourth quarter was offered at an upset price of $5, but there was no bid. Three-quarters of section 29, township 15, range 6, was sold at $5 per acre. The fourth quarter-section was put up at the upset price of $5, but no bids were offered. The inspector of the school lands, in making his report of the sale of school lands in that district, said that these lands were very much inferior to other lands in Manitoba. I know it has been said by my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) that these lands were worth at least $25 per acre. But I know where you can buy lands within 25 miles of the city of Winnipeg at $17 per acre to-day just as good as any land on St. Peter's Indian reserve. But in any event to say that the lands are worth $25 an acre to-day is no indication that they were worth more than $5.70 in 1908, because lands have increased in value by leaps and bounds in those few years. I know that lands have doubled in value within the last year and a half or two years at the most.

I have nothing further to say on this question. I merely rose for the purpose of putting at rest the allegations of hon. gentlemen opposite respecting the conduct of the Superintendent General of Indian affairs, Mr. Pedley; and although I have referred to a number of the sections of Mr. Pedley's affidavit, I think it but right that I should place it in its entirety on 'Hansard':

Province of Ontario, county of Carleton, to wit.

I, Frank Pedley, of the city of Ottawa, in the county of Carleton, in the province of Ontario, Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, make oath and say:

1. That I have read the speech of Mr. Bradbury, member for Selkirk, delivered in the House of Commons on the 30th day of April, 1910, with reference to the surrender of St. Peter's Indian reserve, and with particular reference to the statements alleged to have been made by me as contained on page 7191 of the House of Commons Debates, and I have heard the said Bradbury to-day reiterate the said statements.

2. That I was present during the whole of the meeting referred to and submitted the terms of the surrender clause by clause to all the Indians assembled, and each clause of the said surrender was carefully explained to the Indians both in the English language and in the language of the Indians by an interpreter acceptable to the Indians and firmly believe that every Indian present at that meeting throughly understood the terms of the surrender.

3. The said meeting lasted for two days, and during that time a full discussion took place in which a great many of the Indians participated, and any Indian who desired to ask for any information was given the fullest opportunity of doing so.

4. On the day when the vote was taken it was decided by the meeting unanimously, just before the noon adjournment, that the vote should be taken at a certain hour in the afternoon of the same day. This was done, and out of a possible vote of 270 in the entire band there were 205 votes cast on the question of the surrender. The vote was counted by the Indian agent and the inspector of Indian agencies, and was checked over by Wm. Asham, who was opposed to the surrender, and by one other whose name I do not remember. Not one objection was raised either to the vote itself or to the method of taking it.

5. With reference to the payment to the Indians of the sum of $5,000 referred to by Mr. Bradbury, I positively state that the Indians were informed by me that in case of a surrender of the reserve being taken, the department proposed to advance the Indians the amount of $5,000 in accordance with the

terms of the surrender and as allowed by law.

6. I did not use the words attributed to me by Mr. Bradbury, namely: 'I have $5,000 here in my satchel; if you vote for this surrender to-night I will distribute the $5,000 among you; if you do not vote for the surrender I will take my bag and go home and you won't get a cent.'

7. During the discussion of the clause of the surrender referring to the advance of the sum of $5,000, I was asked by some one if this sum would be distributed among the Indians if they did not surrender. To this I replied that this could not be done, as this sum could only be paid on a surrender being given in accordance with the terms of the document providing for the surrender.

FRANK PEDLEY.

Sworn before me at Ottawa, in the county of Carleton, this 22nd March, A.D. 1911.—Wm. Graham, a commissioner, &c.

There is one point to which I intended to refer, and I will take a minute to do it—the question whether the surrender was legal or not; the question whether you require for a surrender a majority of the Indians living on the reserve and entitled to vote or a majority of those at the meeting and entitled to vote. I have made some inquiry since six o'clock, and I am informed that the opinion of the department is that all that is necessary is a majority of the men of the band present at the meeting and entitled to vote, and that in every surrender dealt with by the department, that has been the practice. The section referring to the matter is section 49, as follows:

> Except as in this part otherwise provided, no release or surrender of a reserve, or a portion of a reserve, held for the use of the Indians of any band, or of any individual Indian, shall be valid or binding unless the release or surrender shall be assented to by a majority of the male members of the band of the full age of twenty-one years, at a meeting or council thereof summoned for that purpose, according to the rules of the band.

Surely that applies to a smaller number than a majority of the voters of a band. However, I am informed that it is the opinion of the Justice Department that it is a perfectly legal way to deal with the acres farther north in Manitoba and that surrender, and in my opinion the section means a majority of those present at the meeting and entitled to vote; if otherwise, the words at the meeting have no force or effect.

Mr. C. J. DOHERTY (St. Anne, Montreal). It is not my purpose to detain the House with any lengthy discussion of the questions that arise upon this motion. I do not know that I would have intervened in the debate at all if it had not been for the magnificent indifference the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) this afternoon exhibited as to what the law might be governing the rights of these wards of his. He told us that he did not know whether this surrender was legal or illegal, and it is a perfectly fair inference that he did not care whether it was legal or illegal, since he told us that he had not even taken the trouble to consult the Department of Justice. I have to congratulate the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) upon caring more about the legality of this transaction than the Minister of the Interior, for he tells us that, at all events, since six o'clock this evening, he did take the trouble to ask the Department of Justice its opinion of the legality of this surrender. And he tells us that, after the mature deliberation which the Department of Justice, of course, gave the question—a question of some little importance—between the moment when it was consulted and eight o'clock the department gave him the opinion that this surrender was perfectly legal, and therefore he is perfectly satisfied.

Now, I am not going into the question of the facts; I am not going to discuss the very contradictory evidence that has been put before the House upon the facts, except that on this latter point I have just one thing to say; and what I have to say is so obvious that it seems to me I should almost apologize for saying it. We have most absolutely contradictory evidence as to the circumstances under which this surrender was obtained. We have the evidence of people who, until something is shown to the contrary, ought to be considered as credible—large numbers of people—that false representations were made to induce this surrender; and we have the denial on oath of the persons to whom these false representations are imputed. In that state of affairs, the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) says: This is a matter that ought to be investigated. And the answer of the government is: Why, the evidence is contradictory; therefore you should not investigate. If there could be a conclusive argument why you should investigate, it is to be found precisely in that. If there were no contradiction there would be no need of investigation; but the fact that this House is in the position of having before it absolutely contradictory statements with regard to the facts concerning this very important matter is precisely the conclusive reason why this House ought to investigate,— unless this House in regard to the facts, indulges in the same happy disposition as shown by the minister (Mr. Oliver) this afternoon, with regard to the law, and does not know and does not care what those facts are. But, as I stated, I would not have intervened in this debate if it had not been for the absolute indifference—I do not think

I should be exaggerating if I said, contempt—with which the minister disposed of the question this afternoon whether this transfer was legal or not. There are just two observations I would like to make upon this question of legality. So far as the minister is concerned, all that he knows about it is that, as he has informed us, it has always been done that way. Now, he has not told us whether the question ever has previously arisen whether the majority of the persons present at the meeting is the equivalent of the majority of the members of the tribe at a meeting, he has not told us whether that question has ever arisen or not, and whether the Department of Justice has ever passed upon the question or not. Of course, I am not in a position to know how many of these surrenders have been made, nor under what circumstances they have been made. But I feel quite safe in taking this position,—that no number of surrenders in which the question never arises, in which nobody ever raised the question, form any precedent for the determination of the question that now is raised. If we look at this statute, the first thing that we see is that the determination of the question is not left to the meeting. I quite agree that where you leave the determination of the question to a meeting of persons of certain classes, then the decision of the majority who are present at the meeting is the decision of the meeting, and governs so far as the decision of the meeting can govern. But it is to be pointed out that this statute is very careful not to leave the determination of the question to the meeting. It points out precisely what are the conditions precedent to the surrender of a reserve. And it is well, when we read this section, to remember that it is making an absolutely exceptional provision of law, a departure from a fundamental general rule,—namely, that a man cannot be deprived of his property without his own consent. I have no hesitation in laying down the proposition—certainly as regards the law of the province from which I come, and I think I can with as little hesitation authorize myself to lay it down as a proposition of the common law—that it does not matter how many owners there may be of a property, you cannot deprive any one of these owners of his property without his consent. This is a fundamental rule of the common law. This statute proposes to depart from that rule. Now, anybody who knows anything about the law—anybody who is not like the Minister of the Interior absolutely above the law and neither knows nor cares what it is—knows that when you come to interpret an exceptional disposition of the law, that is to say, a disposition creating an exception to the general rule, you have to give it the strictest possible interpretation, you have to keep it within the absolute limits of what the words used require. What are the words used?

Except as in this part otherwise provided, no release or surrender of a reserve, or a portion of a reserve, held for the use of the Indians of any band, or of any individual Indian, shall be valid or binding, unless—

Here is the condition precedent:

Unless the release or surrender shall be assented to by a majority of the male members of the band of the full age of 21 years.

And then, while I do not want to attach too much importance to the punctuation, there follows a comma. There is the thing that is required and then the law goes on to say when and how that thing shall be done.

At a meeting or council thereof summoned for that purpose, according to the rules of the band,

So that the thing that is required is positive action on the part of a majority of the male members of the band; unless that is done no surrender shall be valid or binding. Not only must you have that done, but you must have it done at a meeting called in accordance with the rules of the band. The hon. minister interprets that as meaning that no matter how many people go to the meeting if you have a majority of the people at the meeting, you have complied with the law. The first answer to that is that it is not what the law says. The law does not say a majority of the male members of the band who are present at the meeting, the law says you must have the assent, the law is not contemplating voting, but you must have positive action on the part of a majority of the male members of the band, they must assent. A man who sits down and says nothing neither assents nor dissents, and what the law requires is the assent of the majority. It further requires as a protection to the people who may be deprived of their property against their will that that assent shall be given at a meeting held in the presence of the Indian Superintendent. Why? To prevent the possibility of people going around and buttonholing one Indian after another, and by one means and another, not in the presence of the superintendent his natural protector, inducing the individuals one by one to give their assent, until the assent of a majority of the members of the band has been secured. At a meeting is the additional protection added by the legislator who wants to protect these people whom he quite recognizes he is depriving, as individuals, of their distinct individual right to say each one whether or not he will part with his right in the reserve. This provision is twisted by his guardian against

him to make it mean that he, the guardian, may claim a title in case he gets the assent of a majority of members of the tribe who choose to go to the meeting. This is not a question of election where people are called upon to choose between one man and another, or between one course of action and another; there is only one thing put to the Indian here, the law says the thing he is asked shall not be binding on him unless he, to the extent of a majority at all events, assents. When you come to consider that the purpose of this section is to provide a method whereby a minority of that tribe may be deprived of their property rights in the reserve against their will, which is in violation of every principle of the common law, I do not think I need add any reason for saying that this is a provision of law to be given the strictest possible interpretation. If you have 200 members of the tribe and 101 vote to surrender, the other 99 are deprived of their property against their will, without their consent. That is the law and you must bow to it, but here the department is stretching the law to mean that where you have 200 members of a tribe and you call a meeting which is attended by only 20, a majority of that 20 may grant a surrender, whereas if a majority of the members of the tribe stay away they do not assent and therefore the property does not pass. Under that interpretation if 20 men go to the meeting, and out of those 20, 11 assent and 9 dissent, the property of the other 180 members of the band is alienated. That proposition was put to the minister last year, and he said he thought that would be legal. He should have done as he did this year and say he did not know if it was legal or illegal. He thought it would be legal, but very inequitable. But he said in this case when there were present 203 out of 289 he thought that would be equitable. I would ask the House to consider what the legal position is if we are going to apply this doctrine. It simply is that the law means that the majority at a meeting can give away the property of the others who are not there when the minister thinks it is equitable, and the majority at a meeting cannot give away the property of the minority when the Minister of the Interior thinks it is inequitable. That is the interpretation the minister puts on the statute which parliament passed for the purpose of protecting the Indians. In other words, parliament went to the trouble of making a law which on its face apparently meant that it prescribed the conditions precedent to a valid surrender, while it only meant to say that it depends on what the Minister of the Interior for the time being may think about it. That is the most absolutely preposterous proposition to put before any intelligent man.

Mr. DOHERTY.

Looking at this transaction as the surrender of a reserve, while I have not found any authority interpreting a provision precisely in the words of this section, and have, therefore, to deal with the case as what the lawyers would call a question of first impression, I would have no hesitation in saying that if a man came to me with a title derived from a vote of that kind, if the Indians had vigilant guardians, I would never advise him to accept that title, although of course under such circumstances as we have here where the Indians have guardians who apparently consider that their first duty is to find a possible interpretation of the law which would work to deprive the Indian of his property without his consent I dare say the purchaser would be quite safe simply because the only protector of the Indian does not know the law or care what it is.

But there is more than that. The second proposition is absolutely startling. It appears by the report of Chief Justice Howell, it appears by the statement of the Minister of the Interior,—it is part of the justification of the minister for having conceded to the Indians individually portions of the property which was taken over in the surrender,—that these Indians, not as members of the tribe having a share in the reserve, but as individual citizens of Canada, settlers upon that property, were owners of particular portions of that reserve. I am not going back to Chief Justice Howell's report to show where that is. He puts it so clearly that it is not susceptible of dispute. There was a total vote at the meeting of 105 on the one side and 98 on the other, the majority in favour of the surrender being seven. It is stated by Chief Justice Howell and not questioned by the Minister of the Interior, that those 98 men owned particular portions of the reserve, just as I might individually own property, and their property has passed from them under that surrender when they voted that they would not surrender it because there were seven more Indians at that meeting who wanted to surrender their property than there were Indians who did not. So we have this provision made by the government to provide how you may surrender an Indian reserve, twisted to so operate that it will not only deprive those who happen to be in the minority at the meeting, but it will deprive the majority of the whole tribe who did not vote for it, of their share in the Indian reserve. But more than that, so careful of the interest of the Indian is his guardian that we have it twisted so that it will deprive, and it has deprived the Indian who owned, as I might or as the minister might own, a particular piece of property in the province of Manitoba, of his ownership in that property against his negative vote present at the meeting. I

absolutely defy contradiction of that. Then, we are told that we are living in a civilized country. Why, it is fundamental; go away back to Magna Charta; one of the things they fought for was that no man should be deprived of his property against his will except by due process of law. Yet here are 98 Indians who have been deprived of their property. Let us condemn, as the minister condemns to satisfy the government, the men who did not go to that meeting and whose property was taken away from them in their absence; here are 98 men who went to the meeting and voted that they would not surrender their property, yet their property is gone from them, and this is a country where a man cannot be despoiled of his property without due process of law! It is a perfect disgrace. We heard the other day of certain relations of ours with some other countries being a blot on civilization. I say it is a blot on the vaunted civilization of this country and it is no answer to tell me or to tell the public that you have done better for the Indian than if you had left him there. You do not justify the thief. The thief does not justify himself by saying to me: I have taken your property against your will, but I am ready and willing to give you something better. These people owned their property or they did not own their property. The report of Chief Justice Howell called the attention of the government to the fact that these people owned their property as individuals. Chief Justice Howell's report and the meeting of the Indian tribe to which they went to vote against parting with it have deprived them of their property. Now, I may be told that they have signed deeds now by which they have consented to the surrender of the reserve. I dare say that is true; I do not question it. That was part of the plan. Chief Justice Howell does not put in question in his report the existence of those rights which the Indians had under the Manitoba Act. He does not for one moment suggest that the Indians should be told about the existence of those rights. He does not suggest, what must have been perfectly evident to any reasonable man, that these rights were not matters to be dealt with by the surrender of an Indian reserve, but he says that when the surrender is voted it would be well to have these Indians renounce their individual rights. So, the individual rights are sufficiently clear that it is quite recognized that the surrender of the reserve will not deprive them of their individual rights, and, therefore, it would be well to put them specially in the deed. I have not seen the evidence that that was put to these men at the meeting. Ninety-eight men voted against any surrender at all, voted that they wanted to keep their rights and, in the face of that positive affirmation, without colour of right in so far as these individual rights are concerned, this government has taken over their property because it has been able to get them to sign off some deed for which they were paid no other consideration than the considerations that were offered for the surrender of the Indian reserve.

The Minister of the Interior is indignant because my hon. friend from Selkirk talked about robbery. Well, I suppose the minister was right when we get down to technical things, robbery means stealing with violence. As far as I know there was no violence. If my hon. friend from Selkirk had called it larceny, had called it obtaining property by false pretenses, he would, perhaps, more correctly technically have described it. But, if taking a man's property without right, depriving him of his property in violation of the law, appropriating to yourself that which belongs to another man, may be properly described as robbery, then I do not know of any case of robbery more clear, more unmistakable, more indisputable, than this. We are told that we robbed the Indian for the Indian's good—a very convenient doctrine. I wonder how we would like to live under a law which would enable the government to rob us for our own good? My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) suggests that they practically do it now. Well, as far as robbing is concerned, he may be right, but as to how far it is for our own good I would be more disposed to question his statement. But, that is beside the question. In so far as that answer is made, all I have to say is that there is no right in the government of Canada to rob an individual for his own good any more than there is in me to deprive my neighbour of his property because I think I can do something better with it than he can do for himself.

I quite recognize that they have not described their act in taking the property as I have described it, but they have sought to justify it by saying that the Indians have got a better reserve, and the white people are happy to be rid of the proximity of the Indians. In such an absolutely clear case of legal spoliation it would be a pity to spoil it by adding anything to it that might be qualified as sentimental lamentation. Our friends on the other side are not very fond of sentiment in connection with any question, but for my part I cannot help expressing my endorsation of the words of the member for Selkirk, in so far as they point out that this transaction puts an end to our boast that under British government the aborigines get justice. We are bigger than they, more intelligent than they, more astute than they; they do not know they have a title under the Manitoba Act; they know probably even less about the law than the Minister of the Interior wants to

know, and we profit by their ignorance, and we say we will gather them together, and by a vote of a minority of the tribe get them to surrender the reserve, and then we will take for ourselves their personal private property that belong to them under the Manitoba Act. And, we are proud of the achievement and we boast that the white man has been relieved of the Indian. The hon. gentleman from Regina said, in justification of this: There is not a white community in the country that would not be glad to get rid of the Indians in its neighbourhood, and that is given as an absolutely unanswerable conclusive reason for taking the Indians' property. Well, if we are going to do that let us say so, but let us not pretend that we are doing justice to the Indian, let us not pretend that we are administering his affairs justly as his guardians under the law. In the past Canadian parliaments made the law to protect the Indians, but this government has found a way to despoil him of his property in spite of that law. It is absolutely immaterial to me whether the new reserve is better than the old and whether the position of the Indian is improved or not; the great important question that arises is whether, in regard to the Indian or the white man, we Canadians are going to sit quietly by and recognize that the government of this country for the time being has the arbitrary power to deprive a man of his property because the government thinks it is good for him. I register my most energetic protest against such a principle. If the government are right in their proposition that it would be better for the Indian, better for the white man, better for the progress of the country, that the St. Peter's reserve and the private ownership of the Indians in that reserve should disappear, the government had within reach a means towards that end. Why didn't they come to parliament for legislation to authorize them to expropriate the property of these Indians in a lawful and regular way? Why did they not dare to submit to the representatives of the people the question whether or not there was a sufficient public interest at stake to justify special legislation providing for that expropriation. But, they did not dare to do that; they would rather twist the law and violate the law in the hope that people would not find it out. For my part I look upon this as a matter of very much greater importance than its effect on this particular tribe of Indians. Here we have the government standing forth unblushingly and saying: We have taken the Indians' property because he is better without it, and we have given him something for it, something which we knew that so far as he was an individual he would immediately squander, and we have given his tribe something better in the way of a reserve, and its all right and everything is lovely. I do not say it is proved that this thing may not have been done in that kind of good faith which people claim for themselves when they say: I deprive my neighbour of his rights, but it is all for his own good. I am not here to question that the Minister of the Interior may have thought he was doing this for the Indians' good. It is perhaps true of the minister, but so far as the department is concerned perhaps it is not true. There is a great deal of testimony to the effect that it is not true; there is a great deal of testimony to the effect that the surrender was not only illegally but fraudulently obtained from the Indians. I am willing to give as much credence to the men who deny as to the men who affirm, but I say it is precisely a situation where honest men investigate before they pronounce judgment. When you add to that the manifest illegality of the thing done, and its justification, not because it was legal—nobody cares in the government whether it was legal or not—its justification on the ground that it was better for these Indians to be deprived of their land, I must say that I have difficulty in understanding how hon. gentlemen are going to vote that there is nothing even to look into. I certainly shall vote in favour of an investigation into this matter which upon its face is manifestly illegal, and with regard to the good faith and honesty of which there is to say the very least, most substantial reason for doubt.

Hon. G. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). It would be rather an unusual thing, if after the address we have heard from my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) there was no attempt on the part of the government to meet the position which he has placed before the House, and which he I am bound to say put with remarkable force and clearness. Is there any answer to the position my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) has taken and the conclusion to which he has come? If there is we ought to have it. If there is not, how in the world can we sit here and justify it. Does not that appeal to every one of us present, and I noticed that those who are here for the most part paid most particular attention to the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty).

They have heard his argument, his citation of law, his conclusion. My hon. friend is a man of fine legal training and of excellent legal repute, and it seems to me that his argument and his conclusions ought to call for an explanation on the part of the government, or an attempt at rebuttal of his propositions. That is the least that we could expect in a parliament; are we not to have that? If the position which my hon. friend has taken is tenable, I have never seen a government in a worse position before its own

followers and before the House and the country. He has absolutely made the deduction from his argument that the government has been party to robbery. In the technical sense he calls it something different, but in the essence of it, he alleges that the government has taken away from men who have legal rights that which they possess by virtue of those legal rights, and has done it without process of law and without their consent. Now, you may call it robbery or larceny or whatever you please. The name matters nothing; the act itself is brutal, manifest and unjust. Is there no reply to that? My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior is not expected to make a reply. He does not know the law; he does not care a fig what the law is—he has told us that more than once. He told us that last year when it was put to him straight as to whether this was a legal thing or not, and up to this very hour he has shown that he cared so little about it that he has never asked for an opinion from the Department of Justice about it. He is not even so thoughtful as my hon. friend from Regina, who did take the precaution to get an affidavit from a responsible officer, the deputy minister, between the hour of adjournment and the hour he commenced to speak—an eleventh-hour affidavit, or worse. Well, it struck me, who am not a lawyer and have never been a judge and never expect to be, that where you have affidavits clear and explicit, on one side, and affidavits equally clear and explicit on the other side, a judge would not care to try a case on that kind of testimony. He would consider that it called for oral evidence under strict and close examination and cross-examination. Here we have, in the first place, a member of parliament, just as honourable as any other member of parliament, just as anxious to do his duty by his country and his constituents, and from his personal observation, his personal knowledge, and the information he has gleaned over two or three years during which this transaction has been more or less before the House and the country, giving us his positive views on the matter. He lives in the vicinity and knows the circumstances personally, and his version is that a great wrong has been committed. We cannot simply laugh at that and say there is nothing in it. That is not reasonable. Dozens of men, who have interests, who have knowledge and who have information, have made solemn affidavits, all of which are to the effect that there has been wrong-doing—that they have been wrongfully done out of their rights, in exactly the way the hon. member for Selkirk has described. Now, that ought to produce the impression that a prima facie case has been made out, and that it is something worth looking into. Then, the legal aspect of the matter has been brought out, and there is no answer to it. I do not believe that my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin), would contravene the legal conclusions which have been arrived at by my hon. friend from St. Ann's (Mr. Doherty). No man in the government does, and the minister himself, without the least solicitude, admits that he has never taken the trouble to get the opinion of the Justice Department upon the matter. Now, I want this much understood with reference to myself, and I think it is true with reference to my hon. friend from Selkirk, that neither of us holds the view that it is impolitic or wrong in itself to endeavour in certain circumstances to change the Indians from one reserve to another. The hon. Minister of the Interior tried naturally to make capital against the hon. member for Selkirk, by basing an argument on that. He said it was for the benefit of the Indians and for the benefit of the white men living near and for the public good that there should be a change of reserves. Granted that that is so; the opposition of my hon. friend from Selkirk is not because the reserve was sought to be changed to another locality, for the general good of both white people and Indians, but it is because in carrying out that which might have been a laudable object, it was carried out so that wrong and injustice resulted, and men and Indians were deprived of their property rights and of what should have been the real result of the sale or disposal of those 48,000 acres of land. The hon. minister thought he had made out his whole case when he said that 74,000 acres of good land for a reserve had been given to them in place of the 48,000 acres which they owned under him as their guardian.

You must go further than that. Granted that another reservation of 74,000 acres were given to them, and that they will be healthier and better on it, and that the public good will be better served, there is this element of injustice. They owned that 48,000 acres, they had a right to every dollar that land could be made to bring over and above expenses. To whom should the profit go—to the Indians or the speculators? The whole gravamen of the charge is that the guardian of the Indians caused proceedings to be carried on whereby the speculators got almost everything, and his Indian wards almost nothing. There were 48,000 acres of land. My hon. friend from Regina can talk about the value as long as he pleases, he cannot convince any one who knows the circumstances, that the land in that reservation, which is the choicest land in Manitoba, was not worth

far more than the Indians got for it. Its location has been explained by my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Crothers). I myself have been there and know the situation. Let any one go there and look at the locality, and just consider what the land is worth. Take the testimony of my hon. friend's own office, and the general opinion of people who know anything about the locality. It is within 25 miles of a city of 150,000 people, which will shortly be a city of half a million. It has four channels of communication open from it to that city throughout the year with the exception of some part of the winter season. It has steam railways on each side, an electric railway and water transport throughout the season of navigation. Do you mean to say that that land, situated alongside the very considerable growing town of Selkirk, and within 25 miles of one of the greatest cities of the west, and with constant facilities for transport—do you mean to tell me that that land in 1907 was worth no more than $5.60 per acre? There is no use talking about any such price. It was worth at that time four times that price; and if the guardian had been faithful to his trust and had undertaken to get for his Indian wards all that could be got out of that land, instead of the small paltry sum which the Indians are to get, they would have been made rich by it. They had a right to that; the speculators had none. The guardian should have got that for them; but either through negligence or active participation, he enabled the speculator to get the profit and prevented the ward from reaping it. What happens? Persons who come to settle on that property and enter into active work of cultivating it must pay on an average from $25 to $60 an acre for it. So that my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) has not even the excuse of giving the land to the real tiller of the soil at the bottom price. Instead he has enabled speculators to get it at the bottom price, and then the speculators hand it over to the real cultivators at the highest price. But what have the Indians got?

My hon. friend made an argument against himself out of his own mouth. He says that the Indian in 1907 was much worse than was the Indian of 40 years ago. Although the evidence is against him, he must be judged by his own view. If that view be correct, all the more reason why the guardian should have been the more careful to look after his ward. Taking his own view, if the Indians have deteriorated during the last 40 years, and are, therefore, more like children and less like men, they should have had all the more the best care that their guardian could give them.

No man can read the story through—and I have read it through carefully—without coming to the conclusion that there was either callousness to any of the best rights and the best interests of the Indian on the part of his guardian, or there was absolute, open knowledge that the Indian was being dispossessed in order that the speculator might have the greater gain and profit.

I do not want to weary the House by a recital of what is in the evidence, but I would ask any man just to read over the facts and circumstances and see if he can come to any other conclusion. To get up here and read an affidavit, in which a man writes just what suits him and no more and swears just exactly what he wants to swear to, and cannot be cross-examined, is simply abusing our credulity. There is no use in reading an affidavit of that kind in order to convince level headed men that everything has been properly done. Why, in affidavit after affidavit and evidence upon evidence, the fact stands out that the Indian agents themselves made it easy to sluice that property from the Indians and hand it over to the speculators, and it was done through the passage ways of backstairs influence, and drunkenness and truck—any device that could be used in order that the Indian might be despoiled at the lowest possible price to the speculator. Why, the agent himself dabbled in this thing, and the guardian of the Indians knew it and knows it to-day. The agent of the guardian appointed to look after his wards dabbled himself in these lands, and the guardian knew it, and knows it to-day.

Yet the silly, inane proposition is put before us to-night that if the Indian has been cheated by fraud or forgery, he can prosecute. Let the Indian prosecute! All you need is to put that proposition before you and look at it with one eye and you can see it is absolutely untenable and untrustworthy as an argument.

Now, look at the outcome. There was the property of the Indians in the trust of the Minister of the Interior, worth at least $1,000,000 in 1907, and before the speculators get rid of it, it will have changed hands for pretty nearly $2,000,000. What does the Indian get out of it? He gets 21,000 acres given to himself, and the average that he got for 18,000 acres of this were taken by three or four land speculators was $5 per acre. And what became of the $5 per acre that he got? The men did not get it in many cases. There were cases in which truck and false accounts and trumped up accounts were part of the payment made to the Indian. The Indian agent knew what was going on, and never interfered; the department knew well, before they permitted the change, that these men would have no chance at all in the hands of the speculators. Why, you might as well turn untrained children into the arena of business, and expect them to protect themselves, as to expect the Indians, under certain circumstances, to protect themselves in the disposal of property. Anyway, all

they got for that land was $5 an acre—that is, about $115,000. Where much of it went we could easily see from what I have already said. A great part of it was dissipated in that way—here to-day, to-morrow nowhere, and the Indian is left without the needed means of subsistence which he would have had if his guardian had watched over and protected him during that period. And what was done with the rest of the lands? Three thousand acres of hay land were kept, and it is there yet, maybe. And 15,000 acres were auctioned What is the use of us spinning cobwebs over that auction? An advertisement was inserted in weekly papers some four to six times, then absolutely dropped for a month, so that it might fade out of people's memories, and then, in midwinter, on the 16th of December, the land was auctioned off. And who got it? All but 1,000 of the 15,000 acres auctioned, went to these same three or four men who had collared the 18,000 in the first lot—speculators who were onto it from the first, and were into it at the last, and were both onto it and into it because of the facilities allowed them either by the inaction or by the action of the department. For that 15,000 acres, these men paid $5.68 per acre, which is somewhere about $85,000. But there is another side to that. So far, $32,000 has been taken out of that for expenses and yet only one-third of the band is transferred to the new reservation. Now, another point; what was the purpose in all this that the minister did or allowed to be done? His purpose was to separate the Indian from the white people in the vicinity of Selkirk? Are they separated? Two-thirds of the Indians are there to-day, and it is three years or more since these transactions were carried out. So, the minister has not separated them in reality. And to-day there is this sense of injustice, and this absolute injustice and wrongdoing which has been set forth by my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) without any answer being forthcoming.

Now, I do not know that there is much use in talking any longer about it. We have no real jury here, and we do not even get the attendance of one-quarter of those who are to decide the case. If a vote is called upon this question, men will troop in and vote. Because they have heard the discussion and understand the case of the Indians? Not at all. The jury as constituted here, is made up in large part of men who vote without hearing the evidence or without caring what the facts are. The bell rings, they come in and vote, and they vote the way the Minister of the Interior votes. There is not much encouragement for the wards of the nation to bring their grievances before the great tribunal, the King's parliament, when they find that scarcely a baker's dozen of the King's parliament are present to hear the presentation of their grievances and that, by and by, when the vote is taken, the verdict will come from men who have not heard the case and have not listened to the grievances. If there is any fault for that, the large fault lies with the government. For the government is supposed to act wisely, and above all, to act legally and justly. And if there are any people with whom they are particularly bound to act in this way, they are the helpless, the weak and the inefficient, and if with any class of that kind, with the Indians who once owned everything in this country and who have been driven by the incoming white population back upon their reserves. And now their reserves are taken from them without due process of law, and they are wrongfully despoiled of that which they ought to have. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) sent Mr. MacDougall up to make an investigation so that it could be said in the House: Rev. Mr. MacDougall has gone up there and made a thorough investigation, and this is his report. Was the Rev. Mr. MacDougall sent up there in order to hear the complaints of the Indians on their own reservation and report that to the minister? If not, what was the use of sending him up at all, and for what purpose did he go? Mr. MacDougall is said to be the author of a report made on November 10 last to the minister and presented to this House. Mr. MacDougall, as I know, and as is capable of proof, met these Indians in the school house on their reserve and, for hours upon hours, listened to their complaints. I have them here taken by the reporters of the three different Winnipeg newspapers, and all practically agreeing as to what took place. In these complaints they said they had been unduly deprived of their rights. They said that the meeting had not been legal. They declared that they had been dispossessed by the law, and asked for a royal commission from the father of the Indians, from the guardian of the Indians and from parliament which ought to look to their interests.

Does Mr. MacDougall give one word of all that, in the report which he hands to the minister? Not a single word. From his report you would not know that there was any dissatisfaction amongst the Indians except that they wanted a chief and an election to get a chief. If any body doubts that let him read the report. From it you would never guess that these Indians had asked Mr. MacDougall to ask their guardians to have a royal commission to look into their grievances, to make an examination and to report the facts. Yet that was the

main plea they made to Mr. MacDougall. Is that the full report that Mr. MacDougall made to the minister, verbal and written? Would Mr. MacDougall counsel for hours with these Indians, have all their grievances placed before him and then come here and not report a single word of these conferences and the complaints and grievances brought and laid before him? Is Mr. MacDougall the stripe of man who would do that? I do not believe it, and therefore I do not believe this is the full knowledge and information that Mr. MacDougall imparted to the minister and his department. If it is it is not a truthful report, and I would be very sorry to imply that Mr. MacDougall would make an untruthful report.

With all these things before us will the minister allow me to ask him who can be injured and what can be injured if we appoint a good, true, honest business man to examine this whole thing and report? The minister is not immaculate any more than I am; he may be wrong in his interpretation of the law just as I may be. Working through officers, he may have been misled as any minister may be, but this is a most important matter and it involves a most important principle and touches the rights and property of the wards of the nation. Would it not be the wisest and best course to appoint a commission and let us have all the facts and the whole truth of this matter. Surely if the Indians have been defrauded we ought to see that they are righted. Surely if perjury and forgery and fraud has gone on in the guardian's offices to the detriment of his wards, we ought to know it, and the men guilty ought to be punished, and no punishment could be too great for men who would cheat Indians, the wards of the people. If the minister's statement is true that not a man in Selkirk or its vicinity, or in Winnipeg can be found to say that these transactions were wrong, what harm, what risk can come to the government from a commission? After what we have heard tonight I do not think any government should rest a moment until it has put machinery in operation to clear away from the department, and from the government, and this country, that which would be about the lowest, meanest, vilest blot upon its escutcheon, that it would cease to care for the rights of its wards, that it would allow them to be in any way infringed upon or to be in any way despoiled of that which belonged to them. Is it not worth a commission to settle that question once and for all? I wish to repeat there are many things that a man advocates, some for political purposes, some for other purposes, but it is not fair to assume that whenever a man in this House makes a plea for on interest, or a section, he is unworthy in his motives in making that plea. I believe that the motives of the hon. member for Selkirk in his plea are pure and honest. All the political capital that he could get out of it, he could have got out of it long ago, but there is this question of right, of absolute justice, and I believe that that is the impelling motive with my hon. friend. I have said before that I have looked into this question most minutely, and I cannot come to any other conclusion than that a wrong has been committed of a kind that should be the last for a government to commit, or for a parliament to allow to go without restitution. That wrong has been committed against the Indians of that reserve, but it is committed against the wards of the country generally.

I repeat that we should not involve this question with the others as to whether circumstances may not arise in which it is better that Indians should be shifted from the reserve they have and be placed somewhere else where it will be better for them and for the country at large. That question is not involved. The question that is involved in this case is simply and only, was it honestly, fairly, justly done. Has the Indian got his rights. or has he been despoiled of his rights?

Mr. J. P. MOLLOY (Provencher). Mr. Speaker, this subject has been so thoroughly discussed that there is little left to say upon it. Reference has been made to sales of school lands adjoining the St. Peter's reserve after the sale, and for the information of the House it may not be out of place to quote the prices of lands adjoining it during the last ten years. I have here a list of transactions furnished me by Mr. William Frank, a large purchaser of this St. Peter's reserve, who was charged with dishonesty in dealing with these Indians. I met him in Ottawa, and went into the matter with him and his statements were to the effect that his dealings and those of every other man whom he knew, with the St. Peter's Indians, had been fair and above board. I asked him as to the prices paid, and how they compare with other sales in the district and he furnished me with this list of transactions in which he was concerned:

January 20, 1911.

The following are a few of the land sales I have put through my office in the Selkirk district during the last eleven years.

Year 1899.—Purchased from the municipality of St. Clements, the southeast of 33 and the north ½ of the northeast of 28-13-6 east, 240 acres. Price, $175. This land is located two miles from St. Peter's Indian reserve, and is of first-class land.

March 21, 1900.—Purchased from the municipality of St. Clements, the southwest ¼ and the south ½ of the northwest ¼ of section 24-14-6 east, 240 acres. Consideration $144.85. Terms, one-third cash, the balance in one year at 6 per cent. Torrens title. This prop-

erty is located 3¾ miles from St. Peter's reserve.

March 21, 1900.—Purchased from the municipality of St. Clements, the southeast of 23, and the north ½ of the northeast of 14-14-6 east, 240 acres. Consideration, $175. Terms, one-third cash, the balance in one year. 3¼ miles east of St. Peter's Indian reserve.

March 21, 1900.—Purchased from the municipality of St. Clements, the northeast and the east ½ of the northwest ¼ of section 21-13-6 east, 240 acres. Consideration, $186, and the current year's taxes. 1¼ miles east of St. Peter's Indian reserve.

February 6, 1900.—Purchased from the municipality of St. Clements, the west ½ and the southeast ¼ of section 4-13-6 east, 80 acres. Price, $60. Terms cash.

February 6, 1900.—Purchased from the municipality of St. Clements, the east ½ and the northeast ¼ of 33-13-6 east, 80 acres. Consideration, $60. Terms cash. Two miles east of St. Peter's Indian reserve.

February 6, 1900.—Purchased from the municipality of St. Clements, the northwest ¼ and the north ½ of the southwest ¼ of 13-14-6 east, 240 acres. Cost, $140. Terms cash. 3¾ miles from St. Peter's Indian reserve.

February 6, 1900.—Purchased from the municipality of St. Clements, the southeast ¼ of the south ½ of the northeast ¼ of 21-14-6 east, 240 acres. Cost $160. Terms cash. Location, 1¼ miles east of St. Peter's Indian reserve.

February 6, 1900.—Purchased from the municipality of St. Clements, the southwest ¼ and the north ½ of the southeast ¼ of 22-14-6 east, 240 acres. Cost, $160. Terms cash. Location, 1¾ miles east of St. Peter's Indian reserve.

February 6, 1900.—Purchased from the municipality of St. Clements, the east ½ of the southwest and the north ½ of the south east ¼ of section 20-14-6 east, 160 acres. Consideration $100. Adjoining St. Peter's Indian reserve.

All the above properties were purchased in the fall of 1899, and in February and March of 1900, from the municipality of St. Clements. These lands had been bought in by the municipality some years previous for taxes and were not considered of sufficient value by the owners to redeem them for the tax sale, consequently in course of time the municipality became the owners. They offered these lands for sale in various ways, finally the late E. H. Taylor and myself made a purchase of the above lands at the prices and on the terms referred to.

In the years 1900 or 1901, the late E. H. Taylor, Mr. G. W. Walker and myself purchased from the municipality of Brokenhead about 5,500 acres, at a price somewhere between $1 and $1.05 per acre. These lands were originally in the municipality of St. Clements, but when the new municipality of Brokenhead was formed these lands were taken over by the new municipality and sold at the price above-named. These lands lie between 5 and 15 miles east of St. Peter's Indian reserve and north of the towns of Tyndall and Beausejour, north of the Canadian Pacific railway.

July 31, 1900. Purchased from Charles McKenzie, of Sarnia, Ontario, the southeast ¼ and the south ½ of the northeast ¼ of section 30-13-6 east; 240 acres. Price, $3 per acre. Terms, $75 cash, the balance in four equal annual instalments. This property adjoins the St. Peter's Indian reserve, and is a very excellent piece of land.

1900. Purchased from the late Thomas Hardy the southeast and the south ½ of the northeast of 25-13-5 east. 240 acres. Small improvements on the property. Twenty or thirty acres broken, and a small house and stable. Purchase price, $1,200, which included a team of work horses, which were afterwards sold for $400, leaving the price of the land at $800. This property adjoins the St. Peter's Indian reserve, also adjoins the farm of Sir Wm. Van Horne, and is only two miles from East Selkirk station.

June 11, 1901. Purchased from E. A. Taylor of Fort Worth, Texas, the northwest ¼ and the north ¾ of the southwest ¼ of 16-14-6 east; 240 acres. Total cost including title, $267.45. This property is within three-quarters of a mile of St. Peter's Indian reserve.

October 18, 1900. Purchased from George Knight, farmer, East Selkirk, the southwest ¼ of 7-13-6; 160 acres. Price, $480. Three and one-quarter miles from St. Peter's Indian reserve. This quarter is all excellent farming land.

July 12, 1899. Sold to the late E. H. Taylor the southeast ¼ and the south ½ of the northeast ¼ of section 1-13-6; 240 acres. Cost, $1 per acre. Location, three-quarter mile from Tyndall Station.

August 25, 1899. Sold for Senator W. E. Sanford of Hamilton, Ontario, the southeast and the outh ½ of the northeast of section 16-13-6 east; 240 acres. Price, $840. Terms, $84 cash, nine yearly payments for the balance. This property is within two and a half miles of Tyndall station, on the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway, and about three miles from St. Peter's Indian reserve, and is one of the finest pieces of land in the Selkirk district.

October 28, 1899. Sold to Alloway & Champion, bankers, Winnipeg, the southeast of 21, and the north ½ of the northeast of 16-13-6 east. Sale price, $300. I had bought this property a few weeks before for $200, turning it over to the purchasers at a profit of $100. Location within two miles of St. Peter's Indian reserve.

The above are only a few of the many sales I have made in the last ten or twelve years. The last five or six years the market has been gradually working higher. At present the prices rule from $5 per acre upwards for all lands that are of fair quality.

The statement has been made that the Indian has been robbed of his land. Does the Indian own his land, or is the Indian the ward of the nation? Is he not being taken care of in this matter? The Indians who occupy the lands of St. Peter's reserve have been provided with a reserve which is larger in extent, and which is located in a place in which it would be more in the interests of the Indian to live. I believe as I stated before that the price paid for this land was a fair price having regard to its value at the time. Competition was not very keen because a great many people did not want the land. A great many people would not purchase any of it

and there are those who are purchasing land who would not accept it as a gift because about 11,000 acres of it is nothing but low, swampy land. I mention this to bear out the statement I made last session as to the price of the land. This and other statements which have been made by me can be verified and the information upon which they are based cannot be disputed.

Amendment (Mr. Bradbury) negatived on division.

NEGRO IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex). Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to a matter respecting another race of people—I mean the negro. Representing a large number of this race of people, who are honest, law-abiding, good citizens, I was very much surprised, in common with my colleagues, who represent the adjoining county of Kent, to find an article on the front page of this morning's edition of the 'Citizen,' the leading Conservative paper of the city of Ottawa, to the following effect:

WOULD STOP NEGROES.

(Canadian Press Despatch).

Winnipeg, Man., March 21.—Officers of the Immigration Department left to-day for Emerson, on the border, to stop the entry into Canada of 165 negroes from Oklahoma, who intended to settle in Canada's Northwest. The railway company has appealed to Washington and Consul-General Jones has been instructed to go down and see that they get through.

If it is correct that the officers of this government have taken the steps to prevent the entrance into this country of these people on account of their colour, then I think it will require a very great deal of explanation from the department to justify it. Coloured people in my experience have been amongst the most loyal citizens of this country. They have been true to the British flag and I think they are worthy to be reckoned amongst the people of Canada. Surely, the large areas of this country are sufficient to entitle us to take in this class of people who have not the privileges of other classes. It has always been the boast of British institutions that unfortunate men will find a haven within our borders. Representing a large number of the coloured people, I certainly protest against any rule which would exclude them on account of their colour, and I think that before supplies are granted it is only proper that a statement should be made by the government, or by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), with regard to this important matter.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think it will be necessary to have the consent of the House before the minister can speak again unless it is in answer to a question.

Mr. OLIVER. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the consent of the House to give my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Clarke) the information that he desires.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. OLIVER. I have noticed in the papers recently paragraphs of something of the nature of this one alluded to by my hon. friend from Essex. I have only to say that, in so far as these paragraphs state or have stated that the Dominion government has issued orders through its officials to prevent the entry of negroes into Canada, these paragraphs are absolutely and entirely incorrect. No such instructions have been issued, no such action is being taken. I would assume that the paragraphs are being circulated unjustifiably for illegitimate purposes. It may be, however, that they are being circulated on account of a misunderstanding or misapprehension of the policy of the department which I may be permitted to explain in a very few words. The immigration policy of Canada to-day is restricted, exclusive, and selective as compared with the former policy of indiscriminate immigration. We have exclusion officers stationed along the boundary between Canada and the United States and at our ocean ports, and under the laws and the regulations authorized by them, the exclusion officers take measures to prevent the entry of all persons who may be considered undesirable under our law, without any distinction of race, colour, or previous condition of servitude. I wish to have the matter thoroughly understood—in the administration of the exclusion provisions of the law there is taken into account the question of whether the proposed immigrant is ordinarily considered desirable or ordinarily considered undesirable. The immigrant ordinarily considered desirable is the man who wishes to go on the land, and if he does not want to go on the land the presumption towards him is not so favourable.

Mr. FOSTER. The presumption does not go so far as to say he is undesirable.

Mr. OLIVER. No, but there are many cases where the admission or exclusion of an immigrant depends on a strict or a lax interpretation of the law, so that if the immigrant is of what we would call the desirable class it may be that the restrictive desirable class then they are administered laxly, and if he is of the presumably less desirable class then they are adminstered more restrictedly. Beyond that there are no instructions to the immigration officers, but they are expected to act according to the instructions they have.

Mr. FOSTER. I know less now of the real circumstances of the case than I did before my anxious friend made his impassioned appeal before we voted any further supplies. I wonder if the hon. gentleman is thoroughly enlightened now after the minister's statement; for my part I cannot tell for the life of me whether these coloured people are to be allowed to come in or not. The only idea I have from the statement of the minister is, that he is above the law in that he winks at it if a man is going on a farm, but he stares at it in a very different way if the man is not going on the farm. If we have a law, and regulations framed under it, is the minister administering the law and regulations or is he not, and if he is will these coloured people be allowed to come in.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Their colour won't keep them out.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not been able to understand whether it will or not.

Mr. OLIVER. I was trying to explain what the Minister of Public Works said—these people will not be kept out because of their colour and neither will they be admitted because of their colour if they are otherwise undesirable.

Mr. FOSTER. What makes them undesirable?

Mr. OLIVER. The conditions are described in the statute and regulations.

Mr. FOSTER. That relieves me to some extent because the minister said at first that he would go outside the law if he thought it best not to let a man in, but he would keep a good way inside the law if he thought the man should come in. Now he says he administers the law and the regulations according to their text.

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

Intercolonial railway, airbrake, improved triple valve, $7,150.

Mr. RHODES. Is this for passenger equipment?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). For freight as well. These cost about $5.50 each and this vote will do about 1,300 cars next year.

Mr. BLAIN. How many years to complete?

Mr. GRAHAM. Eight or nine.

Mr. RHODES. What are the other large roads doing with respect to these valves?

Mr. GRAHAM. They are all adopting them.

Strengthening bridges, $29,000.

Mr. STANFIELD. What bridges will be strengthened?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to strengthen the spans on a number of bridges. We took $61,000 last year and $20,000 of this is a revote.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. We buy all the material by tender and contract, and then we do the work with our own staff.

Mr. BLAIN. How many years has this strengthening of bridges been going on, and is there likely to be any end to it?

Mr. GRAHAM. It will go on as long as we increase the weight of the rolling stock. The bridges were made to carry a certain weight, and as the weight of the rolling stock is increased, they have to be made stronger. It is possible that when we get through with this work we may have to make the bridges still stronger.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that the usual course?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. I was speaking to Mr. McNicoll only an hour ago, and he told me that his company the Canadian Pacific railway was strengthening a great number of bridges this year.

Mr. BLAIN. What is done with the old bridges?

Mr. GRAHAM. The wooden ones are of no use. The steel ones are not taken out, but are strengthened.

Mr. BLAIN. A few years ago, when Mr. Blair was Minister of Railways, there was some discussion as to what was done with the old steel bridges, and he said they were taken away and placed at other parts of the railway, perhaps on the branches where the rolling stock was not so heavy.

Mr. GRAHAM. Both systems are adopted. Where a bridge is so light that it cannot be strengthened, it is taken out. If we can use it on another part of the line, or on a branch, we do so. If we cannot use it, we scrap it.

To increase accommodation at Campbellton, $150,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Campbellton is where we had the very destructive fire. Up to the end of the present year we shall have spent there a little over $100,000. We are making a somewhat new departure here. The cost of the old station, with the freight and freight sheds which were burned, was about $76,000, and this loss is being paid out of the revenue of the year. So that the capital vote will only be for the increased accommodation above that. The new works will cost $327,000 all told. We are having a large modern yard, a new station, and a large engine house.

Mr. RHODES. If the value of the property which was destroyed is charged to income, then it will not appear as an asset.

Mr. GRAHAM. The cost of the new works charged to capital will be $327,000 less $76,000.

Mr. RHODES. That is, you have practically written off the value of the property destroyed?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. STANFIELD. Does the minister propose to follow the same rule with regard to the loss by fire of the Sydney station?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, that will be paid out of revenue.

Chatham, diversion of line and branch to wharf, $300,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This branch is about 8¼ miles long, and it is to get rid of a grade down to the waterfront. The work was begun about two years ago. The contract was let to Morrison and Clark.

Mr. STANFIELD. What was the amount of the tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. $245,853.58. The total cost is estimated at $512,603.58, which includes the right of way, ties, ballasting, grades, and so on.

Mr. STANFIELD. Does that include the station?

Mr. GRAHAM. That appropriates $30,000 for the station building.

Air brakes to freight cars, $12,160.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is just following out what is necessary to bring the equipment of our cars up to the standard.

Mr. RHODES. Are there still cars on the Intercolonial railway not equipped with air-brakes?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, it seems that there are quite a number.

Mr. RHODES. Will this supply all the rolling stock with air-brakes?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed that this will practically complete that work.

To exchange drawbars of freight cars, $2,000.

Mr. RHODES. Will this complete the equipment of your cars with modern drawbars?

Mr. GRAHAM. No. Last year we had a vote of $10,000 for the purpose, and we are now asking for only $2,000 of that amount. This will equip about 40 cars. We find it difficult to get the cars into the shop for the purpose.

Mr. RHODES. I would like to ask the minister if he can use that link and pin coupling on the main line of the Intercolonial railway? Where are those cars?

Mr. GRAHAM. They are in use mostly on the branch lines where we have lighter rolling stock. We cannot mix the cars and we have to use those practically by themselves, but there is quite a number still in use.

Mr. RHODES. Is there not some statute which requires that the cars shall be equipped with automatic couplers within a certain period?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Board of Railway Commissioners ordered that on the company lines, and we are trying to follow out that order, and are equipping our cars as rapidly as possible.

Mr. RHODES. Are you equipping yours as rapidly as the company lines do?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so.

Fredericton, to increase accommodation at, $25,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for a new station at the city of Fredericton. Practically all we have there now is a frame station of a very poor standard. This work would have been undertaken before but we had some discussion with the Canadian Pacific railway about a joint terminal. We could not, however, come to any agreement and propose to build a new station. $25,000 is the amount you are now asked to vote, but it is estimated that the cost will be about $42,000 with the adjoining freight sheds.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the minister aim at having stations uniform in design all along the line.

Mr. GRAHAM. I regret to say that this plan has not been adopted on the government railway. My own idea, if I were starting a new railway, would be to have the stations of a uniform style so that one could see at once that they belonged to the Intercolonial railway. The idea which has hitherto prevailed seems to have been to have the stations conform with the other buildings in the cities themselves.

Mr. LENNOX. From this time forward, the minister should adopt a uniform style of building whether large or small. If he began now, no doubt with the assistance of fires, it will not be very long before he would have uniformity throughout the line. On the Grand Trunk railway and other lines, they are building all their new stations on the same plan.

Mr. RHODES. Could the hon. gentleman give the cost of the stations at Pictou and Amherst?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not got the figures here.

Mr. RHODES. The reason I ask is this. I should like to impress on the hon. minister the necessity of having a permanent station in Fredericton which would be a credit to the capital of the province, and the Intercolonial railway as well. If I were disposed to criticise, I would be inclined to say that the amount we are asked to vote is perhaps not quite sufficient.

Mr. GRAHAM. The business at Fredericton of course is not likely to equal that at Pictou and Amherst, and the size of a station must be regulated by the amount of business it is expected to accommodate. I shall endeavour to have a building worthy of the capital of the province.

General protection of highways, $20,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are endeavouring to set an example in protecting the highways. We have put in gongs and other appliances at road crossings, subways and aqueducts, and are spending more money along that line every year. Last year we spent $10,000, and this year we propose to spend $20,000.

Mr. STANFIELD. Is the hon. minister picking out the worst crossings to protect?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are trying to.

Mr. LENNOX. I agree that there ought to be a great deal of generosity in the matter of protecting highway crossings, but I think that the suggestion just made should be acted upon. I think that the government should get a report as to the crossings that are most dangerous and most in need of protection, and not deal with them in a haphazard fashion. The government should employ two or three men if necessary to go over the whole road and report as to the crossings. The minister has said that in some cases he is putting in gongs, &c. That is a device probably better than nothing; but almost worse than anything else. He should aim at separating the railway crossings in some way from the highway in all cases possible at any reasonable expenditure. He knows that in many cases where you have to cross on the level, by the deviation of the highway a very little distance you can get a subway at very moderate expense. It is simply a matter of carrying sufficient strength across—certain beams across and perhaps building two cement piers or retaining walls, and does not involve any great expense. We should aim to have our government railway an example to other railways, until in Canada we shall have to some extent the same system as is followed in Great Britain of endeavouring to separate the highway from the railway. Twenty thousand dollars seems to me to be a very small vote for this purpose. Of course if the minister has no definite plan of judicious expenditure in the next year, there is no object in taking a larger vote. But, for myself, I would be disposed to be very generous in this matter.

Mr. GAUVREAU. May I ask the minister if this amendment is intended to include an expenditure on the subway of Rivière du Loup station which is so much needed?

Mr. GRAHAM. I may say to my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), that I think his amendment is small. We have our maintenance of way engineer, Mr. Burpee, to make reports, and those works that he recommends we are taking up first. Personally, I would feel like spending twice this amount. Possibly, in the supplementary estimates, I may ask for more money. To my hon. friend from Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) I may say that we are having a report made on the Rivière du Loup and Chaudière and possibly we expect to get some money this year for construction. I am waiting for that report every day.

Mr. LENNOX. Without instancing the case which has just been referred to, I may say that the minister will see what I had in mind. He will be harassed by members representing the different ridings, each urging the construction of crossings within his own territory. But if the minister orders first a comprehensive investigation, he will be relieved of that difficulty.

Mr. GRAHAM. The condition at Rivière du Loup and Chaudière is particularly dangerous. People going from the station have to cross the tracks. I have visited it and came to the conclusion that we ought to have a subway for the protection of the public.

Mr. RHODES. Last year, the department took up the case of the Victoria street crossing in the town of Amherst. Is that covered by this vote?

Mr. GRAHAM. By a similar vote last year?

Mr. RHODES. Has the minister any data as to that?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no data here, but I can get it.

Halifax, to increase accommodation at, $82,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. The big item in this is for additional siding accommodation and remodelling the yards. The appropriation on this account last year was $52,650. There has been a standing demand at Halifax for increased dock accommodation, and I desire to say a few words on the subject now, because the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) asked about it several

days ago. Some years ago, the government purchased the old Cunard property. It was considered cheap then, and is considered still more so to-day. In view of the constant demand, the chief engineer and the members of the board visited Halifax. It appears that larger ships are being run by the Canadian Pacific railway and the dock accommodation is altogether inadequate for their accommodation. In order that we might get an idea of some proper system, the board asked Mr. John Kennedy, of Montreal, an eminent harbour engineer, to visit Halifax. Mr. Kennedy did so, and has prepared a scheme; and I think it is no breach of confidence to say that I expect to ask the House to vote a certain sum of money to begin that scheme. The intention is to build one large dock and to enlarge another. This will afford early accommodation for the larger ships that are being built, and, year by year, it will develop into a larger scheme, including several docks. These changes are absolutely necessary, because not only the Canadian Pacific railway gets its traffic from these steamship lines, but the Intercolonial as well.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister might tell us how the amount voted last session was spent, and also what this vote is to cover.

Mr. GRAHAM. The amount voted last session, $52,650, was really spent remodelling Richmond yard, the outlying freight yards in connection with the city of Halifax. And the present vote is just to continue the work. The items of the proposed expenditure are as follows: Drop pit, $1,000; small tools, $1,000; remodelling yard and additional siding accommodation, $75,000; miscellaneous $5,500; total $82,475, and we are asking $82,500. I think it may as well be understood that, as years go by, if Canada is to develop these great ports on the east, larger sums will have to be spent every year in Halifax until we get yards sufficiently large to accommodate the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Pacific and possibly the Canadian Northern. These are not local works. The Intercolonial railway may be doing them, but they are not properly chargeable to that road, for they are great national works for the accommodation of the exports and imports of the country.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister will understand that I am not objecting to the expenditure, but I felt that as the items go through, it is better that we should understand what is to be done with the money.

Mr. GRAHAM. Certainly. I feel that I am being helped by this.

Mr. CROSBY. I am glad to hear the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) say that as years go by Halifax will get something,—promise, if nothing else. The first time I had the honour of seeing and hearing the Minister of Railways, I thought I had met one of the finest men of this government.

Mr. GRAHAM. I hope the hon. gentleman has not changed his mind.

Mr. CROSBY. If not, it is not because the Minister of Railways has not given me sufficient reason to change my mind. And I think that many people in Halifax feel as I do. We in Halifax have been asking for accommodation for a great many years. One of the first acts of the minister after taking office was to visit Halifax. If the money spent on visits to Halifax, for I do not know of an engineer in Canada who has not been sent to Halifax to report, although there has not been very much spent in Halifax—

Mr. GRAHAM. The government have spent $4,431,947 in Halifax in connection with the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. CROSBY. On what?

Mr. GRAHAM. On terminals in Halifax. It has been going on for years. My visit to Halifax was to look over the work there in progress. I have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars there since I became minister.

Mr. CROSBY. It is easy for the minister to make statements of that kind. You have undertaken after some 60 years to make a new roundhouse, and to build up a concrete wall in order to prevent buildings and other things from tumbling on to the railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am sorry Halifax is in that shape.

Mr. CROSBY. Yes, it is in bad shape. My hon. friend has not done much to put it in better shape. He has paid many visits, I have often enjoyed hearing his pleasant stories and seeing his pleasant countenance, and the new deputy is also very genial, a good second to the minister. After the deputy minister's visit some of the board of trade said among themselves. 'Well Graham was kind of slick, but now we are going to get a lot from Campbell; he is all right.' Yet the same condition prevails in Halifax to-day. Mr. Kennedy of Montreal was sent there to tell us how the docks could be constructed. We have plenty of men in Halifax who could tell that, we have been passing resolutions for years.

Mr. GRAHAM. You cannot build a dock on a resolution.

Mr. CROSBY. But my hon. friend thinks he can build one on good stories and talk. He toldl us he had bought the Cunard property to give better freight accommodation for Halifax, although he told me in the House that he only bought it because it was a bargain. He did not spend a dollar on it, but retained those who had the property as lessees from 1906 to the present time. The only thing he has done is to cheat the city of Halifax out of $100,000 taxes because we could not tax the government property. God knows we have enough down there that they do not pay taxes on. Halifax is one of the great Atlantic ports of Canada. Of course if Canada goes into reciprocity she will not need an Atlantic port, but I wonder what Canada would have done if Nova Scotia and New Brunswick had entered the United States and not become part of the Dominion. You would be very glad indeed to vote a great deal of money to get these provinces in order to have outlets on the Atlantic. We hear a great deal of the Grand Trunk Pacific. We hear of their getting terminals in Portland and Boston, and building a great new depot in Providence, but we never hear of their acquiring property in St. John or Halifax. I am as anxious to see St. John get trade as Halifax, there is plenty of trade for all these ports if we take care of that trade. If the Intercolonial railway is to handle the traffic from Moncton to St. John and Halifax, it should be double-tracked on these sections, and there is much to be done to prepare it to handle that traffic. If this government had done what they should have done between 1904 and 1908 I would not be here. I did not want to come up here but the people in Halifax thought that although they had been sending up two strong supporters of the government the ministers had put them aside, and at last the people of Halifax put those representatives aside. I propose either to have something done or to be able to tell the people the reason why. Every year we are told something must be done in Halifax. We cannot go on from year to year, it must be done now. We had the Canadian Northern steamers coming to Halifax this winter without any dock accommodation at all. I think the minister has a desire to do something for Halifax, but when he gets away he forgets all about it. I think the railway would be better off if we had some man closer down there, even the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). We might get him past St. John sometimes. Of course, it is very difficult to get him to undertake any public works beyond St. John, but we might get him past St. John if he had charge of the railway. I really feel that the Minister of Railways does not give enough attention to the eastern part of the railway. Sometimes we hear men from Ontario saying that the Intercolonial is a millstone around the neck of Canada, and that it costs a great deal of money. I have heard some hon. gentleman sitting on the other side of the House say that they did not want to have anything to do with the province of Ontario. I never shared that feeling myself. We have a great deal in common with our friends of Ontario and the west. This road is a great advantage to Ontario as it is a great advantage to us, but we cannot get this advantage unless we have the necessary accommodation. The only terminal port of the Intercolonial railway is Halifax, and I say that without intending to cast any reflection upon St. John at all because when they go to St. John they have a competitor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend might elaborate that idea a little.

Mr. CROSBY. It would be a good thing if my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works would elaborate his ideas a little, come down to Nova Scotia a little oftener than he does, and not hang around St. John and Courtenay bay so much.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some hon. members think that we go too much to Nova Scotia.

Mr. CROSBY. When an Intercolonial railway train goes to St. John it hands its freight over to a boat that is usually controlled by the Canadian Pacific railway. That boat goes across to the old country, and comes back to St. John, but it does not hand its freight over to the Intercolonial railway; it hands it over to the Canadian Pacific railway. If the Intercolonial brings a load of freight to Halifax it goes on a boat not controlled by the Canadian Pacific railway and that boat brings a cargo back to Halifax and hands it over to the Intercolonial, because there is no other railway to take it. Therefore, the government should do something to provide better accommodation at Halifax. I am very proud to know that St. John has the Canadian Pacific railway. It is a great advantage to the port of St. John. Although we in Nova Scotia assisted largely in constructing and making the Canadian Pacific railway a success we have never benefited one iota from that road, while St. John has. The time has come when we need terminal facilities, and when we need to have the Intercolonial railway double tracked. I am not talking about the conditions that exist between Quebec and Moncton, I am accepting the conditions as they are, but the time has come when the railway should be double tracked from Moncton to Halifax and from Moncton to St. John. If it is to be done by the time the transcontinental railway is constructed to Moncton it should be commenced at once. There is no time to lose. The minister knows that we have

not sufficient accommodation in Halifax for even a single road, but with the construction of a double tracked road it will be necessary to provide additional facilities, and put our road in such a shape as to be a credit to the Dominion. We have a port there which is a credit to the Dominion and we should be proud of it. Western people should be able to send their products down to our eastern ports, if not all the year around, at least during the winter season. The minister may think that I am taking up a good deal of time, but it is better for me to say what I have to say because I am compelled to say this in order that I may be able to say something when I go to Halifax. The minister knows that he can say something when he goes to Halifax, but the difference between him and me is that I have to live there all the time. He can get away and live somewhere else, but I have to do something as well as say something. I am sure the minister will support me in my effort to provide terminal facilities, and not only to provide terminal facilities, but to arrange at an early date for the double tracking of the Intercolonial railway from Moncton to Halifax. We have a railway running into Dartmouth. The local government have been trying to build a road from Dartmouth running eastward through Halifax and Guysborough counties and stopping perhaps nowhere, but they have not been able to get capital to build that road, and I do not think it would be possible for them to get the capital. They have been trying to build that road for I cannot say how far back, perhaps from a time before I went to Halifax at all. It strikes me that the government could make the Intercolonial railway a paying road and afford more accommodation to the people by having a terminal at Dartmouth. All they have to do is to start from Dartmouth with that road, construct it down through the eastern part of Halifax county, through Guysborough county, connecting with the Intercolonial railway at Canso, crossing on the Intercolonial railway ferry from Canso to Point Tupper, going down to Richmond county, into Cape Breton county, to Louisburg, connecting the Louisburg railway, coming back to Sydney and connecting with the Intercolonial railway again at Sydney thus making a loop of the province of Nova Scotia. If another company should build that road there is no doubt that the Intercolonial railway would have to take it over some day, and if that be so is it not better for the Intercolonial railway to construct it now and give the people the accommodation that they have been seeking for a long time? I put that propositon to the minister two or three months ago. I have not heard from him, but I did have an inkling that there was a possibility of the government taking it up. The Intercolonial railway skirts only one side of Nova Scotia and a great many of the people of that province are without railway accommodation. We have the Halifax and Southwestern railroad in eastern Nova Scotia, and while we cannot say that we are particularly proud of it yet it is better than nothing. I impress on the Minister of Railways that he should do something for Halifax and for Nova Scotia generally. I am not unmindful of the advantage to the city of St. John from the double tracking of the Intercolonial railway from Moncton to St. John, and also to Halifax. Although we treated the minister pretty well in 1908 when he came down there, I have no objection to his being treated better when the next election comes round if he gives us what we are entitled to.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the minister no reply to make to the member for Halifax who spoke with such earnestness and good faith?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby), is pretty well able to take care of himself in any kind of company. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) evidently was not here when we discussed this vote at the beginning, and it is only part of the total estimated expenditure of $233,000 when we got through. All that the hon. gentleman from Halifax has said will receive the serious consideration of the government and it must be understood that the three transcontinental lines, the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Canadian Northern railway must get to Halifax as well as to St. John.

Mr. RHODES. What does the government propose to do with respect to the double tracking of the Intercolonial railway from Moncton to Halifax? We may spend millions upon millions upon terminals at Halifax but the money will be practically wasted unless we have a railway over which to carry the traffic. It is well known that on the present Intercolonial railway single track, not only do the gradients not conform to the standard laid down by the Grand Trunk Pacific but they are unusually heavy especially through the Westchester mountains. It is economically impossible to carry traffic at the present time over the Intercolonial railway to Halifax on a paying basis, and in any case a single line will not take care of the traffic. If it is intended sooner or later to double track the line a beginning should be made very soon. I am aware that the Intercolonial railway is double tracked from Moncton to Painsec but that is only a tithe of the way, and it is the portion of the road where construction is of the easiest character. The Minister of

Railways endeavours to lead the House and the country to the belief that politics is largely eliminated from the Intercolonial railway, and while I am willing to believe that he is sincere in his attempt to exclude politics, yet, in the county of Cumberland just before the election of 1908, in the fall of the year, when the money was in a large degree wasted, thousands of dollars were spent on a survey for the proposed double tracking of the Intercolonial railway. The men in the field could not do competent work and they were hurried through the survey in order to cover the whole county. I am not a competent engineer, but my information is that it was not a bona fide survey. I should like to have a statement from the minister as to his intention with respect to the double tracking of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a very large project. There is no doubt in the world but that a great deal of the freight of the Canadian Pacific railway is taken to St. John and whether that will continue in the future or not I cannot say. The Grand Trunk Pacific will not be completed for two or three years and the Intercolonial railway at present can handle all the freight that the Grand Trunk Pacific can give it which will only be local.

Mr. RHODES. You cannot handle it on a paying basis.

Mr. GRAHAM. What local traffic there is can be handled. So far as the Grand Trunk traffic is concerned the Intercolonial railway has it for 99 years under contract. No person with a sense of responsibility would undertake to say offhand what it is proposed to do with respect to the double tracking of the Intercolonial railway. If the government is going to undertake to put the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern railway into Halifax and St. John, then the government will have to double track the Intercolonial railway, but that is a matter for consideration and discussion with these companies, as to whether an arrangement can be arrived at by which the government may do that, or whether the railways will do it for themselves. We have been giving that very point a good deal of consideration.

Mr. RHODES. I appreciate that the project is a big one but no matter how big it is there must be a beginning. I ask the minister what consideration has been given to the results of the survey made in 1908 just before the general election; was that survey made with a view to some systematic beginning towards this double tracking?

Mr. GRAHAM. Some railways have surveys made fifteen years before they build the line. The question of the better course to take in Nova Scotia is a difficult question to work out. There is a divergence of opinion among railway men as to what we ought to do.

Mr. RHODES. I hope, for the good name of the Minister of Railways, that the railway will not be run on political lines, and that when he decides which line to take, he will not do it in the month preceding the time of the next general election. A beginning has been made in double-tracking the Intercolonial railway to Painsec Junction, and that must be in view of some larger scheme.

Mr. CROSBY. We have a double track to Painsec Junction and also from Halifax to Windsor Junction.

Mr. GRAHAM. That accommodates the Dominion Atlantic.

Mr. CROSBY. It does, but has the government not taken into consideration the question of double tracking the Intercolonial railway from Halifax to Moncton? In the election of 1904 it was asserted that the work would be done inside of two years, and I do not think that candidates supporting the government would make that statement if they had not some authority to make it. I would like to know whether the government has come to that conclusion or not?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have said that we have that whole question under consideration, and it will take a good deal of consideration before we arrive at a decision.

Mr. CROSBY. Then I am to understand that the government has not arrived at a conclusion that they will double track the line from Halifax to Moncton?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have given my hon. friend the only answer that I can give.

Moncton—Locomotive and car shops with equipment and new freight yard and cut-off line, $200,000.

Mr. STANFIELD. Is the minister aware that the roof of these shops is in bad condition?

Mr. GRAHAM. The roof has been somewhat faulty, but repairs have been made to it.

Mr. STANFIELD. Is it now satisfactory to the workmen?

Mr. GRAHAM. My information is that it is satisfactory to the engineer?

Mr. STANFIELD. The information I have is that there are complaints from the workmen of leakages in the roof which are so bad that they have to put tarpaulins over some of the machines.

Mr. GRAHAM. There was some complaint of the ventilation of the buildings, but I think some improvement has been made in that.

Passenger cars, to equip with fire extinguishers and tool boxes, $6,400.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are equipping all our cars with these.

Mr. RHODES. Is this called for by the Railway Commission?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is called for by the orders of the Railway Commission to the railway companies, and we are trying to comply with them.

Rolling stock, $133,200.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for new rolling stock, including four switching engines, two baggage cars and fifteen tank cars.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any public competition for these?

Mr. GRAHAM. We invite tenders from the different car builders in Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. Do you always accept the lowest?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, for this reason. Sometimes we get a low tender from one company which cannot supply the cars in time, and we usually divide up the work. Sometimes we get the cars constructed at the lowest price, and sometimes we get a number at the lowest price and a number at the next lowest price.

Mr. RHODES. What is the practice with respect to writing off each year for wear and tear of rolling stock, and also as to replacements of rolling stock which has previously been charged to capital stock?

Mr. GRAHAM. We lay aside every month $25,000 for renewal of equipment, so that we write off $300,000 a year on account of rolling stock. This year I am going to ask the House to let me have $100,000 more out of revenue, as we need rolling stock very badly. I am being urged by the board to ask for $200,00. It may be done.

Mr. RHODES. The answer of the minister would indicate that the government have no settled policy. At present he asks $130,000 a year. Later on he proposes to ask an additional $100,000, and some of the members of the Intercolonial Railway Board want him to take an extra $200,000 or $500,000 in all. What percentage does he write off this rolling stock each year for depreciation? Are cars which are otherwise good, but wrecked by railway accidents replaced from income account?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. What percentage do you write off for depreciation?

Mr. STANFIELD.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no percentage written off. Under the regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission, you have to keep the standard of your cars up. You start the year with a certain number of cars carrying so many tons, and at the end of the year you must have that same number carrying that same tonnage, and you must keep them up out of revenue. If the system we adopted two years ago had been adopted many years ago, there would have been no difficulty, but we are practically following the regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission. We do not write off any percentage, but keep up the rolling stock out of revenue, so that it is always in good condition.

Mr. RHODES. The only way you can do that would be by keeping a record of the rolling stock and its condition.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is what we do.

Mr. RHODES. What is the amount expended on rolling stock from year to year?

Mr. GRAHAM. The average replacement of the present rolling stock will run about $300,000 per year, perhaps a little more. This year the road is in thoroughly good condition, and I want to make up for loss of time, and go further than the Interstate Commerce Commission would allow me to go, by providing rolling stock out of revenue.

Steamer 'Scotia,' new machinery for, $1,100.

Mr. LENNOX. How is this chargeable to capital account?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for a repair shop for our machinery to be put on the boat. It is all new. We never had it before. Instead of sending out pieces of machinery for repairs, we will make the repairs right on the boat.

Surveys and inspection, $15,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have not at present any vote to pay for a survey when necessary. If I want to find what a thing is going to cost, I have no contingent fund or anything of that kind out of which to take the money.

Mr. RHODES. Is this properly chargeable to capital?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. You have nothing to show for it.

Mr. GRAHAM. It will be for capital work. Suppose I wanted to double the track and find out what it will cost, I would take the money out of this vote.

Mr. RHODES. You might survey different routes and only chose one.

Mr. GRAHAM. On the Hudson Bay route, we have surveyed half a dozen routes, and we charged the cost to capital.

Mr. RHODES. But that is a new line.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am often asked to find out what a thing is going to cost, and have no contingent fund or anything out of which I can take the money, and have had to ask for it in the supplementaries. But I am now taking a more businesslike way.

Mr. JAMESON. There is a subject I would like to discuss, and which comes properly under this vote, but as the hour is late I would ask permission to bring it up at another stage.

Mr. GRAHAM. Any time my hon. friend pleases.

Sydney Mines, diversion, $250,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We undertook this a year or so ago, but it was very strongly petitioned for as long ago as 1893. I find a very strong recommendation in its favour from the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). This will cost $539,000 when completed, but will give us a road straight to Sydney mines.

To increase accommodation and facilities along the line, $40,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. This includes a number of small improvements which are not put in as separate items. The vote taken last year under this head was $38,700.

Mr. STANFIELD. The hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) is not present. Will the hon. minister reserve to him the same liberty as has been spoken of?

Mr. GRAHAM. They can discuss anything they like on operation expenses.

Truro, to increase accommodation at, $57,200.

Mr. RHODES. The department did some work on a highway in the town of Amherst called Station street and really government property. I believe it was done under the supervision of the deputy minister, at all events, the ground was inspected by him before the work was got done. In Ontario that gentleman was known as 'Good Roads Campbell.' If he is to be judged by the roadway prepared in the town of Amherst under his supervision, he is liable to lose his reputation, for the work is a discredit to the department, and the money has been practically wasted. The gravel was dumped in odd quantities upon a flat surface—no system of drainage, no grading, no rolling. The road is in quite as bad a condition as it was before the work was performed. This is a serious inconvenience to all those who use the freight shed there. The revenue of the freight yards at Amherst, as the minister knows, is one of the largest on the Intercolonial, and every pound of freight has to be hauled over this terrible piece of road. I urge, in the interest not only of the merchants and citizens generally of Amherst, but of the Intercolonial itself that some systematic attempt be made to construct a decent road.

Mr. STANFIELD. What is this vote to be spent for?

Mr. GRAHAM. The amount required will be much larger than this. It will include a brick station with stone trimmings.

Mr. STANFIELD. What will it cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. Ultimately, $100,000. There will also be expenditure in changing tracks, new freight shed, removing of old freight shed, purchase of land, new electric light plant, water-supply—total estimated cost $250,000.

Mr. STANFIELD. Are the plans being prepared, and does the minister expect that work on the station will be begun this year?

Mr. GRAHAM. The plans are not prepared, but as soon as we get the money we will prepare the plans and will start work immediately.

Mr. STANFIELD. I wish to thank the minister for listening to my oft-repeated prayers both in and out of the House. I will not detain the House by telling how badly this station is needed, but, while I am on this subject, I would like to suggest that before the plans are completed the engineer should be sent down to look over the ground. The land owned by the government around the station is a disgrace to the Intercolonial and to the town. In completing the work, this low grade should be paved for the traffic over it is so heavy that ordinary gravel will not stand it.

Mr. GRAHAM. That will have to be looked into.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.23 a.m.

INDEX

THIRD SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1910-1911.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2° 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass.; Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider, Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., Northwest Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

ALLEN, Mr. H. E., *Shefford.*

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9619 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7661 (iv).

AMES, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Alcoholism International Congress, Delegates to (Ques.) 5632 (iii).

Aliens Naturalization, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 2666 (ii).

Australian and Can. Reciprocal Negotiations since 1900 (M. for stmt.*) 1501 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2440 (ii).

Charing Cross Bank, and Atlantic Quebec and Western Ry. Co. (M. for cor with Govt) 1726 (i).

Chemin Gouin, Postmastership, Name of, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 7038 (iv).

——— Postmaster A. C. Miquelon, Superannuation, &c. (Ques.) 7210 (iv).

Colonial Conference, 1911, Canada's Proposals, &c. (Ques.) 1280 (i).

Customs Tariff with Foreign Countries, Arrangements by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 981 (i)

G.T.P. Lake Superior Division, Construction Limit, Penalty *re* (Ques.) 1492 (i).

See 'N. T. Ry.'

Half Breed Scrip, Cor. with Rt. Rev. George Holmes (M. for copy*) 1912 (i).

Harbours and Rivers Expenditures by Public Works (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).

N. T. Ry., Changes in Original Specifications, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

N. T. Ry., Change in Structures to the amount of $10,000 (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Commission, List of Members of Engineering Staff who have resigned, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Construction Work, Change in Concrete used, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1499 (i).

——— Contractors, Amounts paid on Force Account, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Contracts, Estimated Quantities *re* (Ques.) 1491 (i).

——— Moncton and Winnipeg Contracts, Original Estimates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Shops, Plans and Specifications for Machinery (Ques.) 1569 (i).

——— Shops, Specification *re* Emplymt. of Mr. W. J. Press (Ques.) 2157 (ii).

——— Total Expenditure to 31st Dec., 1910, Estimated Cost of Completion of Winnipeg and Moncton Section (Ques.) 1497 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 1727 (i).

——— Train Hauled Filling, Payments *re* (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

North Shore Taxpayers and Voting at Federal Elections (Ques.) 1082 (i).

Post Office Buildings, Total Value, Expenditure, Subsidies *re* Mails, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).

Preferential Tariff, Concessions granted to G. B. (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Quebec Bridge and Labour Organizations (M. for cor.*) 7039 (iv.)
——— Fair Wage Clause for Bridge Workers (Ques.) 6757 (iv).
——— Payment of $100,000 to Phœnix Bridge Co. (M. for cor.*) 981 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4083 (iii).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6786 (iv).
See 'Australia.'
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5051 (iii).
St. Johns Postmaster, Refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir' (Ques.) 1089 (i).
Six Nation Indian Reserve, Grant to Merrill to bore for Natural Gas, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 1863; (Montreal, P.O., alterations) 1862; (Montreal postal station) 1861 (i).
Three Rivers Harbour Commission, Interest paid, &c. (Ques.) 814 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6293 (iv).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1947 (i).
Atlantic Fast Service and All Red Route, Establishment of (M. for cor.*) 1726 (i).
Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of (Ques.) 2371 (ii).
Banking and Commerce Com., Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2364 (ii).
'Canada Farthest South,' Cost of Printing and Preparing (Ques.) 2885 (ii).
Canada-Japan Trade Treaty, Expiration of (Ques.) 5638, (iii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3455 (ii).
——— Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8805 (v)
Canned Pease, Impure, Importation of into Canada, Number of Cases (Ques.) 3279 (ii).
Canso and Guysborough Mail Service, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 8994 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9046 (v).
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. 206 (Mr. D. A. Gordon) in Com., 8970 (v).
Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6206 (iv).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2513 (ii); in Com., 8677 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8726 (v).
——— (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8908, 8924 (v).
Copyright Act B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8899 (v).
Coronation Stamps, Inquiry *re*, 9247 (v).
Dixon Post Office, Pets. *re* Change of location (Ques.) 4669 (iii).
Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re* (Ques.) 662 (i).
'Earl Grey,' Ice Breaker, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6475 (iv).
Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Transfer to Canada (Ques.) 799 (i).
Experimental Farms, Number established in the past year (Ques.) 656 (i).
——— Number operated, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1102 (i).
Farmer's Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5453 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* (remarks) 7560 (iv).
Favoured Nation Treaties before Imperial Conference, Par. in Toronto 'Globe' (remarks) 5292 (iii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4367 (iii).
Franking System, for Private Business (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
Grand Bend, Ont., Right of Way, Purchase of (Ques.) 1287 (i).
Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 7038 (iv).
Indian Act (Treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7828; in Com., 7848 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8744 (v).
King, Dr., Residence at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 804, 1349 (i).
Live Stock Industry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1200 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence, on M. for Sup., 2894 (ii).
Mail Delayed and Mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c. (Ques.) 2371 (ii), 4667 (iii).
Mails, Illegal Use of for Fraudulent Schemes (Ques.) 802 (i).
——— remarks, 1356 (i).
See 'Sheldon, C. D.'
Manitou Lake Fishing Privileges, Lease *re* (Ques.) 1348 (i).
Montreal Govt. Weir, Inquiry for Ret., 2065 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Naval Service, Number of Battle Ships withdrawn from Canada by G.B., during the past five years (Ques.) 1092 (i).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) on M. for 3°, 8963 (v).
Parcel Post Rates, Reduction *re* (Ques.) 5934 (iv).
Parcel Post Service between Canada and G.B., Colonies, &c., Loss *re* (Ques.) 805 (i).
Postage Stamps, Canadian Design, Refusal of Imperial Design (remarks) 6908 (iv).
See 'Coronation.'
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Short-Date Newspapers, &c. (remarks) 10340 (v).
Postmasters' Salaries, Increase to, Classification of Offices, &c. (Ques.) 5934 (iv).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8070 (v).
Post Office Buildings, Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1870 (i).
Post Office, Deptl. Money Orders, Printing of (Ques.) 1101 (i).
Post Office Estimates, Objection to Passing (remarks) 4297 (iii).
Public Buildings, Inquiry for Ret., 5541 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders *re*, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies, 3072 (ii).
——— Supervision, Expenditure (remarks) 6672 (iv).
Railway Mail Clerks, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
——— Names of those compensated for Accidents (Ques.) 9537 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3737 (ii).
Reciprocity—British Ambassador's Warning to Can. Mins., 6200 (iv).
——— Britain's Demand from U.S. for Tariff Concessions (remarks) 6574 (iv).
——— Dairymen's Association of Western Ont., Denial of Stmnt. of Min. of Customs, 4570 (iii).
——— Papers, Comparative Prices, Printing of (remarks) 10469 (v).
——— Res. of Toronto Anti-Reciprocity League *re* Annexation (read) 4141 (iii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, 6802 (iv).
'Review of Reviews,' Collection of Extra Postage (Ques.) 2371 (ii).
Richelieu and Ontario Nav. Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 8969 (v).
Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Stamps and Postcards manufactured, &c. (Ques.) 806 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery Routes, Number in Operation, &c. (Ques.) 983 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) 10365 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, &c. (remarks) 1364 (i).
——— Action of Government *re* Returning to Canada (remarks) 6200 (iv).
See 'Mails:.
Soil Fertility, Memorandum from Experimental Farm (read) in Com. of Sup., 5965 (iv).
Stamp Cancelling Machines, Cost, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 806 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (animals health) 5964; (dairying) 6249 (iv); (exhibitions) 9079 (v).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1051; Mines (salaries) 1480; Post Office (contingencies) 6068 (iv); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 1485 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (wireless stations) 6457 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subsidies (Canada and Australia) 8765; (Canada and Cuba) 8778; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 8786; (Canada and G.B.) 8775; (Canada and Mexico) 8781; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8783; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784 (v).
Post Office (Curren ,R. C., gratuity) 4283; (mail clerks) 4281 (iii), 6082 (iv); Outside Service (magazines) 6080; (mails) 6077 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ontario (Brantford drill hall) 2098 (ii); Ottawa (McGillivray's contract) 5994 (iv); (Printing Bureau) 2362 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8877 (v); Ontario (Peterborough) 2608 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ontario (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).
Railways—Intercolonial Railway (freight service) 5988 (iv); (Halifax) 5924 (iii); Miscellaneous (official cars) 6447 (iv).
United States Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations re (Ques.) 984 (i).
See 'Review.'
Wireless Stations, Number, Location, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2678 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1340 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

ARTHURS, Mr. J. E., *Parry Sound.*
Callender Lighthouse (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6498 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work (remarks) 7220 (iv).
Explosives Importation, Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8457 (v).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 5155 (iii).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co's. incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) on M. for 3°, 8965 (v).
North Bay, Burk's Falls and Maganatawan Wharfs, Total Cost, &c., (M. for ret.*) 981 (i).
Parry Sound Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).

ARTHURS, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Porcupine Disasters by Fire, Govt. Aid to (remarks) 9695 (v).
Port Perry Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1880 (i).
Reciprocity with United States, Resolutions *re*, M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 9646 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Mines (salaries) 1479 (i).
Immigration (agents) 5195 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses &c.) 6455, 6497; (Midland and Tiffin) 6502 iv).
Unorganized Districts in Northern Ont., Deferred Elections (remarks) 10100 (v).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. Sir Allen B., K. C. M. G. (Minister of Justice) *North York, Ont.*
Address, The, 664 (i).
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2168 (ii).
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., ref. to Justice Department. (Ans.) 926 (i).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7578 (iv).
C. P. R. Land Tax, Decision of Privy Council (remarks) 2992 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Investigation Commission, on Inquiry for Judge's Rep., 9594 (v).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4582 (iii).
Clarry, L. F., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 813 (i).
Constantineau, Judge, Number of Motions heard, Travelling Expenses &c. (Ans.) 982 (i).
Convicts liberated from Kingston Penitentiary without Clothing or Means (remarks) 1913 (i), 2067 (ii).
——— (statement) 1986 (ii).
Coronation Celebration at Ottawa, Invitation to Ministers (remarks) 10352 (v).
Dini, Victor, Release from Penitentiary (Ans.) 8582 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston (Ans.) 4826 (iii).
——— Royal Commission re Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5498 (iii).
Fedorenko, Extradition of (remarks) 10 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Use of by Americans (Ans.) 7804 (iv).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8971 (v).
Hague Arbitration, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Fundy Bay) on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup., 4593, 4603 (iii).
——— (explanation) *re*, on M. (Mr. Jameson) 4683 (iii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. Sir Allen B.—*Con.*
Hague Arbitration, Counsel, Names, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 797 (i).
——— Fisheries Regulations with U. S., Conference *re* (Stmnt) 1988 (ii).
See 'North Atlantic,' 'Supply—Justice.'
Hudson's Bay, Position *re* Hague Award (remarks) 673 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 970 (i).
International Prison Congress, Canadian Representative (Ans.) 5405 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9158 (v).
See 'Waterways.'
Judges appointed since 1896, Residences, &c. (Ans.) 8095 (v).
Judges in Yukon Ter., Annuities (M.) for Com. on Res., 8790 (v).
Justice, Deputy Minister acting as Counsel in outside Cases (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 1014 (i).
Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 469 (i).
Juvenile Deliquents, Act 1908, (B. 189) 1°*, 8187 (v).
Legal Agents appointed 1or Govt., Precautions *re* acting for private Parties (Ans.) 813 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2902 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3256 (ii).
See 'Waterways.'
Markey Fishing Leases, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 4209 (iii), 6761 (iv).
Marriage Laws in prov. of Quebec, Action of Roman Catholic Church (Ans) 7208 (iv).
Marriage Laws, Parliamentary Powers, Govt.'s intention (Ans.) 10196 (v).
Marriages, Power of Parlt. to Legalize (Ans.) 8585 (v).
Marriages, Validity of, Law respecting (Ans.) 6269 (iv).
Masonic Property stolen, Verdict of Montreal Jury (Ans.) 7207 (iv).
Ministers, Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 7441 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Land Damages, Fiats *re* Land Damages, Compensation (remarks) 3949 (iii).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriages.'
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10489 (v).
New Westminster Penitentiary Employees, Increase of Salaries, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor, 2186 (ii).
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, Arbitration at The Hague, on Address, 664 (i).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. Sir Allen B.—*Con.*
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor, 4337 (iii).
—— Distribution of copies (remarks) 8094 (v).
See 'Hague.'
Offensive Weapons, Pets. *re* Legislation (Ans.) 3064 (ii).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8331 (v).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 2740 (ii).
Pecuniary Claims *re* Hay Claims, Objections, &c. (Ans.) 803 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. A. Lanctot) on M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7899 (v).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 963 (i).
Reciprocity and North York, Challenge *re* Contest (remarks) 7223 (iv).
Sand supplied to Kingston Penitentiary, Payments to R. H. Fair (Ans.) 5406 (iii).
Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 111 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 3184 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Action of Govt. *re* Returning to Canada (remarks) 6200 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Justice (contingencies) 1020; (salaries) 1014 (i).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6161; Exchequer Court (contingencies) 6160; (printing reports) 6161; Miscellaneous (Hague arbitration) 6164 (iv), 9560 (v).
The Hague: *See* 'North Atlantic.-
U. S. Army Deserters at Niagara Falls, Subjects of Extradition (Ans.) 708 (i).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Delay, &c. (remarks) 9906 (v).
—— on M. (Mr. Meighen) 10144 (v).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 908 (i), 9158 (v).

BARKER, Mr. S., *East Hamilton.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5572 (iii).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7471 (iv).
Cameron, Miss, Emplymt. as Immigration agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5192 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8850 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9050 (v).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9610 (v).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Fishery Inspectors, Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6631 (iv).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10251, 10272 (v).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9519 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8550 (v).
G. T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 5795 (iii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9305 (v).
Grantham, Gertrude May, Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8974 (v).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, Conditions *re* Public Health (remarks) 5535 (iii).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10101 (v).
Hamilton Provident and Loan Society (B. 172) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
I.C.R. Renewal Equipment, Cor. &c. with Aud. Gen., Stmnts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 784 (i).
Military Adviser to Imperial Conference, Apptmt of Mr. S. Hughes (remarks) 9072 (v).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com., 8521 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6147 (iv).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages, &c (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8593 (v).
Pig Iron Charcoal, Number of Tons imported (Ques.) 1721 (i).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8070 (v).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 961 (i).
Railway Act (telegraph, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9315 (v).
Reciprocity Statistics, Accepting as Read and Printing in Hansard (remarks) 6860 (iv).
—— Ques. *re* Vote of Member for Labelle, 6839 (iv).
Revillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8578, 8967, 9575 (v).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3349 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coins) 6061 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3812 (ii); Ont. (inspectors) 6631 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5192 (iii).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5583 (iii).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6161; Exchequer Court (printing reports) 6161; Miscellaneous (Hague arbitration) 6166 (iv).
Legislation—House of Commons (Dep. Clerk Crown in Chancery) 6167; (sessional clerks) 6168 (iv).
Militia (allowance) 8528 (v).
Post Office—Outside Office (mail service) 6179 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3201 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 8514 (v).
Unprovided Items (generally) 6160 (iv).
Unorganized Districts, Deferred Elections (remarks) 10101 (v).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H., *Victoria, B.C.*
Alien Labour Law, Employment of Foreigners on Public Contracts Works (remarks) 10367 (v).
Babcock, Mr., Payments *re* Extra work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6108 (iv).
Beddington, Mr., Pension to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7872 (iv).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10433 (v).
Clayoquot Life Saving Station, Investigation *re* Irregularities (M. for reps.*) 785 (i).
Customs Free Goods entered at Vancouver, by Kelly & Co. (M. for copies) 931 (i).
See 'Vancouver.'
Esquimalt Guns, Removal of (Ques.) 3220 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (compensation for injuries) Amt. (B. 25) 1° m., 663 (i).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms (remarks) 9005 (v).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8458 (v).
Fisheries Act (salmon licenses) Amt. (B. 58) 1° m., 1343 (i).
Fish Poachers on Pacific Coast, Protective Service *re* (remarks) 2080 (ii).
——— Par. in Victoria 'Daily Colonist' (remarks). 1458 (i).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8631 (v).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 2879, (ii).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7863 (iv).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9470 (v).
Jardine, Mr. John, Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 4670 (iii).
——— Par. in 'Daily Times' *re* Claims on Govt. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).
——— Payment by Govt. in excess of Work (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
Shipwrecks on B. C. Coast, Inspection *re* Loading, &c. (remarks) 7257 (iv).
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7251 (iv).
See 'Indian Act.'
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6108 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6491; (buoy steamers) 6550; (Lime Kiln Crossing) 6546; (pensions to pilots) 6534 (iv).
U.S.. Tax on Canadian Shipping, Legislation at Washington (remarks) 9247 (v).
Vancouver Customs Entries, by Robt. Kelly, &c. (M. for copies) 713 (i)
See 'Customs.'
West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 811 (i).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. res. (Mr. Meighen) 1946 (i).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8936 (v).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1312 (i).
Coronation Day in Ottawa, Absence of Ministers, &c. (Ques.) 9989 (v).
——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 10351 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) (personal explanation) 5316 (iii).
Flags, Regulations by Govt. *re* Flying with Foreign Flags (prop. res.) 4347, 4379 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1438 (i).
London and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 57) 1°*, 1277 (i).
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s (B. 75) 1°*, 1488 (i); in Com., 3024, 3181, 3389 (ii).
Newspaper Trains, Cost of Operation *re* Special Trains (Ques.) 9982 (v).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9925 (v).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5258 (iii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Railways, Transportation Problem, on Stmnt, (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5119 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res. (Mr. Fielding) 10535 (v).
—— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10042 (v).
Senate, Reform of, on prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4311 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6629 (iv); Post Office (mail clerks) 4281, 4284 (iii).

BEAUPARLANT, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Census Taking System, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4341 (iii).
Civil Service Act (garnishee) Amt. (B. 12) 1° m., 195 (i).
—— Garnishee of Salaries, on M. for Sup., 4571 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Compensation to (Ques.) 658 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7450 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3793 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 1697 (i).

BELAND, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*
Address, The, 172 (i).
Arthabaska and Drummond Election (remarks) on Address, 172 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, *re* Statements in 'Le Devoir,' 146 (i).
Horses Diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada (remarks) 7427 (iv).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 3389 (ii).

BEST, Mr. J., *Dufferin.*
Aud. General, Cor. *re* over-payments by Govt. (remarks) 1010 (i).
Census Enumerators, Pets, in Favour of Reciprocity, Circulation of (remarks) 6507 (iv).
Eucharistic Congress, Number of Buildings decorated by Govt. (Ques.) 4667 (iii).
—— Reception to by Federal Govt., &c., (Ques.) 5935 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Stock *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3795 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1528 (i).
Mica Exports, 1900 to 1910 (Ques.) 5290 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of, Members paying for Speeches, &c., 1355 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 9885, 9891 (v).
—— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8367 (v).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6812, 6828 (iv).

BEST, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6190 (iv).
Shelburne Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3795 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6069 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Combines Investigation Act) 4280 (iii).
Legislation—Senate (salaries) 6166 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8691 (v).
Post Office (rural postmasters) 4281 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3159 (ii).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*
Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238 (v).
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt (B. 39) 1° m., 924 (i).
—— Discussion *re* (remarks) 4383 (iii).
La Banque du Canada incorp. (B. 123) 1°*, 4109; on M. for Com., 5631; in Com., 5776 (iii), 6120 (iv).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 3180 (ii), 7720, on M. for 3°, 7717 (iv).
Pontiac Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1453 (i).
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.'s (B. 192) 1°*, 8187; in Com., 8969 (v).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s (B. 214) 1°*, 8955; in Com., 9167 (v).

BLACK, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*
Canada Medical Act Amt. (B. 15) 1°m., 309 (i); 2° m., Ref. to Special Com., 2253 (ii); in Com., 6067 (iv).
Dog Fish Industry (remarks) 8048 (v).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8048 (v).
Fruit Duties *re* Reciprocity (remarks) 3377 (ii).
I.C.R. Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1134 (i).
Medical Council Bill, Par. in "Globe," Correction *re*, 2991 (ii).
See "Can. Medical."
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2533 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, Dufferin Res. *re* (remarks) 5547 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8756 (v); Post Office —Outside Service (magazines) 6080 (iv).
Typhoid Epidemic in Ottawa, Pollution of the City Water, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4475 (iii).

BLACK, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*
Typhoid in Ottawa, Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' 4656 (iii).
—— (explanation) 4720 (iii).
Ventilation of the House of Commons (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4473 (iii).
Windsor Letter Carrier, Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R., *Peel.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 355 (i).
Advertising Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).
See "I.C.R."
Agricultural Expenditures in Ontario, for 1910 (Ques.) 6668 (iv).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6311 (iv).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3181 (i).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3600 (ii).
British Preference (remarks) 5620 (iii).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 201) in Com., 8982 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8828 (v).
Casualty Co. of Can. incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8568 (v).
Cattle Exports to the U.S., bonded to G.B. (remarks) 7426 (iv).
—— Reshipped to G.B. (remarks) 7558 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Apptmt. by Liberal Associations (remarks) 7021 (iv).
—— Apptmt. of (remarks) 2887 (ii), 4933 (iii).
—— Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9053 (v).
—— Enumerators in Peel County, Number, Apptmt. &c. (Ques.) 10335 (v).
Census Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9725 (v).
Census, System of Taking, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4341 (iii).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2508 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7872 (iv).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8717 (v).
Civil Service Appointments from South Grey since 1904, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1912 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 2555, 3059 (ii).
Continental Fire Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. B. 196 (Mr. Molloy) in Com., 8968 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage (remarks) 4659 (iii).
Electric Railway Charters, Number since 1896, Extensions *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4043 (iii).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3504 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8121 (v).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8996 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5431 (iii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8215 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
Freeman, Cecil Ernest Relief (B. 143) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10252 (v).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5127 (iii).
Govt. Goods purchased in U.S., Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).
G.T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 5796 (iii).
—— Investigation by Judge Barron, Remuneration to (remarks) 1805 (i).
—— Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1073, 1507 (i).
—— Settlement *re* (remarks) 9692 (v).
—— Status of men Reinstated (remarks) 3377 (ii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1409, 1545, 1729, 1746 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6938 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2962 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8744 (v).
I.C.R. Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
—— Working Operations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1295 (i).
Justice, Deputy Minister, acting as Counsel for outside Cases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Labour Strikes, Conflict *re* (remarks) 6366 (iv).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6000 (iv).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. res. (Mr. Sproule) 1239 (i).
Lunenburg Tower Clock, Specification *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2359, 2578 (ii).
Matches, Phosphorus, Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2023 (ii).
Milk and Cream shipped in Western Ontario, Accommodation *re* Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).
National Battlefields in Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9498 (v).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5947 (iv).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) on M. for 3°, 8965 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6133 (iv).
——— on M. to introduce, 2829 (ii).
Opium Importation of, Prohibition of Sale B. 22 (Mr. King) on M. for 1°, 468 (i), in Com., 2539 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. by Govt., Censure *re* (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2271, Neg. (Y. 61; N. 104) 2358 (ii).
Peel County Mail Service (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
See 'Postal.'
Pork Packing Industry Delegation, Inquiry for Rep. 3530 (ii).
Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iv).
Port Credit Public Works, Expenditures for 1909-10 (Ques.) 5638 (iii).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of certain Newspapers (remarks) 10341 (v).
Postal Service in Peel County, Rural Mail Delvery (remarks) 10355 (v).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Post Office Buildings, Advertisements for Tenders, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1882 (i).
Printing Bureau Irregularities, Money Loss *re* (Ques.) 794 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen's. Rep., 831 (i).
Quebec Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) 1639 (i).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt), to sit during Sittings of the House, 10190 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Railway Freight Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4167 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) 7550 (iv); Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7618 (iv); Original Resolution (remarks) 7668 (iv).
——— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8369 (v).
——— Berlin Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5728 (iii).
——— Letter from the 'Globe' Reporter on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7677 (iv).
——— Negotiations, Letter of J. A. Macdonald in Stratford 'Herald' *re* visit to Washington (remarks) 4299 (iii).
——— Oleomargarine, Admission of (Ques.), 6668 (iv); (remarks) 6504 (iv).
——— Protests *re*, Inquiry for, 3951 (iii).
——— Resolutions, Presenting of, (remarks) 5951 (iv).
——— Special Interests in Can., (remarks) 3058 (ii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6812, 6892 (iv).
——— Statistics, Accepting as read and Printing in 'Hansard)' (remarks) 6859 (iv).
——— Statistics, Reply of Trade and Commerce Dept. *re* Return (remarks) 6514 (iv).
Returns, Notice to Members *re* Bringing Down (remarks) 5938 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery: *See* 'Postal,' &c.
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2662, 3844 (ii).
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6191 (iv).
South Grey Govt. Appointments, Inquiry for Ret. 3344 (ii).
See 'Civil Service.'
Speeches of Ministers distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).
Springhill Mine, N. S., Strike, (remarks) *re* Militia, 2641 (ii).
Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price paid, &c., (Ques.) 10335 (v).
Supply, Schedule of Votes, Proportion, &c., (remarks) 9567 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c., (dairying) 6243 (iv); (exhibitions) 3776 (ii); 9078 (v); (seeds) 6221 (iv); (tobacco production) 6262 (iv); Quarantine (animals health) 5960 (iv); (public health) 5979 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (tugs) 6388 (iv); St. Peter's (improvements) 6419 (iv); Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6392 (iv); Welland (Jane St. bridge) 6425 (iv); Williamsburg (machinery) 6426 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1475 (i); Customs (salaries) 5992 (iv); Justice (salaries) 1018 (i); Labour (salaries) 1484 (i); Militia (salaries) 1029 (i); Mines (salaries) 1476, 1478 (i); Public Works (salaries) 1033 (i).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6617 (iv); (legal expenses) 6661 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5168 (iii).
Indians—Man. (annuities) 8886 (v).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6162 (iv).
Labour Dept. (technical education commission) 3801 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamers) 6549; (maritime road) 6543 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8770 (v).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6570 (iv).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6555 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (electric power) 3211; (fire escapes) 3160 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3157; (immigration buildings) 3157; (sundries) 3161 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fredericton pavement) 1614 (i); (Hampton) 1615; (Hartland) 1620; (Hillsborough) 1622; (Moncton armoury) 1623 (i).
Public Works—Buildings— N.S. (Lunenburg) 1592; (Parrsboro) 1598, 1629; (Wolfville) 1599 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2604; (Seaforth) 2626; (Sudbury) 2627; (Tilbury) 2627; (Uxbridge) 2630; (Wallaceburg) 2633; (Waterloo) 2634; (Wiarton) 2636 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 3164; (heating, &c.) 2590, 3162; (H. of C. improvements) 2592; (lighting) 3202 (ii); (McGillivray's contract) 5994 (iv); (pavements) 2594 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8872 (v); (steel cases) 2582 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1666; (Aylmer) 1673; (Grosse Isle) 1675 (i); (Montreal barracks) 2575 (ii); (Napierville) 1866; (Quebec immigrant) 1887; (Rigaud) 1888; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1893; (St. Lambert) 1895; (Three Rivers) 1902 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2972 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3215; (salaries) 3214 (ii).
Public Works—Dredging (generally) 9556 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9502 (v); Ont. (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R (air brakes) 5913; (bridge strengthening) 5914; (rolling stock) 5927 (iii); (working expenses) 6340 (iv)
Railways—Miscellaneous (Ry, Commissioners) 6428 (iv)
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6559; (meteorological service) 6563 (iv)

Western Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9706 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Woods Building Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3188 (ii).
See 'Supply—Public Works—Ottawa.'
Wentworth, Number of Govt. Appointments since 1904 (M. for ret.) 2162 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2557 (ii).

BLONDIN, Mr. P. E., *Champlain.*

Address, The, 169 (i).
Arthabaska and Drummond Election, *re* Disloyal Speeches (remarks) on Address, 169 (i).
——— Statements in 'Le Devoir,' Denial, &c., 145 (i).
——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 471 (i).
Lanctot: *See* 'Richelieu.'
Piles Federal Works, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 7590 (iv), 8103 (v).
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot, on Amt. (Mr. Monk), on M. (Mr. German), to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 8027 (v).
Richelieu, Member of, Charges *re* Emplymt. of Govt. Work men from Sorel Ship yards, Ques. of Priv., 4645 (iii), (M.) for Com., 4654 (iii).
St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 2674 (ii).
Sorel Naval Shipyards, Investigation, Dismissal of A. Senecal (remarks) 5732 (iii).
Thibodeau, Mr. Frank, Salary as Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 8100 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK, K.C.M.G., (Minister of Militia), *Kings, N.S.*

Alberta Rangers, Macleod, Squadron, Capt. D. J. Campbell's connection therewith (Ans.) 7341 (iv).
Annual Drill, Number of Men, Officers, &c. (Ans.) 8700, 9353 (v).
Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Baby Farm, Sale of, Competition *re* (Ans.) 2155 (ii).
Bear River Rifle Range, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3606 (ii).
Bliss, Lt. Col. D. C. F., Emplymt. by Govt. &c (Ans.) 8100 (v)
Canadian Veterans at Coronation (Ans.) 3608 (ii).
Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of (remarks) 9997 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage (remarks) 4660 (iii).
——— Canadian Cadets, &c. (Ans.) 706 (i).
——— Names of Officers, Cadets, &c. (remarks) 7106 (iv).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Coronation Contingent, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3277 (ii).
—— Regulations *re* Selection (Ans.) 3220 (ii), 4464 (iii).
—— Selection of Officers (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Esquimalt Guns, Removal of (Ans.) 3220 (ii).
Eucharistic Congress and Guards of Honour (Ans.) 704 (i).
—— Militia Officers at Reception, Uniform, &c. (Ans.) 707 (i).
—— Attendance of Militia, Authority for (Ans.) 3219 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Compensation to (Ans.) 658, 1089 (i).
—— Number surviving, Pensions, &c. (Ans.) 1715 (i).
See "Veterans."
Flags Flying on Military Buildings (remarks) 4725 (iii).
Fort Osborne Barracks, Negotiations *re* Purchase by Man. Govt. (remarks) 4470 (iii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6055 (iv).
French, Gen.'s, Report (presented) 76 (i).
—— on Inquiry for Rep., 10 (i).
Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c. (Ans.) 2886 (ii).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10349 (v).
Militia and Agriculture Expenditure from 1867 to 1910 (Ans.) 9371 (v).
Militia, Annual Drill, Number called out from 1894 to 1910 (Ans.) 8700 (v).
Militia Dept., Showing of Passes by Members of Parliament (Ans.) 1003, 1090 (i).
—— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Militia Expenditures, Total Amount since Confederation (Ans.) 3467 (ii).
—— Regiments, Number in Montreal, Quebec, &c. (Ans.) 7595 (iv).
—— Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1003 (i).
—— Supplies, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 4667 (iii).
—— Surveys, Expenditure in last five years (Ans.) 1102 (i).
—— Total Annual Cost from 1867 to 1910, &c. (Ans.) 1289 (i).
Montreal and Mar. Prov. Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
N.B. Artillery Regiment, Annual Drill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).
Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Associations, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 7340 (iv).
Petawawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Force Training (Ans.) 4465 (iii).
Porcupine Fire Sufferers, Request for Tents, Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 9984 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Boston Speech (remarks) 5751 (iii).
—— Kentville Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5548, 5750 (iii).
Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own Regiment while in England (Ans.) 1088 (i).
—— Number issued to Queen's Own (Ans.) 9781 (v)
Ross Rifles loaned by Canada to G.B., Use at Bisley, &c. (Ans.) 1087 (i).
—— Recommendation to British Govt. (remarks) 7553 (iv).
Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price paid, &c. (Ans.) 8583, 10335 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Militia—(salaries) 1021 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8758 (v).
Militia (allowance) 8514, 8528 (v); (customs duties) 6054; (R.M.C. maintenance) 6054; (Winnipeg rifle range) 6053 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, R.M.C.) 3156; Que. (Montreal barracks) 3145 (ii).
Toronto Barracks, Erection of (remarks) 7558 (iv).
—— Purchase of Site (Ans.) 2154 (i).
Veterans, Grants to by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5214 (iii).
See 'Fenian.'
Veterans of 1866, Compensation *re* (remarks) 9999 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L., *Halifax, N.S.*
Address, The, 22 (i).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Naval Policy, 218, (amt.) 228 (i).
—— on Ques. of Order, Member asked to apologize for using word "liar," 463 (i).
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2173, 2183 (ii).
Agricultural Implements, Valuations for Duties, Manipulation of, &c. (remarks) 1360 (i).
Arthabaska and Drummond Elections, Cartoons used by Min. of Marine, published by "Le Canada" in 1904 (remarks) on Address, 223 (i).
See 'Drummond.'
Atlantic Mail Contract, Question *re* (remarks) 2373 (ii).
Bahama Islands, Annexation to Canada, rumours *re* (remarks) 9373 (v).
Bank Act, Consideration by Govt. (remarks) 6674 (iv).
Bank Curators Reports (remarks) 4569 (iii).
Birthday of Prime Minister, Congratulations, &c., 8 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
British National Songs in N. W. Schools, Remarks of Mr. Armstrong (remarks) 4932 (iii).
Budget, The, (remarks) 6439 (iv).
Business of the House, Inquiry, 4117 (iii).
—— Adjournment for Coronation (remarks) 9310 (v).
See 'Coronation.'
Cable, G.B. and Canada State-owned, Proposal *re* G.B. and Can. (Ques.) 1905 (i).
See 'Telegraph.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8804, 8813, 8841; in Com., 9256 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re* Mr. Oliver on Proposed Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8191 (v).
See 'Oliver.'
C. P. Ry. Reduction of Rates, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com., 1848 (i).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work (remarks) 7219 (iv).
—— Cor. *re* Apptmt. of Enumerators (M. for copy*) 9994 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9056 (v).
Census, Inquiry for Information, 9694 (v).
—— Progress *re* (remarks) 9594 (v).
Census Omissions in Enumerations, on M. (Mr. Perley) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9717 (v).
—— Further information *re*, 9897 (v).
Census, Systems of Collecting (M. for papers, &c.) 4337 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (remarks) 6669, 7556 (iv).
China-Japan SS Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10401, 10450 (v).
—— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9838-9 (v).
—— Discussion *re* Rep., 9929 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8723 (v).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com on Res., 8906 (v).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re* (M. for cor.) 2218 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 7553 (iv).
—— (notice of motion) 1912 (i).
Coal Strikes, Settlement of (remarks) 6914 (iv).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7808 (iv); in Com., 8896 (v).
Copyright Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 9595 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8711 (v).
—— Definite Date (remarks) 9090 (v).
See 'Business,' 'Imperial Conference.'
Customs Act Schedules, Average Value in 1896 and 1910 (Ques.) 801 (i).
See 'Duties.'
Customs Officer at Ingram Dock, Dismissal of *re* Municipal Elections (M. for O. Cs. &c.) 2218 (ii).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7017 (iv).
Deptl. Expenditures of Public Moneys, Investigations *re* (remarks) on Address, 37 (i).
Dog Fish Industry, (remarks) in Com., 8044 (v).
Dom. Lands Act, O. Cs. in Com., 8087 (v).
Drummond, &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 476 (i).
Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value of articles in Schedules of Customs Act (M. for ret.) 1105 (i).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3480 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8111 (v).
English Mails to Mar. Provs.: *See* 'Mails.'
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'
Fanny Louise Land Patent, Cancellation of, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2191 (ii).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2251 (ii).
—— Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5387 (iii).
—— Proceedings *re* Commission, Inquiry for, 10471 (v).
Farmers' Delegation from the West, Control of Rates, &c. (remarks) 1508 (i).
—— (remarks) *re* Printing of Speeches, &c., 1454 (i).
—— Stmt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Grain Growers' Guide (remarks) 1575 (i).
Fedorenko, S., Extradition of (remarks) 10 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9627 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, Speech of P.M.G. at Montreal (remarks) 2269 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8044 (v).
Fisheries, Newfoundland: *See* 'Hague.'
Fishery Officers in Victoria Co., on Inquiry for Ret., 6672 (iv).
Fisheries Protection Service, Seizure by 'Rainbow' (remarks) 4208 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup., 8501 (v).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4352 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. 8086, 9346 (v).
French, Gen., Rep., Inquiry for, 9 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4115 (iii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).
See 'Business.'
Grain Act Amt. B., 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9514 (v).
Grand Falls and St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5705 (iii).
G.T.R. Trainmens Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1071 (i).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B., 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306 (v).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8978 (v).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S., Agreement *re* (remarks) 1725 (i).
——— Bay of Fundy, on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Sup., 4614, 4701 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Speech on Address, 24 (i).
——— Fisheries Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1804 (i).
——— Stmt. *re* (remarks) 1913 (i).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Halifax Customs Officials, Complaints *re* Treatment *re* Salaries (remarks) in Com., 8723 (v).
Halifax Pier at Cunard Wharf, Construction of (remarks) 2150 (ii).
Halifax Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ques.), 653 (i).
Homestead Regulations in B.C., on M. (Mr. Taylor) for Ret., 2861 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1411, 1536, 1739, 1765 (i).
House of Commons Appointments (remarks) on M., 5288 (iii).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1564 (i).
Imperial Conference, Attendance of Prime Minister, Position of the Opposition, Compromise, &c. (remarks) 8033 (iv).
——— Cor. with Mr. Harcourt, &c. (remarks) 10340 (v).
——— Precis *re* Proceedings (remarks) 9693 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Imperial Conference, Precis Rep. and Verbatim Rep. (remarks) 9783 (v).
——— Printing and Distribution in Canada (remarks) 9691 (v).
——— Rep. presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10114 (v).
Indian Act Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 7020; on M. for 2°, 7825, 7832; in Com., 7852 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2956 (ii).
I.C.R., Construction at Grand Narrows, O. Cs, &c. *re* Claims of Contractors (M. for copies*) 5640 (iii).
——— inquiry for ret., 10470 (v).
——— Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1179 (i).
——— Excursion Trains *re* Political Meetings, (remarks) 3000 (ii).
——— Freight Transfer, Letter to Agent at Moncton (Ques.) 653 (i).
——— Halifax Terminals, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham 2647 (ii).
——— Terminals, at Halifax, Dock Accommodation (remarks) 2376 (i), 9561 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 1301 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 971; in Com., 976, 1295; in Order for Com., 1407 (i).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 871 (i); on M. for 2°, 9132; in Com., 9157 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations B. 224 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9452; on M. for 3°, 9533 (v).
See 'China and Japan.'
Japanese Treaty, Action *re* (remarks) 9076 (v).
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, Prime Minister's Birthday, Congratulations, &c., 8 (i).
Lemieux, Hon. Mr., Speech at Montreal. *See* 'Fiscal.'
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop, Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1199 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence, on M. for Sup., 2887 (ii).
——— Cor. between Govt, and British Ambassador, Inquiry for 3530 (ii)
——— Rep. of American Commissioners, Canada's action, &c., (remarks) 1651 (i).
See 'International Waterways Bill,' 'St. Lawrence.'
Mail Service to Mar. Provs., English Mails, &c., (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9543 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Mail Service to Maritime Provinces, Representations by Board of Trade at Halifax (remarks) 2376 (ii).
——— (remarks) 8794 (v).
Mails, Illegal Use of, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* M. to adjn. hse., 1358 (i).
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6202 (iv).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c., (remarks) 6764 (iv).
Matches, White Phosphorus Manufacture, Prohibition B. 10 (Mr. King) on M. for 2°, 1576 (i).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2800 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8888 (v).
See 'Business,' &c., 'Govt. Business.'
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9498 (v).
N. T. Ry., Eastern Div., Total Cost up to 31st Dec., 1910 (Ques.) 2434, 3064 (ii).
——— Land Damages, Delay *re* Fiats for Compensation (remarks) 3949 (iii).
——— Payments *re*, on Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
——— St. Lawrence and Moncton Div, Completion of (Ques.) 1711 (i).
Naval Defence, Government Proposals (remarks) on Address, 34 (i).
Naval Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Address, 218 (amt.) 228; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 126) 649 (i).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5947 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co.'s Investments in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) for Com., 782 (i).
Niagara Falls Water Power, Treaty Obligations, &c., Par. in Press (remarks) 8791 (v).
——— Power, Regulations, &c., (remarks) 8893 (v).
See 'International.'
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration at The Hague, (M. for cor.) 4337 (iii.)
——— Hague Award (remarks) 689 (i).
——— Distribution of Copies (remarks) 8093 (v).
See 'Hague.'
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 8309; (amt.) 8314, Neg. (Y. 69; N. 102) 8347 (v).
——— Inquiry for Meeting of Com., 9899 (v).
See 'Can. Northern,' &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill (Mr. Conmee) on M. to introduce, 2831 (ii).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2534 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2344 (ii)
Oyster Culture, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor. (remarks) 725 (i).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c., (remarks) 9917 (v).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages Damages (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8591 (v).
Perley, Mr., Cor. *re* Riordan Paper Co., (remarks) 10201 (v).
Postoffice Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9579 (v).
Prime Minister's Tour Through the West, (remarks) on Address, 25 (i).
P. E. I. Judicial Vacancy, Apptmt. of, Delay, &c. (remarks) 6928, 7428, 7803 (iv); 8375 (v).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission 7698, 7794 (iv).
——— Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Murphy) to print (remarks) 8 (i).
Privileges and Election Com., Charges *re* (Mr. A. Lanctot) on M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 7884 (v).
Priv., Ques. of (Mr. Lake) on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5746 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Aud. Gen's. Rep., 860 (i).
——— (remarks) 309 (i).
Public Buildings, Erection, &c. (M.) to discharge Order, 4319 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Contract, Advertisement *re*, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copy, 1497 (i).
——— Contract *re* Construction, Resignation of Chairman (remarks) 4205 (iii)
——— Date of Completion, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
——— Information *re*, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4334 (iii).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 700 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 966 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9331, 9391 (v).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5235 (iii).
Railways, Transportation Problem in Canada on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5044 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2497 (ii), 4830; (amt.) 4844; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 111) 4875 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. of Res., 3294 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4058 (iii).
Reciprocity, British Preference, Increase of, Readjustment of Tariff, &c. (remarks) 7210 (iv).
——— Articles *re* Obstruction (remarks) 10004 (v).
——— Free Trade Offer by U.S., Speech of Presd't Taft (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 5293 (iii).
——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 2990 (ii).
——— Fruit Duties in B.C. (remarks) 3771 (ii).
——— Importations into Canada from Favoured Nation countries, Entry of Canadian Goods into their Markets, 4134 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 2555 (ii).
——— Manufactured Products and Agricultural Products (stmnt) *re* Mr. Clark's Speech *re*, 4196 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Best) to adjn. debate, 9886 (v).
——— Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1506 (i), 2271 (ii).
——— Negotiations with U.S. and Can. (remarks) on Address, 32 (i).
——— Obstruction by Opposition (Mr. Fielding) on M. to adjn. debate, 9886 (v).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Currie) 4125 (iii).
——— on Question of Order referring to previous debate, 8256 (v)
——— (remarks) *re* Better Order, 3705 (ii).
——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5950 (iv).
——— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609 (i).
——— Statistics of comparative prices, 6807 (iv).
——— Statistical Tables, Inquiry for 2985, 3059 (ii).
——— Statistics from U.S., Information *re* (remarks) 4931 (iii).
——— on handing in Statements (remarks) 6955 (iv).
——— Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2643 (ii).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7672 (iv).
——— letter from 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7676 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 5733 (iii), 8093 (v).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Limited incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
R.N.W.M. Police, Death of Inspectors on Northern Patrol (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8598 (v).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service at public function (remarks) 938 (i).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service (remarks) 9995, 10095 (v).
St. John Valley Ry: *See* 'Grand Falls,' &c.
St. Lawrence River, Damming the Long Sault (M. for cor. pets, &c.) 3228 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2887 (ii).
——— Further Information *re* (remarks) 3058 (ii).
See 'Long Sault.'
St. Peter's Canal Construction, Answer to Question (remarks) 8355 (v).
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6189 (iv).
Senate, Cost of, amended Motion (Mr. Foster) 1453 (i).
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7825 (iv).
Springhill Coal Strike, Information *re* Present Situation (remarks) 6362 (iv).
Statutes, French Edition, Correction in Translation (remarks) 8088 (v).
Supply for Public Works, Objection *re* Vote in full, 9554 (v).
Supply, Schedule of Votes, Proportion, &c. (remarks) 9567 (v).
Supply B. 225 on M. for 3°, 9580 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9080 (v).
Interior (boundary surveys) 9546; (Dom. Lands surveys) 9547; (seed grain) 9551; (water investigations) 9551 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8753; (Baddeck and Iona) 8763; (Bonaventure River and N.B.) 8764; (Canada and Mexico) 8781 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) 1592; (Halifax post office) 1583; (Lunenburg) 1595 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 8872 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9501, 9507 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax docks) 9561 (v).
R.N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8598; (subsistence) 8600 (v).
Tariff Negotiations, &c., Prime Minister's remarks in the West (remarks) on Address, 26 (i).
See 'Reciprocity.'
Taylor, Geo., Retirement as Chief Whip (remarks) 6 (i).
Telegraph and Cable Services Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9644 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Trade, Imports and Exports, between B.N.A. Possessions and U.S. (M. for ret.°) 4383 (iii).
U.S. Warships in Great Lakes, Armament of, &c (Ques.) 7026; (remarks) 6362 (iv).
—— Information from Official Sources, Delays, (remarks) 6611 (iv).
—— Manœuvres at Chicago, Permission of Can. Govt. *re* passing through Canadian Canals, 6116 (iv).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of, on Stmnt. of Sec. of State (remarks) 10455 (v).
—— Inquiry for Stmnt., 10096 (v).
Water Carriage of Goods Act Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 9348 (v).
Water Carriage of Goods, on M. (Mr. Brodeur) to refer Complaint to Com. on Marine and Fisheries, 6905 (iv).
'Wanda' Yacht, Valuation by Customs (remarks) 5627 (iii).
West Indies Trade with Canada, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6387 (iv).
Whips, Chief, Retirement of Mr. Geo. Taylor (remarks) 6 (i)
Waterways Treaty Bill: See 'International.'

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *Algoma West.*
Algoma, Timber Permits, Amounts paid *re* Dues (Ques.) 4673 (iii).
Alien Labour Law, Administration at Sault Ste. Marie, on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).
—— Emplmnt. of Foreigners on Public Contracts (remarks) 10372 (v).
See 'Sault Ste. Marie.'
Electricians Protest *re* Dismissals at Sault Ste. Marie, Alien Labour Law Administration, on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigatin *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5322, 5508 (iii).
Farm and Garden Products, Imports at Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 7034 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9621 (v).
Fishery Inspectors, Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6646 (iv).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull,' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1559 (i).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10350 (v).
Lt. Governor, N.S., Apptmt. of, Cor. *re* Director of N.S. Steel and Coal Co. (Ques) 2670 (ii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials, Acceptance of (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2747; Neg. (Y. 63; N. 118) 2826 (ii).
—— Ques. of Order, 2768, 2814 (ii).
—— (explanation) 2438 (ii).
—— Notice of Discussion, 2150, 2254 (ii).
Obabikong and Sabiskong Indian Reserves, Tenders *re* Burned Timber (Ques.) 1344 (i).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6121 (iv).
Reciprocity Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10011, 10026 (v).
Reciprocity Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6782, 6900 (iv).
—— Trade and Commerce, Reply to Ret. for Statistics (remarks) 6511 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Labour Strike, Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in 'Sault Express', 6359 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Cor., 6365 (iv).
See 'Alien.'
Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
Seagull Dock, St. Joseph's Island, Date of Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1349 (i).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1400 (i).
Steel Wire, &c., Bounties, Intention of Govt. *re* (remarks) 6613 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (concrete walls) 6358; (mooring posts) 6397; Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6646 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 3001 (ii).
Technical Education Commission, Completion of Work (remarks) 1661 (i).
Veterans, Grants to (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5214 (iii).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Proclamation *re* Earlier Date (remarks) 9900, 10142 (v).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 880 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6329 (iv).
Carillon Canal, Water Powers, Names of Lessees, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 2668 (ii).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4578 (iii).
Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of, &c. (Ques.) 2852 (ii).
Soulanges Canal, Claim for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin (Ques.) 2852 (ii).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H., *Selkirk.*
Agricultural Products of Canada, Total Product (Ques.) 6756 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5083 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9286 (v).
C.P.R. Land Tax, Information *re* Privy Council's Decision, 2992 (ii).
Census Enumerators for Man. and N.W. on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9029 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8928 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to Prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3506 (ii).
Fish Poachers in Lake Superior, Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press' (remarks) 1459 (i).
Fishery Regulations, Proclamation *re* (remarks) 5035 (iii).
See 'Lake Winnipeg'; 'Manitoba,' &c.
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4372 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8608 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9530 (v).
Homestead Inspectors at Medicine Hat, Number, Salaries, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 1722 (i).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1545 (i).
Immigration—Farmers sent to G.B. from Man. (Ques.) 1489 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7833 (iv); in Com., 8404 (v).
Lake Winnipeg Fisheries Investigation Commission, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 796 (i).
Lake Winnipeg Navigation, Icebreaker *re* Res. from Board of Trade (read) 4217 (iii).
Light-House Keepers Salaries, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 773 (i).
Manitoba Fisheries Commission, Inquiry for Rep., 4207, 5035 (iii).
New Westminster Employees, Increase of Salaries, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2185 (ii).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8596 (v).
Postoffice Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5068 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 6680 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Pets, &c., 3057 (ii).
——— Letter from Market Gardeners (read) 4130 (iii).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., Stmnt. of Mr. Clark *re* Opposition to, Ques. of Priv. 4227 (iii).
St. Andrew's Dam, Fishway, Correction in Stmnt. *re*, 1650 (i).
——— Fish Ladder &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3033 (ii).
St. Andrew's Dam, Bridge, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3035 (ii).
——— Sums for Completion (remarks) 1508 (i).
St. Peters Indian Reserve, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5837, Ques. of Order, 5865 (iii).
——— Amounts received from Sales, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 787 (i).
——— Chief Justice Howell's Commission (M. for copy of evidence*) 7039 (iv).
——— Investigation by Rev. Dr. John McDougall (Ques.) 787; (M. for copies) 1292 (i).
——— Moneys paid by Govt., Complaints &c. (Ques.) 1974 (ii).
——— Original Documents &c. (remarks) 8192, Cor. *re* Original Documents &c. (read) 8109; on Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 8478 (v).
——— Rep, in Winnipeg 'Telegram' *re* Speech on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Oliver) 3841 (ii).
——— Request by Commission for Official Documents (remarks) 9899 (v).
Selkirk Postoffice Box (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
Sinclair, Mr. John, Indian Inspector, Emplymt. of (Ques.) 6272 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3789 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6059 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5175 (iii); (agencies) 6047 (iv).
Indians, N.W.T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6036, 6039 (iv).
Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9549 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (pavements) 2593 (ii); (Sussex Street Block) 3172; (water supply) 2586 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (repairs) 9553 (v).
R.N.W.M. Police (subsistence) 8600 (v)
Whitemouth River Fishway (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
Winnipeg River Water Powers, &c., Inquiry for Ret. 3955 (iii).

BRODER, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6292 (iv).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1944 (i).
Agricultural Implements imported into Can, Valuations &c. (remarks) 1362 (i).

BRODER, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Dairy Industry, Memorials *re* &c. (Ques.) 2671 (ii).
Elevator Terminals &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2390 (ii).
Elevator Terminals &c., Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1497 (i).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8240 (v).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1559 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1221 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill, on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2816 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6739 (iv).
Rideau Canal Lockmen, Increased Pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 6414 (iv).
Sheet Steel Co., Emplymt. of men *re* ice blockades (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Rapide Plat (dredging) 6413; (iv) Williamsburg (electric power) 6396; (iv); Public Works—Buildings, N.B., (Fredericton pavement) 1613 (i).
Waddington Power Development, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7210 (iv).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P., (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), *Rouville.*
Address, The, 135, 152 (i).
Aids to Navigation *re* St. Lawrence, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c., (Ans.) 800 (i).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4240 (iii).
'Alva' Str., Purchase of, Dimensions, &c., (Ans.) 1909 (i).
'Arctic' Rep. of Capt. Bernier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Barrington Passage Bait Freezer, on Inquiry for Ret., 5293 (iii).
Bay of Fundy Fishing Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).
Beddington, Mr., Pension *re* Pilotage Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Brier Island Light, Application *re* new House (Ans.) 4929 (iii).
—— Salary, &c., (Ans.) 4929 (iii).
B. C. Fisheries Regulations (M. for Com. on Res.) 4201 (iii).
See 'Fisheries Act,' 'Govt. Steamers.'

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3859 (ii).
Canadian Naval Service, Boot Contract, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1723 (i), 2675 (ii).
—— 'Bristol' Type, Specifications, &c. (Ans.) 1279 (i).
—— Building of Cruisers, &c. 197 (i).
—— Cruisers, Article in Naval Annual *re* Scrapping (remarks) 931 (i).
—— Coal Consumption by Niobe, (Ans.) 7209 (iv).
—— Cruisers manned by Canadians, Names, &c., (Ans.) 805 (i).
—— Cruisers ordered for Canada, Stmnt., in the 'Navy' (Ans.) 793 (i).
—— Date and Port of Sailing of 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' (Ans.) 1091 (i).
—— Fisheries Protection Service, Seizure by 'Rainbow,' (remarks) 4117, 4208 (iii).
—— Loan of Cruisers by Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 983 (i).
—— Names of Employees, Duties, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Stmnt., 935 (i).
—— Naval Expenditures Return (remarks) 4659 (iii).
—— Navy Regulations, Printing, &c., (Ans.) 4665 (iii).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Approximate Cost, &c., (Ans.) 7210 (iv.)
—— 'Niobe,' Contracts *re* Provisions (Ans.) 794 (i).
—— 'Niobe,' Date of laying keel, Repairs in England, &c., (Ans.) 793 (i).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Speed, Result of Official Trials (Ans.) 7209 (iv.)
—— 'Niobe,' Wages of Seamen, Discontent, &c., (remarks) 531 (i); (stmnt. read) 664 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' and 'Niobe,' Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c., (Ans.) 792 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' Cruiser, Date of Purchase, Price paid, &c., (Ans.) 788 (i).
—— 'Rainbow,' listed as ineffective (remarks) 1071 (i).
—— 'Rainbow,' struck off Effective List, (Ans.) 1081 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' and 'Niobe,' Total Cost to date, Price, Repairs and Maintenance (Ans.) 791 (i).
—— Recruiting by Postmasters (remarks) 7262 (iv).
—— Recruiting Regulations, O. C. *re* Remuneration, &c., (Ans.) 7804 (iv).
—— Roper; *See* 'Roper.'
—— Ships ordered by Govt., Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press' (remarks) 867 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Canadian Naval Service, Tenders for Cruisers, &c., (Ans.) 8706 (v).
—— Total Cost of Cruisers (Ans.) 791 (i).
—— Total Expenditure since October 31, 1910 (Ans.) 5638 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act (registration) Amt. (B. 155) 1° m., 6112, 2° m., and (M.) to ref. to Committee on Marine and Fisheries, 6675 (iv).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4581 (iii).
Civil Service, Apptmt. of Coloured Persons (remarks) 4930, 5039 (iii).
Coronation, Naval Cadets, Methods of Selection (Ans.) 9986 (v).
'Crissie Toomey,' Purchase of, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5833 (iii).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re* (Ans.) 9374 (v).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7018 (iv).
Dog Fish Industry, (remarks) 8044 (v).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Speeches *re* Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 135, 152; Cartoons displayed to House (remarks) 146 (i).
'Earl Grey,' Str.. Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c. (Ans.) 1972 (ii).
—— Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).
English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters (Ans.) 1080, 1092 (i).
Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Transfer to Canada (Ans.) 799 (i).
Falconer System of Bookkeeping, Adoption of by Depts. (Ans.) 1904 (i).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt (B. 185) in Com. on Res., 8043; in Com., 8419 (v).
Fisheries Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret 5836 (iii).
Fisheries of Can., Extent in Marine Miles, Amount realized, &c. (Ans.) 1289 (i).
Fisheries on the Great Lakes, Regulations *re*, on M. (Mr. Wilcox) to Com. of Sup., 5224 (iii).
Fisheries Officers in Ontario, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6158 (iv).
Fisheries Protection Service, Number of Vessels (Ans.) 805 (i).
—— Control by Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 983 (i).
Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Taylor) 8484 (v).
—— on Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8479 (v).
—— Date of Operations *re* (Ans.) 3465 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Fisheries Treaty, Penalties *re* Violation of, on Inquiry for Ret., 1806 (i).
—— Printing of Documents (remarks) 4207 (iii).
—— Proclamation *re* (remarks) 5035 (iii).
—— Trap Nets (remarks) 2070 (ii).
Fishery Regulations, Violation of by C. K. Golden, &c. (remarks) 2368 (ii).
Fisheries Treaty, 1908, Non-fulfilment by U.S. (remarks) 6531 (iv).
Fishery Commission *re* Saskatchewan and Alberta, Interim Rep. laid on Table, 10590 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
Fish Hatcheries under Dom. Control, Applications *re* Fish Fry (Ans.) 1494 (i).
Fish Hatcheries in East Elgin, Construction *re* (remarks) 5137 (iii).
Fishing Bounties in Kings Co., P.E.I., Names of persons receiving Pay (Ans.) 7246 (iv).
Fish Poachers on Pacific and Lake Superior Coasts (remarks) 1460 (i), 2085 (ii).
Fishing by Steam Trawling: *See* 'Steam Trawling.'
Fish Transportation, Expenditure annually, Value, &c. (Ans.) 6271 (iv).
—— Amounts paid out of Aiding Fund, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) 6506 (iv).
Fish Transhipment from Mar. Provs. (remarks) 6092, 6102, 7106 (iv).
—— Statement (read) 7259 (iv).
Fishing Vessels and Customs Regulations Bill, on Request (Mr. Jameson) to place on Govt. Orders, 3374 (ii).
Fish Wardens in Victoria, N.B., on Inquiry for Ret., 5629, 5732 (iii), 6672 (iv).
Fishways on Pembina River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
—— Placing of Ladder (Ans.) 1090 (i).
Glace Bay Bait Association, Amounts paid from 1906-10 (Ans.) 3670 (ii).
—— Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c. (Ans.) 4044 (iii).
Govt. Goods purchased from U.S., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 817 (i).
Govt. Steamers of Marine Dept., Winter Commissions (Ans.) 5833 (iii).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Grand Manan Fisheries, Weir Licenses &c. (Ans.) 2367 (ii).
Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock (Ans.) 1976 (ii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries, Regulations, Papers laid on Table, 2365 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Hague Tribunal, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Bay of Fundy) on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Sup., 4593, 4678 (iii).
Herring Traps, Close Season (remarks) 2086 (ii).
Immigration Officers of U.S. residing in Canada (Ans.) 1724 (i).
Imperial Defence Conference Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 2216 (ii).
—— Premier's Reception from Conference, Amount expended (Ans.) 9781 (v).
See 'Laurier.'
Imperial Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) on Senate Amts., 6610 (iv).
International Fisheries Commission, Regulation *re* (remarks) 7260 (iv).
—— Regulations, Mess. from Washington (remarks) 6504 (iv).
See 'Fisheries.'
'Iroquois' Str., Report *re* Wreck (remarks) 7104 (iv).
James Bay Fishing Lease to Ach. McNee, Duration of (Ans.) 4830 (iii).
'John B. Young' Str., Stranding of, Govt. Assistance *re* (Ans.) 2368 (ii).
Lafleur, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt., Interference in Elections (Ans.) 1907 (i).
Lake Winnipeg Fisheries, Investigating Fisheries, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 797 (i).
Lake Winnipeg Icebreaker (remarks) 4223 (iii).
Lanctot Charges: *See* 'Privileges,' &c.
Laurier Reception at Montreal, Montreal Harbour Commission's Expenditure (Ans.) 9982 (v).
See 'Imperial Conference.'
'LeDevoir,' Quotations from *re* Drummond Election, Ques. of Priv., 469 (i).
Life Saving Awards, Names of Recipients (Ans.) 3849 (ii).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Date of Appmt. &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 772 (i).
Lobster Fishery Regulations laid on Table, 529 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
Manitoba Fisheries Commission, on Inquiry for Rep., 4207, 5035 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'
Manitou Lake Fishing Privileges, Lease *re* (Ans.) 1348 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
—— Investigations, Prosecutions, &c. (remarks) 10243 (v).
—— Purchase of Ships (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6473 (iv).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 4208 (iii), 6763 (iv).
—— (remarks) on Inquiry for Ret., 6120 (iv).
Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, Dates, Examiners, &c. (Ans.) 2376 (ii), 5637 (iii).
Menzie, Wm., Payments to *re* Meteorological Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).
Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 4929 (iii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses for 1908-9-10 (Ans.) 817 (i).
'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ans.) 1724 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 48) 1° m., 1070 (i); in Com., 8451 (v); on Senate Amts., 9534 (v).
Montreal Legal Firms, Amounts paid for Services (Ans.) 984 (i).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B 45 (Mr. Ecrement) on M. for 3°, 7718; in Com., 7723 (iv).
Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmt., &c. (Ans.) 1105 (i).
Navigation Licenses, on Great Lakes, Regulations from Washington (Ans.) 2376 (ii).
Navy of Canada: *See* 'Can. Naval Service.'
Negroes in Govt. Employ: *See* 'Civil Service.'
Northwest Fishing Co., on Inquiry for Ret. 5630 (iii).
Owl's Head Lighthouse, Construction, Apptmt. of Lightkeeper (Ans.) 5832 (iii).
—— Pet. *re* (Ans.) 3465 (ii).
Oyster Culture, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor. 760 (i).
'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew, &c. (Ans.) 3605 (ii).
Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 9782 (v).
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3908 (ii).
—— Contracts *re* Coal, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2677 (ii).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7979 (v).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Emplymt. of Mr. Cooper *re* Inspection (Ans.) 6663 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Members *re* (Ans.) 2437 (ii).
Reciprocity, Fishing Bounties, Payments *re* (remarks) 6670 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5737 (iii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Rhodes) 1001 (i).
Revised Statutes—Chapter 142, French Version, Correction (B. 136) 1°*, 4740 (iii).
Roper, Commander, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 799 (i).
——— Speech *re* Naval Service, Approval by Govt. (Ans.) 1289 (i).
——— (remarks) 935 (i).
——— Meaning of Word 'Faction,' Incomplete Answer (remarks) 1353 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Depth of Water at Low Tide below thirty feet (Ans.) 1718 (i).
Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c. (Ans.) 2853 (ii).
Sevigny Island, Change of Name (Ans.) 1491 (i).
Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3607 (ii).
Shipwrecks on B.C. Coast, Inspection *re* (remarks) 7258 (iv).
Sick Mariners' Funds, Amount in Trust, Investment &c. (Ans.) 9993 (v).
——— Law *re* Payment of Dues (Ans.) 1904 (i).
Smelt Fishing in Nova Scotia, Pet. *re* Change of Open Season (Ans.) 9984 (v).
Sorel Marine Shops, Complaints *re* Thefts (Ans.) 1089 (i).
Sorel Shipyards, Official Inquiry, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6758 (iv), 9995, 10096 (v).
——— Charges *re* stealing Buoys (Ans.) 7026; (remarks) 7217 (iv).
——— Dismissal of A. Senecal (remarks) 5732 (iii).
——— Instructions to Commissioners, &c. (Ans.) 7039 (iv).
See 'Privileges.'
'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ans.) 1910 (i).
Steam Trawler, Application *re* Fishing Bounty (Ans.) 4046 (iii).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3118 (ii).
Steam Trawlers, 'Wren' and 'Croquette,' Registration in Canada (Ans.) 4046 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1463 (i).
Fisheries (Canadian exhibit) 6661; (fish transportation) 6092, 6102; (fishways) 6659; (legal expenses) 6661; (modus vivendi licenses) 6160; (Ont. inspectors) 6613 (iv); (overseers) 3809 (ii); (oyster culture) 6661 (iv); (protection service) 3807 (ii); (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6105, 6159 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, (Agencies, rents, &c.) 6454; (aids to navigation) 6455; (Barret, M., payments to) 6091;
BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
(buoys in Bay of Fundy) 6458; (Eureka) 6503; (Harling, Mr. Thos., compensation) 6092; (Kerr, Mrs. Elizabeth, compassionate allowance) 6091; (lighthouses, repairs) 6455; (lightkeepers salaries) 6454; (Lime Kiln Crossing) 6546; (maritime road) 6542; (pensions) 6091; (pensions to pilots) 6533, (signal service) 6502; (steamers) 6546; (telephones, life stations) 6539; (Thunder Bay) 6500; (wharfs) 6538; (wireless stations) 6457 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (shipwrecked seamen) 6572; (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6554 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic) 6089 (iv); (cattle inspection) 5828; (Govt. steamers maintenance, &c.) 5811; (masters and mates) 5821; (life saving awards) 5822 (iii); (life saving stations) 6090; (Moodie, Maj. J. D., compensation) 6090 (iv); (obstructions in navigable waters) 5826; (patrol boats in North) 5829; (registration of shipping) 5826; (schools of navigation) 5823; (winter mail service) 5828; (wrecking plant subsidy) 5829 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks 3152 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6557; (meteorological service) 6561, 6564 (iv).
Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 6572 (iv).
Telegraph Act (wireless) Amt. (B. 116) 1° m., 3453 (ii).
Tetagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishway (Ans.) 7807 (iv).
Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal (Ans.) 2367 (ii).
Trawling: *See* 'Steam Trawling'.
Treaty of 1871, *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters (correction) 7023 (iv).
Vessels Registered in Canada, List (presented) 9690 (v).
Vessels transferred between Canada and Newfoundland, Names, &c. (Ans.) 3464 (ii).
'Wanda' Yacht, Change from American to Canadian Register, &c. (Ans.) 4301 (iii).
——— Motive Power, &c. (Ans.) 5834 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods, Complaints *re*, Investigation by Committee on Marine and Fisheries, 6905 (iv).
West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 812 (i).
Westport Signal Stations when and where Erected, &c. (Ans.) 1092 (i).
Whitemouth River Fishway (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
Wireless Stations, Number, Location, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2678 (ii).
See 'Telegraph Act.'
Wood Island Life Boat, Dimensions, Accommodation, &c. (Ans.) 3225 (ii).

BROWN, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
Reciprocity Treaty, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6818 (iv).

BUREAU, Hon. J. (Solicitor General) *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8460 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) Ques. of Order, 9525 (v).
Immigration Act Amt B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2008 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1512 (i).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9219 (v).
Miner, Bill, Capture of (remarks) 4384 (iii).
Railway Act (accidents) Amt B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1800 (i).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1382 (i).

BURRELL, Mr. M., *Yale-Cariboo.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 303, 311 (i).
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Inquiry for Copy, 7255 (iv).
British Columbia and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7872 (iv).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1315 (i).
Elections Deferred (remarks) 10376 (v).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c. (remarks) 8999 (v).
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8105, 9251 (v).
Fruit Clause in Reciprocity Treaty, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' 3283 (ii).
Fruit Duty, Res. from B.C. Inland Board of Trade (read) 3377 (ii).
Fruit Growers from B.C., Report, Inquiry for, 6120 (iv).
See 'Reciprocity'.
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1418, 1793 (i).
Immigration into Western Can., Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1555 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7855 (iv).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9433 (v).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) 1°*, 1640 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2456; in Com. on Res., 3579, 3611 (ii).
—— Editorial in 'Summerland Review,' and Res., from Fruit Growers in Okanagan Valley (read) 4126, 5549 (iii).

BURRELL, Mr. M.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., Negotiations, Minister's Visit to Washington, Par. in 'Citizen' (remarks) 4566 (iii,.
—— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5949 (iv).
—— Statistics *re* Prices, Information *re* (remarks) 6518 (iv).
—— Tel. from Fruit Dealers *re* Duty affecting B.C. (read) 3770 (ii).
—— *See* 'Fruits.'
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c., Quarantine (animals health) 5968 (iv).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 5206 (iii).
Postoffice (postmasters salaries) 4289 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Grand Forks) 3015 (ii); (Greenwood) 3015 (ii); (Vernon) 3018 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (meteorological service) 6563 (iv).
U. S.—Japanese Treaty, Inquiry for Copy, 7256 (iv).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 886 (i).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L., *Dauphin.*
Address, The, 640 (i).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s. incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5083 (iii).
Aylwin Irrigation Co.'s Grant, Inquiry for Papers, 6445 (iv), 8192, 9076 (v).
See 'Percy.'
Canadian Navy *re* Home Rule (remarks) 1461 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re* (Mr. Oliver) Personal Explanation, 8188 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man., and N. W., Apptmt. of, on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9032 (v).
Clock in Tower of Parlt. Buildings, Complaint *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3510 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8126 (v).
Fish Hatchery at Snake Island, Winnipegosis, Apptmt. of Keeper (Ques.) 4041 (iii).
Fishery Inspectors, Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6642 (iv).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4368 (iii).
Fort Churchill and Nelson River Survey, Inquiry for Ret., 5954 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9529 (iv).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L.—*Con.*
Homestead Entries, Irregularities *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5587 (iii).
Homestead Infractions, Punishment *re*, on Ques. of Order, 'Liar,' asked to withdraw, 5561-2 (iii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7852 (iv).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet., *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iv).
Leach, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iii).
Lethbridge Speech of Member for Pictou, Denial of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res., (Mr. Sproule) 1270 (i).
Man. Swamp Lands, Concession to Province, (remarks) 6759 (iv).
Markey Fishing Rights on Nelson River, Extension of, Cancellation of, &c., (Ques.) 4664 (iii).
—— O. Cs., &c., (M. for papers) 4382 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5630, 5954 (iv).
—— (remarks) 4208 (iii), 6761 (iv).
Militia Dept., Showing of Passes by Members of Parlt., (Ques.) 1090 (i).
Mossy River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10528 (v).
Northwest Fishing Co., Inquiry for Ret., 5630 (iii).
Oliver Charges: *See* 'Can. Northern Land Grant.'
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c., (remarks), 9924 (v).
Percy Aylwin Irrigation Grant, O.Cs. &c., (M. for cor.*) 6158 (iv).
Railway Rates in Man. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6435 (iv).
See 'Parcel Post.'
Railway Shelters for Workmen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6438 (iv).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup. 5058 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6916 (iv).
—— Assurance of member for North Oxford *re* Farmers' Interests (remarks) 5541 (iii).
Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5952 (iv).
St. Andrews Dam Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3044 (ii).
Saskatchewan Capital City, on Ques., of Priv. (Mr. Neely) 5561, 5622 (iii).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L.—*Con.*
Selkirk Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9077 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1403 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6241 (iv); (exhibitions) 3785 (ii), 9077 (v); Quarantine (animals health) 5974 (iv).
Canals—Williamsburg (iron mooring posts) 6426; (machinery) 6426 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Indians (contingencies) 4725; Interior (salaries) 4727 (iii).
Fisheries (fishways) 6660; (legal expenses) 6661; (Ont., inspectors) 6642 (iv).
Indians—N.W.T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6040 (iv).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5556, 5582 (iii).
Labour Dept. (technical education commission) 3802 (ii).
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8692 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers) 3212; Ont., (Mitchell) 2147; (Peterborough) 2608; Sask. (Battleford) 2971, 3006; (Humboldt) 3007 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6563 (iv).
Swan Creek Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*
Address, The, 512 (i).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5571 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9271 (v).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Com. of Sup., 4588 (iii).
Civil Service Act, (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8937 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage (remarks) 4661 (iii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5481 (iii).
Grand Falls and St. John Ry. Subsidy, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 9371 (v).
See 'St. John Valley.'
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1528 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. (B. 9) 1° m., 150; 2° m., 1300; in Com., 1526 (i); on Senate Amts., 3460, 3845 (ii).
I.C.R. Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1147 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 969; in Com., 979, 1515 (i).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9482 (v).
Naval Policy, on The Address, 512 (i).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 8961 (v).
Ontario Northern and Timagami Ry. Co.'s (B. 119) 1°*, 4109 (iii).
Potato Barrels; *See* 'Inspection,' &c.
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7783 (iv).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s (B. 120) 1° m., 4110 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 964 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9329, 9391 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 4496 (iii).
—— Dufferin Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5547 (iii).
—— Treaty Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6805 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5646 (iii); in Com., 8413 (v).
Saskatoon & Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 111) 1°*, 2983; 2° m., 3184 (ii).
Saunderson, Pauline Winslow Relief (B. 181) 1°*, 7666 (iv).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2658 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3447 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Hartland) 1618 (i).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) on Senate Amts., 6469 (iv).
Canadian Northern Branch Lines incorp. (B. 81) 1°*, 1640 (i); on Senate Amts., 6468 (iv).
Elevators, Terminal &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3494 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9525 (v).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 19) 1°*, 376 (i).
Reciprocity wih U. S., in Com. on Res., 6952 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. A. W., *Inverness.*
Otter, Beaver or Steam Trawling in Northumberland Strait (M. for cor*) 980 (i).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiation *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3112 (ii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T., *Huron East.*
Address, The, 246 (i).
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1363 (i).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3514 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Representations to Fin. Dept. *re* Stability, &c., (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
Food Supplies and Cold Storage B. 112 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 2985 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S, in Com. on Res., 7517 (iv).
Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers, on M. (Mr. Meighen) 10131 (v).
Small Pox Epidemic, Condition of House of Commons, (remarks) 7259 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (enlargement) 6407 (iv).
Typhoid Epidemic, and Prorogation &c. (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
Wingham Public Building Clock, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 6664 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*
Conciliation Board *re* Strikes, Remarks of Judge McGillivray (remarks) in Com of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4378 (iii).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps. 3904 (ii).
Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6904 (iv).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3089 (ii).

CLARE, Mr. G. A., *Waterloo South.*
Three Rivers Post Office, Temporary Building (Ques.) 8934 (v).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *Essex South*
Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 187) 1°*, 8187; in Com., 8969 (v).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7563 (iv).
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. 206 (Mr. D. A. Gordon) 1°*, 8582; in Com., 8971 (v).
Conduits Co. Limited Patent Relief (B. 43) 1°*, 1069 (i).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Globe Printing Co.'s (B. 121) in Com., 5127 (iii).
G. T. Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 55) 1°*, 1277 (i).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s. (B. 223) correction of clerical error (M.) 9305 (v).
Grain Growers Grain Co. Ltd., incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8547 (v).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H.—*Con.*
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1513 (i).
Negro Immigrants, Prohibition of into N.W. (remarks) 5911 (iii).
Oliver, Hon. Frank, Charges *re*, Meeting of Com. (remarks) 9900 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6144 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 829 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9403 (v).
Revillon Frères Trading Co., Limited, incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7148 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6616 (iv).
Tilbury Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).
Trussed Concrete Steel Co. Patent Relief (B. 188) 1°*, 8308; in Com., 8970 (v).

CLARK, Mr. M., *Red Deer.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 297 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8713 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3496 (ii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4376 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1754 (i).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1561 (i).
Militia Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1009 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S. in Com. on Res., 4143 (iii).
Reciprocity, *re* Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) on U.S. Manufactures &c., 4197 (iii).

CONGDON, Mr. F. T. *Yukon Territory.*
Beatty, Mary Jane Relief (B. 163) 1°*, 6756 (iv).
British Columbia and White River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 64) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2318 (ii).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Crothers) for Royal Commission, 7765 (iv).
Reciprocity Treaty, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7624 (iv).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2731 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2174 (ii).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3028 (ii).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2223 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act (ry. trainmen) Amt. (B. 38) 1° m., 924 (i).
Electricity, &c., Exportation Act Amt. (B. 101) 1° m., 2254 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2415 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s (B. 109) 1°*, 2983; 2° m., 3184 (ii); in Com., 6121, 6124 (iv).
——— M. to introduce, 2828 (ii).
——— Documents *re*, placing on Hansard, 2829 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com of Sup., 2275 (ii).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1649 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2621; Ottawa (water supply) 2589 (ii).

COWAN, Mr. G. H., *Vancouver.*
Chinese Investigation Commission, Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9864 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9456 (v).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9574, 9576 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9388 (v).
Reciprocity Treaty, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6795 (iv).
———Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10063; Ques. of Order, 10008 (v).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3201 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*
Bathurst, N.B., Dredging Total Quantity and Cost (Ques.) 803, 1285 (i).
Builders Woodworking Co., Expropriation of Land for Moncton Extensions (M. for cor.*) 6158 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8805 (v).
Census Commissioner for York County, N. B., (Ques.) 8704 (v).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re* (remarks) 9247, 9374 (v).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*
Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for current year (Ques.) 814 (i).
Eastern Dredging Co., Letting Contracts to (Ques.) 813 (i).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, (Amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10203, Neg. (Y. 59; N. 92) 10308 (v).
Grand Falls Ry: *See* 'St. John Valley Ry.'
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1777 (i).
I.C.R., Moncton Extensions, Acquisition of Land from Builders Woodworking Co., (Ques.) 6157 (iv).
See 'Builders.'
——— Moncton Station, Site purchased, &c., (Ques.) 1291 (i).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2026 (ii).
Mercier, Mr. Geo., Customs Official, Dalhousie, N.B., Member of Town Council, (Ques.) 4044 (iii).
Miramichi Bay, N.B., Dredging Contract, Specifications, Cor. &c., (M. for copy*) 1340 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2556 (ii).
N. T. Ry., N. B. Section, Standard, Estimated Total Cost (Ques.) 4047 (iii).
Ottalie Stream, N.B., Public Works, Construction, &c., (Ques.) 1287 (i).
Ottlecock Dam, Construction of, &c., (Ques.) 2852 (ii).
Petit Rocher Spur, I. C. Ry., Cost, Revenue, &c., (Ques.) 6156 (iv.)
Petit Rocher Wharf, Expenditure since April 1910 (Ques.) 6267 (iv).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 120 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 1°, 4110 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., (remarks) 4523 (iii).
——— Boston Speech of Minister of Militia (remarks) 5751 (iii).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10010 (v).
St. Croix River, N. B., Construction of Public Works, Proposal *re* (Ques.) 1348 (i).
St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, Completion, &c., (Ques.) 814 (i).
——— Rental of Office, &c., (Ques.) 2673, 3065 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry., B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5644 (iii); in Com., 8413 (v).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Fergus) 2111 (ii); Ottawa (McGillivray's contract) 5993 (iv.); (Printing Bureau) 2361 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers —N. S., (Argyle Sound) 9505 (v); (Cribbons Point) 6029 (iv); (L'Ardoise) 6029 (iv); (Margaree) 6029 (iv); (Upper Prospect) 6030 (iv); (West Dublin Bay) 6030 (iv); (Yarmouth) 6031 (iv).
Public Works —Harbours and Rivers — Ont., (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R., (rolling stock) 8514 (v).
Victoria Electoral Division, Convictions, Fines, &c., (M. for ret.*) 7602 (iv).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 869 (i).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B., *Halifax.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8843 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9066 (v).
China-Japan S.S. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2517 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8729 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8947 (v).
Coasting Trode Act, Changes *re* (Ques.) 4675 (iii).
'Crissy Toomey' Schooner, Purchase of, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5833 (iii).
Crooks, Mr. Wesley, Postmaster at Peggy's Cove, Increase to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Dog Fish Industry (remarks) 8044 (v).
East Chezzetcook Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).
English Mail Service to Mar. Provs. (remarks) 8793 (v).
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Depts. (remarks) 2995 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8044; in Com., 8419 (v).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie), 4373 (iii).
Govt. Steamers of Marine Dept., Winter Commissions, &c. (Ques.) 5833 (iii).
Grand Trunk Strike, Payment to Judge Barron (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4261 (iii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S., Conference re (remarks) 2002 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1439, 1772 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Repeal of (remarks) 6934 (iv).
I.C.R., Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. *re* Construction (Ques.) 5832 (iii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Dismissals from Nov. 1908, Number reinstated (Ques.) 3666 (ii).
—— Eastern N.S. Extension, on Prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1170 (i).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2058 (ii).
Militia Supplies, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4667 (iii).
Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse. (remarks) 2261, 2265 (ii).
Naval Coronation Contingent, Names of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 9375 (v).
'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Names of Officers (remarks) 9090 (v).
Owl's Head Lighthouse, N.S., Construction, Apptmt. of Lightkeeper (Ques.) 5832 (iii).
—— Pet, *re* Light (Ques.) 3465 (ii).
'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew, &c. (Ques.) 3605 (ii).
Post Office Act (stamp vending machines) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 8068 (v).
Railways-Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5091 (iii).
Reciprocity—Kentville Res. *re* (read) 5548 (iii).
Springhill Mines Strikers, and Conciliation Board *re* Labour Dept. (remarks in Com. of Sup.) 4236 (iii).
Steam Trawling, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3108 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1052; Public Works (salaries) 1045 (i).
Fisheries (fishways) 6660; (inspectors) 6627 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4236 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamers) 6548; (maritime road) 6544; (pilots) 6538; (wharfs) 6538 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Anapolis and London) 8754; (Baddeck and Iona) 8764; (Canada and Cuba) 8777 (v).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6555 (iv).
Ocean and River Service—('Earl Grey') 6481 (iv); (life saving awards) 5822; (maintenance, &c.) 5812; (masters and mates) 5821; (obstructions in navigable waters) 5827; (schools of navigation) 5823 (iii).
Post Office (ry. mail clerks) 4285 (iii).
Public Works--Building--Alberta (Macleod) 3003, 3005; Ont. (Athens) 2089; (Chesley) 2104; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2134; Ottawa (telephones) 3170; (Woods Building lighting contract) 3175 (ii); Que (Montreal barracks) 1864; (St. Lambert) 1901 (i); Sask. (Battleford) 3002 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers--N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9504 (v).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen's cars) 6446 (iv); I.C.R. (Halifax) 5920 (iii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Vessels transferred between Can. and Newfoundland, Names, &c. (Ques.) 3464 (ii).
West Indies and Halifax SS Service, Arrangements *re* Contract (Ques.) 4674, 4925 (iii).
Woods Building Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3175, 3192 (ii).
Yukon Beer Import Tax Repeal B. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res. 1981 (i).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W., *Elgin West.*
Address, The, 462, (M.) to adjn. debate, 468, rsmd., 491 (i).
Alberta Railway and Irrigation Co.'s (B. 51) in Com., 3024, 3181, 3391 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8836 (v).
Canadian Railways, Accidents, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3940 (ii).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9050 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8737 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8944 (v).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission re Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5377 (iii).
—— Treasury Board, Ret., Ques. of Priv., 5552 (iii).
—— Mr. Calvert's Connection *re*, Ques. of Priv., 5730 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1766 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com. 1516 (i).
Lethbridge Speech of Member for Pictou (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).
Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on the Address, 492 (i).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) *re* Royal Commission, 7751 (iv).
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7943 (iv).
Public Buildings, System adopted *re* Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7077 (iv).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Investigation on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5873 (iii).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3347 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6493 (iv).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Fredericton pavement) 1614 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax post office). 1588 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2098; (Chesley) 2104; (Dresden) 2108; (Dundas) 2109; (Elora) 2109; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2134, 3156; (Midland) 2145; (Tilbury) 2627 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevators) 3162; (pavements) 2602; (water supply) 2589 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Aylmer) 1674; (Napierville) 1866, 1873 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2974 (ii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (tobacco curing stations) 3161 (ii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.,*Simcoe, North.*
Accounts Outstanding, Total Amounts *re* Financial Statement (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
Adjournment for Coronation, Definite Date (remarks) 9090, 9311 (v).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3460 (ii).
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1360 (i).
Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re* (remarks) 10350 (v).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1342 (i).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2430 (ii).
Business of Private Members, Thursdays Routine (remarks) 1550 (i).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co..'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3458 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827; in Com., 9223, 9279 (v).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1838 (i).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2513 (ii).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10438 (v).
—— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9840 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8941 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Regulations *re* Selection (Ques.) 4464 (iii).
—— Selection of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).
Coronation of King George V., Invitation to Members of Parlt., (remarks) 1580 (i).
See 'Adjournment.'

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Estimates of Depts., Procedure *re* Discussing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3185 (ii).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8467 (v).
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel.'
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt, (Mr. Crocket) 10229 (v).
Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s (B. 72) 1°*, 1488 (i).
G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 73 (Mr. Turriff). in Com., 3024 (ii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1545, 1731 (i).
Hydro Electric Power Connection across McGann Property, Decision of Minister (remarks) 1598 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amt., 3460 (ii).
I. C. R. Gross Earnings, Cost per Ton, &c. (Ques.) 5129 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 876 (i): on M. for 2°, 9093 (v); in Com., 9157, 9172 (v).
'Labour Gazette' Names on Mailing List, (M. for copy) 1727 (i).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10349 (v).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence, on M. for Sup., 2893, 2916 (ii).
See 'International.'
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024 (ii).
Morrison, N. L., Pocock, H. A., and Stevens, Captains, Dates of Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, &c (Ques.) 5637 (iii).
Newmarket Canal Rep. and Cor. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10491 (v).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9916, 9930 (v).
Penny Bank Act Amt. B. 221 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9221 (v).
Pollution of Navigable Waters (B. 178) 1°*, 7339 (iv).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Newspapers (remarks) 10341 (v).
Potatoes: *See* 'Inspection.'
Printing Bureau Investigation, Distribution of Evidence (remarks) 1364 (i).
—— Printing of (remarks) 1351 (i).
Pure Foods (B. 35) 1° m., 865 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9314, 9317 (v).
Ry. Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Railway Rates, &c., Treaty *re* Control of (remarks) 8357 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2461 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4771 (iii); remarks *re* Pulp in Com. on Res., 3322 (ii).
——— Discussion by reading Extracts, Ques. of Order, 4124 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Ques. of Order, 4055 (iii).
——— Obstruction by Opposition (remarks) 9889 (v).
——— Submission to House for Ratification (remarks) 1805 (i).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt, (remarks) 7612 (iv).
Revillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 9165, 9167 (v).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9167, 9168 (v).
SUPPLY--
Canals—Welland (survey) 9563 (v).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1475; Militia (salaries) 1022 (i).
Indians—Man., &c. (annuities) 8825 (v).
Public Works—N.B. (Fredericton pavement) 1612; (Hartland) 1617; Hillsborough) 1621; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (Tracadie) 1625 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax Citadel) 1582; (Lunenburg) 1595; (Parrsboro) 1629 (i).
Public Works--Buildings--Ottawa (pavings) 8883; (Rideau Hall) 8876 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9506 (v).
Unorganized Districts in Northern Ont., Deferred Elections (remarks) 10100 (v).
Vessels transferred between Can. and Newfoundland (remarks) 3464 (ii).
Veterans, Grants to (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5215 (iii).
Waterways Treaty, Inquiry for Plans, 3681 (ii).
See 'International,' 'Long Sault.'

CURRIE, Mr. M., *Prince Edward.*
Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.'s (B. 88) 1°*, 1710 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W., *St. John City.*
Absence, Emoluments for (Ques.) 1089 (i).
Administrator of the Govt. during His Ex.'s 'Arctic,' Rep. of Mr. Vanasse (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6542 (iv).
Canada and S. America SS. Service, Subsidies to (Ques.) 5290 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8839 (v).
Census System of Taking, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4340 (ii).
Chatham Public Building, Purchase of Site, Name of Owners (Ques.) 5132 (iii).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2509 (ii).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8911 (v).
Civil Service, Apptmt. of Coloured Persons (remarks) 4930, 5038 (iii).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2229 (ii).
Coloured Aliens as Immigrants from U.S. (remarks) 4470 (iii).
See 'Negroes.'
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4662 (iii).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues (remarks) 9374 (v).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4354 (iii).
——— (remarks) 4724 (iii).
Fredericton Pavement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S., Conferences *re* (remarks) 2002 (ii).
Halifax and St. John Wharfage, &c. (Ques.) 7807 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2019 (ii).
Immigration into Eastern Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
I. C. R., Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
——— Branch Lines Bill, (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9583 (i).
——— Mileage, Value of Rolling Stock, &c. (Ques.) 3068 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 868 (i).
Lorneville Wharf, Tenders re (Ques.) 5132 (iii).
Match Factories, Number of Employees (Ques.) 1976 (ii).
Match Factories, using Phosphorus, Number, Employees, &c. (Ques.) 1717 (i).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2061 (ii).
N. T. Ry., N. B. Section, Pusher Grade (remarks) 4051 (iii).
Naval Boots for Marine Dept., Specifications, Tenders, &c., (Ques.) 1723 (i).
N. B. Regiment of Artillery, Annual Drill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5945 (iv).
"Negroes": *See* "Coloured Aliens"; "Civil Service".
Ottawa City Health Conditions, on Amt. (Mr. Lewis) to Com. of Sup., 6370 (iv).
Port Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1101 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Port Dalhousie Dredging Contract, Contract *re* Lowest Tender (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Post Office Estimates, Objection *re* passing (remarks) 4297 (iii).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5054 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., (remarks) 4501 (iii).
——— Dufferin Board of Trade Res. (read) 5547 (iii).
St. Andrews Rapids Fish Ladders &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3033 (ii).
St. John Drill Hall, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar Contract, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 5129, 5631 (iii).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5695 (iii); in Com., 8411 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (animals health) 5974 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (Iberville) 6357 (iv); Lachine (tugs) 6388 (iv).
Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coins) 6062 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Indians (salaries) 4725 (iii); Interior (salaries) 4726 (iii).
Dom. Lands—Miscellaneous (parks) 6049 (iv); (Banff water works) 6052; (Buffalo) 6049 (iv); (Forestry Convention) 6052 (iv).
Fisheries (fish transportation) 6092 (iv); fishways) 6660 (iv); (inspectors) 6658 (iv); (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6109 (iv).
House of Commons (charwomen) 6174 (iv); (committees) 6471 (iv); (electric attendant) 6175; (messengers) 6173 (iv); (sessional clerks) 6168 (iv); (stationery) 6176 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5169 (iii); (seed grain) 6048 (iv).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6162 (iv).
Labor Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4230 (iii), 6057 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6496 (iv); (buoys in Bay of Fundy) 6458 (iv); (buoy steamers) 6549 (iv); (Eureka) 6503 (iv); (Harling, Mr. Thos., compensation) 6092 (iv); (Kerr, Mrs. Elizabeth, compassionate allowance) 6091 (iv); (Lime Kiln Crossing 6546 (iv); (maritime road) 6542 (iv); (pensions, pilots) 6533 (iv); (shipbuilding) 6488 (iv); (telephones) 6542 (iv); (Thunder Bay) 6500 (iv); (wharfs) 6538 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8764 (iv); (Canada and Cuba) 6058 (iv) 8775; (Canada and Newfoundland 8783 (v).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6555 (iv).
Militia (allowance) 8517, 8528 (v); R.M.C. (maintenance) 6054 (iv); (Winnipeg rifle range) 6053 (iv).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Ocean and River Service (Moodie, Maj. J. E., compensation) 6090 (iv).
Post Office (clerks) 4292 (iii); (railway mail clerks) 6179 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3003 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Nanaimo) 3016 (ii); (Prince Rupert) 3016; (Vancouver) 3018 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax post office) 1590 (i); (Lunenburg) 1597 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3173 (ii); (McGillivray's contract) 5993 (iv); (Printing Bureau) 2361 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1688 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford 2980 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9506 (v); (Yarmouth) 6032 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines (B.C. (Okanagan Valley) 6033 (iv); Sask. and Alberta (Maintenance) 6034 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (working expenses) 6338 (iv).
Senate (casket for address) 6167 (iv).
Scientific Institution (magnetic observatory) 6557 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agents) 6659 (iv).
Water Supply for Parliament Buildings, *re* Typhoid Epidemic (remarks) 2004 (ii).
Wood Island Life Boat, Dimensions, Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 3224 (ii).

DEMERS, Mr. M. J., *St. John and Iberville.*
Bank Act Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 148 (i).
Ques. of Priv., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Apptmt. to Bench, 271 (i).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
E. B. Eddy Co.'s (B. 54) 1° *, 1277 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 5149 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1433, 1749 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2011 (ii).
Imperial Conference, Rep. *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 10109 (v).
Privileges and Elections Com., on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., Ques. of Order 7977 (v).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10191 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7064 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4082 (iii).
——— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8370 (v).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
Revillon Freres Trading Co. Ltd. incorp. (B. 158) 1° m., 6439; 2° m., 7147, 7590 (iv). in Com., 8577, 8966, 9165, 9575 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, &c. (remarks) 1367 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Aylmer) 1672 (i).

DOHERTY, Mr. C. J., *Montreal (St. Anne).*
Bank Act Amt B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9222 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8856 (v).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9722 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8738 (v).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7820 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act. O. Cs., in Com., 8087 (v).
Drummond, &c., Elections, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir, 475 (i).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8452 (v).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8421 (v).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8660 (v).
Guarantee Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 115) 1°*, 3453 (ii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2007 (ii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7859 (iv); on M. for 3°, 8403 (v).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 921 (i); on M. for 2°, 9127; in Com., 9193 (v).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2920 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3259 (ii).
Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents in G. B. (remarks) 9375 (v).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2055 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. B. 48 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8451; on Senate Amts, 9535 (v).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2530; on M. for 3°, 2742 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8091 (v).
Priv. and Elections Com. (Mr. A. Lanctot) on M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. and Amt. (Mr. Monk) 7912 (v).

DOHERTY, Mr. C. J.—*Con.*
Railway Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9316, 9385 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Investigation on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5891 (iii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1380 (i).
Statutes, French Translation, Corrections, &c. (remarks) 8089 (v).
SUPPLY—
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8687 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 1864 (i); 2568, 3144 (ii); (Maisonneuve) 1686 (i).

DONNELLY, Mr. J. J., *Bruce South.*
Farmer's Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5461 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1409 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Estimated Cost, Tunnelling, &c., (Ques.) 3278 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. Fielding) 10456 (v).
Supply—
Public Works—Buildings— Ont. (Chesley) 2103 (ii).
Walkerton & Lucknow Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 817 (i).

DOUGLAS, Mr. J. M., *Strathcona.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr McCarthy) in Com., 5080 (iii).
Pacific and Peace Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 1710 (i)
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c., (seeds) 6230 (iv); Public Works — Buildings — Alta., (Strathcona) 3011 (ii).
Western Alberta Ry Co.'s (B.135) 1°*, 4740 (iii).

DUBEAU, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B.186) 1°*, 8187 (v).

ECREMENT, Mr. A., *Berthier.*
Census Questions, Preparation of Lists, &c., (Ques.) 659 (i).
Commercial Relations, &c., Translations of Documents (Ques.) 3462 (ii).
Conservation of Natural Resources, Number of Copies printed (Ques.) 660 (i).
Industrial Training, Royal Commission, Incompetent Reporting (Ques.) 3463 (ii).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 1069 (i); in Com., 3180, 3389 (ii); 3° m. 7560, 7717 (iv).
Workingmen's Wages, Increased Cost of Living, &c. (Ques.) 3065 (ii)

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W., *Frontenac.*
Agriculture, Govt., Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv)
Agricultural Products and Dairy Produce, Quantity and Value imported from U. S. (Ques.) 9991 (v).
Armouries, &c., in Canada, Inquiry for Ret. 1460 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 24) 1° m., 530 (i).
Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).
Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaint *re* (Ques.) 5406 (iii).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8938 (v).
Convicts liberated from Penitentiary at Kingston, without clothing or means (remarks) 1913 (i), 2065 (ii)
Dairy and Farm Products, Quantity and Value of Importation from U.S., 9361 (v).
Drill Halls, Generally, Construction &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).
Echo Lake Post Office, Application *re* Establishment of (Ques.) 8993 (v).
Elevators, Terminal &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3511 (ii).
Exports and Imports from Canada to Australia, Japan, &c. from 1906-1911, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 9369 (v).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5412 (iii).
Farm Products imported from U. S. into Kingston Quantities &c. (Ques.) 3668 (ii).
Farm Stock and Products, Value of Customs Imports from U. S. (Ques.) 1496 (i).
Fish Hatcheries under Dom. Control, Location, Applications for Fish Fry, (Ques.) 1494 (i).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4359 (iii).
Hay and Grain Imports into Canada from U. S., Quantity, Value &c. (Ques.) 8984 (v).
Horses admitted into Canada with U. S. Settlers &c. (Ques.) 8987 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1408, 1546, (i); on M. for 3°, 3527 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8749 (v).
I. C. R., Locomotives purchased since 1896, Prices, from whom purchased (Ques.) 7033 (iv).
Kingston Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

EDWARDS. Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c. (Ques.) 2886 (ii).
Mica Imports, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 4827 (iii).
Milk and Cream exported to U.S. for 1910-1911, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 7038 (iv).
Milk and Cream, Value of Export to U. S. for March and April, 1911 (Ques.) 8790
Postal Service, Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) 10356 (v).
Post Office Buildings in Rural Districts, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i)
Post Office Revenue and Expenditure, Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 10335 (v).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7774 (iv).
Public Buildings, Cost of for several Years (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2100 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7393 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10065, 10090 (v).
———Names of Favoured Nation Treaty Countries (Ques.) 4665 (iii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, (remarks) 6902 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7632 (iv).
Revenue and Expenditure, Total from 1890 to 1911 (Ques.) 9992 (v).
Rideau Canal, Lockmen, Pets. *re* increased pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).
——— Removal of Stumps (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery: *See* 'Postal.'
Sand supplied Kingston Penitentiary, Payments to R. H. Fair (Ques.) 5406 (iii).
Sharbot Lake Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).
Sheep and Lambs imported in Canada from U. S. &c. (Ques.) 8987 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6258; (farm bulletins) 6186; (tobacco production) 6263 (iv).
Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6412; Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6413; Miscellaneous (lockmen) 6453; Rideau (bridges) 6413 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1050; Militia (salaries) 1020 (i).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6627 (iv).
House of Commons (stationery) 6177 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (pilots) 6537 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8756; (Canada and Australia) 8766, 8772; (Canada and Cuba) 8776; (Canada and Mexico) 8781; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784 (v).

EDWARDS. Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8692 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (quarantine stations) 6027 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax postoffice) 1589 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2093; (Brantford) 2098; (Dresden) 2105; (Goderich) 2115; (Harriston) 2115; (Kingston) 2130; (Kingston, R. M. C.) 2131; (Mount Forest) 2150 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 1698 (i).
Public Works—Telegrapn Lines—Sask., &c. (maintenance) 6034 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (rolling stock) 8514 (v).
U. S. Warships through Canals, Inquiry for Ret., 1571 (i).
Veterans, Grants to, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5211 (iii).
Westbrook Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1103 (i).
Wolfe Island, Customs Official, Apptmt. of &c. (Ques.) 8099 (v).
——— Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
——— Protection to Road (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

ELSON, Mr. P., *Middlesex East.*
Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Government. Remedy, &c. (Ques.) 655 (i).
Reciprocity—Wool in the Fleece omitted from Free List (Ques.) 6264 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1362 (i).
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 220) 1° m., 9224; on M., (Mr. Guthrie) to place on Govt. Orders, 9350 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9260 (v).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup, 1859 (i).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9724 (v).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2222 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8118 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10220 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 223, in Com., 9510 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1764 (i).
I.C.R., Branch Lines (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9584 (v).
———Acquisition of (remarks) 6768 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1151 (i).
International Waters Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9095 (v).
Mail Service to Mar. Provs., English Mails, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8792, 9541 (v)
Militia Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1009 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 48 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 1070 (i); on Senate Amts., 9534 (v).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8888 (v).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. ??? (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9244 (v).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 8960 (v).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Newpapers (remarks) 10343 (v).
Post Office Promotions and Salaries (remarks) 10469 (v).
Railway Act (express companies) Amt. B. 8 (Mr. S. Sharpe) on M. for 2°, 1299 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9395 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).
Reciprocity Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10023, 10033 (v).
Rules of the House, Amendment of (remarks) 10470 (v).

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Divorce Bills, Ques. of Priv., *re* Remarks of Senator Kirchhoffer, 4201 (iii).
United Shoe Machinery Co., Investigation *re* Combines Act, Govt. Action *re* (remarks) 4300 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S., (*Minister of Finance*) *Shelburne & Queen's* (*N. S.*).
Accounts outstanding, (Ans.) 5403 (iii).
See "Government Loans."
Adjournment for Coronation, (M.) 9580 (v).
——— Extension of Time (remarks) 9090, 9566 (v).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5568 (iii).
Alberta Ry and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3392 (ii).
American Bank Note Co.'s Contract, Expiry of &c. (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
American Silver Coin, Quantity exported from Canada into United States (Ans.), 6270 (iv).
See 'Gold'.

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6758, 6907 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Copy (remarks) 7256 (iv).
——— Signing of (remarks) 6673 (iv).
See 'Japanese'.
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Banking Act Amt. (B. 50) 1° m., 1340 (i)
Bank Act Amt. (B. 213) 1° m., 8887 (v); 2° m. and in Com., 9221; 3° m., 9334 (v).
See 'Penny Banks,' 'Quebec Savings Banks.'
Bank Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 6675, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6443 (iv).
Bankers' Associations, &c., on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 4116 (iii).
——— Agreement *re* Competition (Ans) 3466 (ii).
Bank Failures, Reps. of Curators by Govt. (Ans.) 2670 (ii).
——— Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govtl. Action *re*, (Ans.) 5632 (iii).
——— Curators Reports, on Inquiry for Ret., 4569 (iii).
——— Statement by Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses (Ans.) 2671 (ii).
See 'Farmers' Bank.'
Bahama Islands, Annexation to Canada, Rumours *re* (remarks) 8956, 9373 (v).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3601 (ii).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7475 (iv).
Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c. (Ans.) 4825 (iii).
British Preference (remarks) 5620 (iii).
Budget, The (financial statement) 6577 (iv).
——— (remarks) 6439 (iv).
Business of the House, (remarks) 4117 (iii).
Business of the House, Adjournment of House for Coronation (statmt.) 9309 (v).
See 'Coronation,' 'Adjournment.'
——— Morning Sittings (M.) 8887 (v).
Canadian Currency refused on Pullman Cars, Letter from Vice-President of Co. (read) 8191 (v).
Canada Cement Co., Charges by Sir Sandford Fleming (remarks) 9372 (v).
Canada Medical Act, Order called for Com. on B. 15, 6067 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8836; in Com., 9260 (v).
Cattle exports to the U. S., Bonded to G. B. (remarks) 7427 (iv).
——— Re-shipped to G. B. (remarks) 7558 (iv).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Cement Merger: *See* 'Can. Cement.'
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9059 (v).
Census, Hochelaga Division, Names of officers, &c. (Ans.) 9372 (v).
——— Jacques Cartier Division, Names of officers, &c. (Ans.) 9372 (v).
Commercial Agent for Canada at Washington (remarks) 9512 (v).
Continental Fire Insurance Co.'s of Canada incorp. B. 196 (Mr. Molloy) in Com., 8968 (v).
Customs Duties, 1906-1910: Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Hon. Mr. Foster, 7021 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 6438 (iv).
Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff (Ans.) 10196 (v).
Elections Deferred (remarks) 10381 (v).
Estimates (1911) Suppl. (presented) 3068 (ii), 5525 (iii), 8355 (v).
——— (1912) Suppl. (presented) 8534, 8675, 9312 (v).
Estimates, Special Items, reported as passed, &c. (remarks) 9076 (v).
Estimates *to* be voted re Interim Supply Bill (remarks) 9223 (v).
See 'Supply Bills.'
Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5306 (iii).
——— Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation re Double Liability, &c., (Ans.) 4111 (iii).
——— Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8209 (v).
——— Proceedings *re* Commission, on Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 10472 (v).
——— Stmnt. of Warning by Mr. Osler, M.P. (remarks) 5389 (iii); 10473 (v).
——— Treasury Board Minutes (remarks) 4741 (iii).
——— Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificates (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
——— Warning to Govt. (remarks) on Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2679 (ii).
See 'Bank Curators.'
Financial Statement—Budget, The, 6577 (iv).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4357 (iii).
Foreign Consuls, Official Status (remarks) 9511 (v).
Germany, Trade Relations with, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 8535 (v).
Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U. S. and British, Authority *re* (Ans.) 9985 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
See 'American Silver.'
Govt. Loans and Sinking Funds, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3775 (ii).
Govt. Loans, Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c., (Ans.) 3281 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) Ques. of Order, 9524 (v).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9308; in Com. 9510 (v).
Hydro-Electric Co., Water Power Lease, Tenders *re* (remarks) *re* Question, 9352 (v).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Renewal of (remarks) 3275 (ii).
——— Total Amount paid since 1896 (Ans.) 3607 (ii).
See 'Steel.'
Imperial Conference, Military Arviser to, &c., 9182 (v).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9182 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations (B. 224) in Com. on Res., 9432, 9445; in Com., 9494; 3° m., 9533 (v).
Japanese Treaty, Action *re* (remarks) 9076 (v).
See 'Anglo.'
——— Canada-Japan Treaty, Expiration of (Ans.) 5638 (iii).
La Banque International du Canada B. 123 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for Com., 5631 (iii); in Com., 6120 (iv).
Loans: *See* 'Govt. Loans.'
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2765 (ii).
Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with (Ans.) 3066 (ii).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecremont) in Com., 7722 (iv).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on Regularity of Proceedings 9500 (v).
N.T.Ry., Total Cost to Dec. 31st, 1910, inclusive of Quebec Bridge (Ans.) 5130 (iii).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10509 (v).
Niobe and Rainbow, Names of Officers ((remarks) 9090 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, on Inquiry for, 3672 (ii).
Penny Bank Act Amt. (B. 221) M. for Com. on Res., 8104; in Com. on Res., 9220 (v).
Pensions to Veterans (remarks) 6915 (iv).
Porcupine Disaster by Fire, Govt. Aid to (remarks) 9636, 9696 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Govt. Advances (Ans.) 7246 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Financial Loan, Interest *re* (Ans.) 4666 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Advances to, Rate of Interest (Ans.) 2851 (ii).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt. (B. 219) 1° m., 9089; 2° m., 9343 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9228 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., Statement, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 2440; Schedules laid on Table, 2465 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4845 (iii).
——— in Com. on Res., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 3289 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4073
——— Free Trade Offer by U.S., Speech of Mr. Taft (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 5294 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., Alteration *re* Pulp and Paper (Ans.) 4468 (iii).
——— British Ambassador's Warning to Mins. (remarks) 6200 (iv).
——— Britain's Demand from U.S. *re* Tariff Concessions (remarks) 6574 (iv).
——— British Preference, Increase of (remarks) 5620 (iii), 7214 (iv).
——— British Tariff Commission, Rep *re* (Ans.) 6269 (iv).
——— Champ Clark, Speech of, *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609; on Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 3954 (iii).
——— Conference at Washington, Length of Session, &c. (Ans.) 7037 (iv).
——— Cor. laid on Table, 3068 (ii).
——— Cor. marked 'Private,' 2987 (ii).
——— Cor. Giving Names of Writers of Letters, &c. (remarks) 7265 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10007 (v); (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 9885 (v).
——— Debate, Talking of Ministers, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 7292 (iv).
——— Denial *re* Annexationist, 4054 (iii).
——— Farm products imported from other Countries (Ans.) 3668 (ii).
——— Fishing Bounties, Payments *re* (remarks) 6671 (iv).
——— Fruit and Vegetable Growers Representations, French Edition, on Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9075 (v)
——— Importations from Favoured Nation countries (Ans.) 4111 (iii).
——— Importations from Favoured Nations (remarks) *re* Answer, 4114 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Importations from Favoured Nations Countries into Canada, Answer to Questions, 4134 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Pets, &c. (Mr. Bradbury) 3057 (ii).
—— Lord Strathcona's Telegram, Mess. from Associated Press (read) 5292 (iii); on Explanation (Mr. Goodeve) *re* Lord Strathcona's Telegram, 5211 (iii); Tel. from Min. of Fin. to High Commissioner, on Inquiry for, 3274 (ii).
—— Names of Favoured Nation Countries (Ans.) 4665 (iii).
See 'Importations.'
—— North York, Challenge *re* Contest (remarks) 7222 (iv).
—— Perley, Mr., Cor. *re* Connection with Riordan Paper Co. (remarks) 10198 (v).
—— Protests *re* (remarks) 3951 (iii).
—— Pulp and Paper Duties, Further Information *re* (remarks) 2646 (ii).
—— Resolutions against (remarks) 4121 (iii).
—— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5948 (iv).
—— Statistics from U. S. (remarks) 4931 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices in U. S. and Can., 6780 (iv).
—— Statistics, Accepting as Read and Printing in Hansard (remarks) 6858 (iv).
—— Statistics, Mess. to Pres'dt Taft *re* (remarks) 4472 (iii).
—— Statistical Tables, on Inquiry for, 2985, 3059 (ii).
—— Statistics, Purpose of Negotiations (Ans.) 7037 (iv).
—— Statistics from U. S. (remarks) 2737 (ii).
—— Statistics, U. S. Govt. Publication *re* (remarks) 6674 (iv).
—— Stmnt. in White Book, &c. (Ans.) 10194 (v).
—— Suppl. Ret. Laid on Table, 4383 (iii).
—— Tel. of Senator Cummins *re* Manufactured Products (remarks) 4115 (iii).
—— Trade with other Countries affected (Ans.) 3667 (ii).
—— Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2644 (ii).
—— Wool in the Fleece, omitted from Free List (Ans.) 6264 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8093 (v).
Revenue and Expenditure Total for 1890-1911 (Ans.) 9992 (v).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Limited incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).; in Com., 8966, 9165 (v); (M.) to ref. to Banking Com. 7590 (iv).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2596, 2649, 3021, 3454, 3845 (ii).
Selkirk Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9078 (v).
Sessional Employees, House of Commons, on M. (Mr. S. Sharpe) for Ret., 3471 (ii).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry (Mr. Blain) for Ret., 3347 (ii).
Speeches by Prime Minister, distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9072 (v).
Stamp Contract: *See* "American Bank Note."
Statutes, French Translation, Corrections, &c. (remarks) 8090 (v).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3107 (ii).
Steel Bounties, Govt. Inspectors, Salaries, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 5937 (iv).
Steel Wire Bounties *re* (remarks) 6613 (iv).
See "Iron," "Budget, The"
Sterling Trust Co.: *See* "Security."
Supply Bill (No. 128) in Com. 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 4210 (iii).
—— (B. 160), 1°, 6139-40 (iv).
—— B. 225, 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 9580 (v).
SUPPLY—
Schedules of proportion of Votes (presented) 9566 (v).
Charges of Management—(foreign and uncurrent coins) 6060 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3834 (ii).
Indians—Man. &c. (annuities) 8884 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6497 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Newfoundland) 8784 (v).
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8685 (v); (coronation decorations) 9566 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3202 (ii); (pavements) 8884 (v); (Rideau Hall) 8875 (v).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agents) 6059 (iv).
Unprovided items (generally) 6160 (iv).
Testimonials to Ministers. *See* "Ministers."
Treasury Board Minutes, *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting (remarks) 5136 (iii).
U.S.—Japanese Treaty, on Inquiry for Copy, (Mr. Foster) 7256 (iv).
U. S.—Warships on Great Lakes, Information *re* (remarks) 6613 (iv).
Vancouver, Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with (Ans.) 3066 (ii).
Victoria Museum, Cracking of Walls (remarks) 9152 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
West Indies Trade with Canada, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6382 (iv).

FISHER, Hon. S. A., (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*
Address, The, 626 (i).
Agriculture and Experimental Farms Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Agriculture, Expenditure from Confederation (Ans.) 4302 (iii).
—— Expenditure in Ontario for 1910 (Ans.) 6668 (iv).
—— Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).
Agricultural Imports into Canada, Value &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 5402 (iii).
Agriculture and Militia Expenditures from 1867 to 1910 (Ans.) 9432 (v).
Agricultural Products of Canada, Total Quantity (Ans.) 6757 (iv).
"Alva" Str., Price paid to Philip & Son. (Ans.) 2438 (ii).
Animal Industry in Can., Reps. Data, &c., on M. (Mr. Magrath) for Copies, 4677 (iii).
Animals transported between Can. and U. S., Disregard of Rules (remarks) 311 (i).
Archives Dept., Commission of Historical Work, Care of Documents, &c., (Ans.) 2156 (ii).
Archives Historical Work, Names of Staff (Ans.) 2155 (ii).
Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re* (remarks) 10350 (v).
Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 655 (i).
Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co's. Patent Relief B. 187 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8970 (v).
Cement Production, Total annually since 1900 (Ans.) 10196 (v).
Census Commissioner, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 2155 (ii).
Census Commissioner for York County, N. B. (Ans.) 8704 (v).
Census Enumerators, Apptmt. of by Liberal Associations (remarks) 7021 (iv).
Census Enumerators for Hochelaga, Names, &c. (Ans.) 9432 (v).
Census Enumerators for Man., Recommendations *re* Apptmts. (remarks) 8889 (v).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9016 (v).
Census Enumerators Names, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4465 (iii).
Census Enumerators in Peel County, Names, Apptmt. &c. (Ans.) 10335 (v).
Census Officials, Policy of Appointments (remarks) 2887 (ii), 4933 (iii).

FISHER. Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Census of North and South Ontario, Expenditure &c. (Ans.) 9432 (v).
Census, Omissions by Enumerators, (Stmt.) 9898 (v).
—— Inaccuracies in Quebec (remarks) 7217 (iv).
—— Omissions in Enumerations, on M. (Mr. Perley) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9714 (v).
—— Omissions in Enumerations in Toronto (remarks) 10099 (v).
Census, Progress *re* (remarks) 9594 (v)
Census Questions, Preparation of Lists, &c. (Ans.) 659 (i).
Census Returns, Method of, on Inquiry for Ret., 6669 (iv), 8193 (v).
Census, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 9694 (v).
Census, System of Collecting, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4338 (iii).
Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6204 (iv).
Cheese Curing Cool Room, Brockville, Sale of (Ans.) 8096 (v).
Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5407 (iii).
Cholera Precautions, &c. (remarks) 10197 (v).
Civil Servants, Appointments from South Grey, on Inquiry for Ret., 2555 (ii).
Cold Storage, Aid to by Govt. (Ans.) 1455 (i).
Cold Storage Depots, Total Amount paid from 1907-10 (Ans.) 2437 (ii).
See 'Live Stock.'
Coloured Persons appointed to Experimental Farm (remarks) 5039 (iii).
Conservation Commissioners' Report, Printed Copies, &c. (Ans.) 660 (i).
—— (presented) 698 (i).
Copyright Act Amt. (B. 184), in Com. on Res., 7807 (iv); 2°* and in Com., 8895 (v).
Copyright Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 7557 (iv), 9594 (v).
Copyright Law and Imperial Copyright Conference, Canada's Action *re* (Ans.) 5134 (iii).
Crop Statistics, Method of Collecting, &c. (Ans.) 5937 (iv).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7018 (iv).
Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re* (Ans.) 663 (i).
Embargo on British Cattle, (remarks) 10344 (v).
Exhibition Grants, Subsidies paid *re* (Ans.) 2437 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Fruit and Vegetable Farms (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9001 (v).

FISHER. Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Experimental Farms, Number established for past year (Ans.) 656 (i).
Experimental Farms, Number operated in Dominion, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1102 (i).
——— Ottawa, Milk Average, Eggs, &c. (Ans.) 662 (i).
——— Sale of Eggs, &c. (Ans.) 1286 (i).
Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets for 1910-1911 (Ans.) 8096 (v).
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8107 (v).
Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale, on prop. Res. (Mr. Stanfield) 3226 (ii).
Fruit Growers, Duty *re* (remarks) 3284 (ii).
Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Appointmt, Qualification, &c. (Ans.) 8701 (v).
Horses diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada (remarks) 7428 (iv).
Immigration—Farmers sent to G. B. from Man. (Ans.) 1489 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (bushel and bags) Amt. (B. 153) 1°*, 6035 (iv); in Com., 8078 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9476 (v).
Jacques Cartier, Census Enumerators &c. (Ans.) 9431 (v).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1197 (i).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2809 (ii).
Munderloh and Co.'s Patent Relief B. 203 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 8970 (v).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5946 (iv).
Quebec Experimental Farm, Purchase of by Govt. (Ans.) 8992 (v).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 701 (i).
Rabies, Outbreak, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4409 (iii).
——— Papers Laid on Table, 10590 (v).
——— Speech of Min. of Agr. in Montreal, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) 6199 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6811 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7669 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5736 (iii).
——— Delays in Preparing (remarks) 7554 (iv).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation *re* (remarks) 10095 (v).
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. (B. 157) in Com. on Res., 6189 (iv); in Com., 8077 (v).
FISHER. Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Seed Grain Distribution, Complaints *re* Quality and Price (remarks) 8042 (v).
Selkirk Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9077 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture (archives) 6184 (iv); (dairy and fruit inspection) 6234 (iv); (exhibitions) 3775 (ii), 9077 (v); (farm bulletins) 6185 (iv); (Patent Record) 6184 (iv); (seeds) 6213 (iv); (tobacco production) 6262 (iv); (year book) 6184 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 5954 (iv); (salaries) 1474 (i); Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1486 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 1485 (i).
House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6170 (iv); (stationery) 6177 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3157 (ii); N.B. (Tracadie) 1625 (i); Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 8879 (v); Que. (Grosse Isle) 1675 (i).
Quarantine (animals' health) 5955 (iv); (public health) 5979 (iv); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 6187 (iv).
Senate (address to His Ex.) 6167 (iv); (salaries) 6166 (iv).
Trussed Concrete Steel Co.'s Patent Relief B. 188 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8970 (v).
Wheat Prices in West and Canada and Liverpool Market (Ans.) 6267 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E., *Toronto North.*
Address, The, 60, 531 (i).
——— Correction of Figures by Mr. Guthrie (remarks) 229 (i).
See "Customs Duties" "Govt. Sinking Funds."
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1361 (i).
American Silver Coin, Amount exported from Canada (Ques.) 6270 (iv).
Anglo-Japanese Commercial Treaty, Signing of (remarks) 6673 (iv).
——— Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6907 (iv).
——— (remarks) 2271 (ii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Quebec Oriental Ry. Co. and New Canadian Co., Date of Incorporation, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2161 (ii).
Bahamas and Canada, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 8955 (v).
Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8887 (v).
Bank Act Bill, Delay in Discussing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6444 (iv).
Bank Act, Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govtl. Action *re* (Ques.) 5632 (iii).
Bank Failures, Rep. of Curators by Govt. (Ques.) 2670 (ii).
——— (M. for copies*) 3142 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Bank Failures, Inquiry for Ret., 4569 5038 (iii), 7556 (iv).
See 'Farmers Bank.'
Bankers' Association, Bylaws, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 4116 (iii).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2364, 2429 (ii).
Bark Lake Post Office, Cleaning and Opening, &c. (Ques.) 6270 (iv).
Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co.'s Patent Relief B 187 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8969 (v).
British Preference (remarks) 5620 (iii).
Budget, The, Reply to Financial Statement, 6588 (iv).
——— Delay, &c. (remarks) 6441 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7575 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8836 (v).
Can. Shipping Act (registration) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 6115 (iv).
Canada and West Indies SS. Subsidy, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 5936 (iv).
Canadian West Loan Corporation Incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8568 (v).
Census Appointments for East Elgin (Ans.) 4302 (iii).
Census Enumerators, Commencement and Completion of (remarks) 7218 (iv).
Census Taking, System, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4339 (iii).
China-Japan, SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2509 (ii). in Com., 8677 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8719 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8906 (v).
Continental Fire Insurance Co. of Canada Incorp. B. 196 (Mr. Molloy) in Com., 8968 (v.)
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1322 (i).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7819 (iv); in Com., 8898 (v).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8714 (v). *See* "Supply—Miscellaneous."
Customs Duties, Average Value for 1896 and 1910 of Units (M. for ret.) 2162 (ii).
Customs Duties 1906-1910, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 7022 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Customs Duties, (correction) 7104 (iv).
See 'Address' &c.
Dog Fish Industry (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 8045 (v).
Dom. Lands Act, Orders in Council, Amendments to, in Com. on Res., 1985 (ii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Cartoons, Telegram, &c. (remarks) 147-156 (i).
———, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations, &c. from "Le Devoir" 472 (i).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur and Fort William, Investigation *re* Management; on prop. Res. (Mr. W M. Martin) 2379 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8115 (v).
Farmer's Bank Failure, Application *re* Charter, Date and Names (Ques.) 1970 (ii).
———, Incorporation, and Dom. Govt. (M. for cor.°) 1726 (i); 2230 (ii).
———, Inquiry for, 4468 (iii).
———, Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8214 (v).
———, Question *re* Incorp. (remarks) 1904 (i).
———, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5329 (iii).
———, Treasury Board Minutes (remarks) 4741 (iii), *see* "Treasury Board".
——— Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificate (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 2679 (ii).
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8108 (v).
Fisheries Act, (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8045, 8420 (v).
Fisheries Arbitration at Washington, Sir John Thompson's Memorandum, (M. for copy*) 980 (i).
———, Inquiry for Sir John Thompson' Memorandum, 2004 (ii).
———, Regulations, Changes at Washington (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8495 (v).
———, Printing of Documents (remarks) 4207 (iii).
———, Trap Nets (remarks) 2070 (ii).
Fish Transhipments from Mar. Provs., Ret. (remarks) 7106, 7259 (iv).
Fish Transportation, Amounts paid out of Aiding Fund. Further Information *re* (remarks) 6506 (iv).
——— Expenditure annually, Value, &c., (Ques.) 6271 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8607 (v).
Govt Sinking Fund, Legal Amount required Bounties paid, &c. (Ques.) 982 (i).
—— ref. to by Mr. Guthrie for 1895-6, Ques. of Priv. 3772 (ii).
See 'Address.'
Germany, Trade Relations with Negotiations *re* (remarks) 8403, 8534 (v).
Grain Grower's Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8536 (v).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of Men (remarks) 1507 (i).
Hague Arbitration, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Bay of Fundy) on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup. 4683 (iii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations w U. S. Conference *re*, on Stmnt. (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 1998 (ii).
—— Distribution of Copies (remarks) 8094 (v).
—— Printing of Papers (remarks) 230 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3. (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1529, 1747 (i).
House of Commons, Translation Staff, Promotions, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 527 (i).
House of Commons and Senate, Inquiry for Ret., 2556 (ii).
Hudson Bay, Position *re* Hague Award (remarks) 673 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Lands, Number of Acres sold, re Construction Fund (Ques.) 796 (l).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 2005 (ii).
Imperial Conference, Secretariat Formation, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7352 (iv).
See 'Secretariat.'
Imperial Defence Conference, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 2217 (ii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7837 (iv); on M. for 3°, 8104, 8403 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amts., 3460 (ii).
I.C.R. Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6388 (iv).
I.C.R. and G. T. Ry. Arbitration Commission, Points to be determined, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3665 (ii).
—— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 4205 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9092 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Iron and Steel Bounties, Renewal of (remarks) 3275 (ii).
Justice, Deputy Minister acting as Counsel for outside Cases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3061 (ii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1199 (i).
Manitoba and Southeastern Ry. Co.'s Land Grant, Inquiry for O.C. of May 6th, 1907, 6915 (iv).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
—— Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 7447 (iv).
Milk and St. Mary's River Water Rights (remarks) in Com. on Waterways Bill, 9109 (v).
Mint Operations Implementing Information (M. for ret.*) 980 (i).
Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation, &c., Conditions complied with (Ques.) 3065 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8887 (v).
Munderloh and Co.'s Patent Relief B. 203 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 8970 (v).
Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 546 (i).
Negro Immigrants, Prohibition of into N.W. (remarks) 5912 (iii).
—— Restrictions re (remarks) 6525 (iv).
Niagara River Water Powers Regulations *re* (remarks) 8892 (v).
N.W. Mounted Police, Loss of Men on Macpherson-Yukon Patrol (remarks) 7254 (iv).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8317 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6123 (iv).
—— on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2830 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, Apology for using word 'liar' insisted on, 463 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2274 (ii).
Parliament, Opening and Closing, Date of from 1896 to 1910 (M. for ret.*) 786 (i).
——Inquiry for Ret., 1805 (i).
Pelagic Sealing, Treaty between G. B. and U. S., Protection (remarks) 3671 (ii).
Post Office Act (stamp box) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 2736 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7697 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Blocking in Public Accounts Com., 998 (i).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4337 (iii).
Questions, Incomplete Answers (remarks) 1013 (i).
Racial and Religious Prejudices, Liberal Pamphlets, &c., Quotations &c. (remarks) on Address, 531 (i).
Railways and Canals Deptl. B. 156 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8410 (v).
Ry. Commission &c., Agreement *re* Traffic between U.S. and Can. (remarks) 3056 (ii).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
'Rainbow' and 'Niobe' Cost to Date, Price, Repairs, and Maintenance &c. (Ques.) 791 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 3327, 3530 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4852 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com, on Ways and Means, 2446 (ii).
——— (remarks) on Address, 72 (i).
Reciprocity, Assurances *re* Farmer's Interests (remarks)) 5543 (iii).
——— Letter of 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7678 (iv).
——— Negotiations at Washington, Mr. J. A. Macdonald's Connection *re* (remarks) 4299 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., Pets. Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 980 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1652 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2439 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Commercial Statistics, 2070, 2555, 2646, 2737, (ii).
——— Mess. to President Taft *re* Request for Statistics (remarks) 4471 (iii).
Reciprocity on Inquiry for Pets., &c., (Mr. Bradbury) 3057 (ii).
——— Trade and Commerce Dept., Reply *re* Ret. for Statistics (remarks) 6510 (iv).
Reciprocity Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5949; Rule (read) 5953 (iv).
——— Procedure in the House, *re* Resolutions, &c. (remarks) 5752 (iii).
Reciprocity, Tabulated Statements, &c. (remarks) 2986 (ii).
——— Tel. from Min. of Fin. to High Commissioner, Inquiry for, 3274 (ii).
——— Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2644 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8093 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Revillon Freres Trading Co., incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8577, 8966 (v).
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 8969 (v).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service at Public Function (remarks) 940 (i).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5643, (iii); in Com., 8411 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5871, 5900 (iii).
St. Lawrence River, Damming the Long Sault, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3230 (ii).
Secretariat in London, Inquiry for Papers, 1506 (i); 5836 (iii).
See Imp. Conference.
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2649, 3845 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2722 (ii).
Senate, Cost for each year from 1896 to 1911 (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1805 (i).
Senate, Reform of, on prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4316 (iii).
Senate Vacancy in P. E. I. (remarks) 2074 (ii).
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7248 (iv).
Sussex Street Deptl. Buildings, Alterations in Plan (remarks) 2077 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture &c. (exhibitions) 3776 (ii), (seeds) 6213 (iv); Quarantine (animals health) 5962 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6396; Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6391; (machinery) 6389; (protection works) 6390 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1474; Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1486; Depts. Generally (cleaning, &c.) 1486; High Commissioner (salaries) 1486; Justice (salaries) 1017; (contingencies) 1020, Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1464; Militia (salaries) 1025; Mines (salaries) 1476; Privy Council (salaries) 1013; Railways and Canals (salaries) 1473; Secretary of State—External Affairs (salaries) 1472; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 1485 (i).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6625 (iv).
Militia (allowance) 8517 (v).
Miscellaneous (Coronation Members and Senators) 8685; Imperial Conference (Ministers expenses) 8679; (pelagic sealing conference) 8679 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax Citadel) 1581 (i); Ont. (Athens) 2089; Que. (Montreal barracks) 2572 (ii).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov.-Gen's cars) 6447 (iv).
Tariff Negotiations, &c. (remarks) on Address, 65 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Tatamagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishway, &c. (Ques.) 7806 (iv).
Treasury Board Minutes *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting (remarks) 5136 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 4659 (iii).
See 'Bank,' Farmers Bank.'
Treaty of 1871 *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters (remarks) 7022 (iv).
U.S. Consuls, Names, Fees, &c. (M. for ret.) 1727 (i).
U.S. Immigration Agents, and Canadian Travellers (remarks) 6119 (iv).
U.S., Japanese Treaty, Inquiry for Copy, 7256 (iv).
U.S. Warships on Great Lakes, passing through Canadian Canals (remarks) 6118, 7253 (iv).
U.S. Warships passing through canals, Inquiry for Ret., 1571, 1805 (i), 2556 (ii), 5629 (iii).
Vancouver Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with (Ques.) 3066 (ii).
West Indies Trade with Canada, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6371 (iv).
—— Notice of Discussion, 6274 (iv).
Yukon Beer Import Tax Repeal B. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 1978 (ii).

FOWKE Mr. F. L., *South Ontario.*
Address, The, 254, 271, (i).
Baptist Convention of Ont. and Quebec (B. 152) 1°*, 6439; in Com., 7470 (iv).
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. (B. 161) 1°*, 6756 ; in Com., 7560, 7568 (iv).
G.B. and U.S. Arbitration Treaty, Information *re* (Ques.) 5834 (iii).
Naval Policy *re* Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 271 (i).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 126) 1°*, 4384 (iii).
Reciprocity, Manufactured Articles, (remarks) 5746 (iii).
—— Oshawa Fruit Growers Ass'n, Res. (read) 5747 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6824 (iv).
Scugog River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Supply., 6425 (iv).
Whitby Postoffice Site, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1868 (i).

FRASER, Mr. A. L., *King's (P.E.I.)*
Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building, &c. (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8932 (v).

FRASER, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*
Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractor, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 7593 (iv).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8047 (v).
Fishing Bounty in King's Co., P.E.I., Names of Persons receiving (Ques.) 7246 (iv).
Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Appotmt., Qualification, &c. (Ques.) 8701 (v.)
Georgetown Public Building Drainage, &c. (Ques.) 3469 (ii).
Govt. Railways Constructed previous to Confederation, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4829 (iii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U. S. (remarks) 2003 (ii).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Material purchased, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 7593 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. (B. 153) in Com., 8743 (v).
Judicial Vacancy in P.E.I., Apptmt. *re* (remarks) 2072 (ii), 7553 (iv).
Knight's Point Breakwater, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 7805 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Committee, Meeting of (remarks) 4048 (iii).
New Harmony Postoffice (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6084 (iv).
Oyster Industry, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor., 757 (i).
P. E. I. Coast Fisheries, Fines, Penalties *re* Breach of Regulations (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).
—— Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments (remarks), 6923 (iv).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3883 (ii).
P. E. I. Tunnel, Memorial, &c., *re* Surveys, on M. (Mr. Richards) for Copies, 2178 (ii).
—— Winter Service, Contracts *re* Coal, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 2677 (ii).
Red Point Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 3469 (ii).
St. Peter's Bay, P.E.I., Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
St. Peter's Breakwater, Repair, &c. (Ques.) 7344 (iv).
Senate Vacancy from P.E.I., Complaints *re* (remarks) 2072 (ii).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3105 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Lighthouse and Coast Service—Marine (ice breakers) 6489; Postoffice—Outside Service (mail clerks) 6084 (iv); (postmas-

FRASER, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
ters) 4295 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Summerside Armoury) 1602 (i), (Tignish) 1603 (i), Railways—P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira branch) 6352 (iv).
Supreme Court Judgeship in P.E.I. Vacancy, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2072 (ii), 7553 (iv).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6295 (iv).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election (remarks) 5777 (iii).
I. C. R. Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1166 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers, from Quebec to Gulf of St. Lawrence, Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret. 774 (i).
Order, Ques. of, Apologies for using word "liar", 467 (i).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents) 5184 (iii); Railways—I.C.R. (highways protection) 5918 (iii).

GEOFFRION, Mr. V., *Chambly and Vercheres.*
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s (B. 44) 1°*, 1069 (i); in Com., 2594-5, 3021 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 60) 1°*, 1453 (i); in Com., 3060, 3182 (ii).
La Sauvegarde Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 193) 1°*, 8308 (v).
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7938 (v).
Restigouche Riparian Association incorp., (B. 176) 1°*, 7019; in Com., 7589 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Public Works—Buildings—Que (Montreal barracks) 3147 (ii); (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (St. Lambert) 1895 (i).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M. *Welland.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Par. in 'Globe' *re* commencement (remarks) 2261 (ii).
International Ry. Co. and International Traction Co, &c., (B. 74) 1°*, 1488 (i).
Mather Bridge and Power Co.'s (B. 20) 1°*, 377 (i).
Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Ry Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 2254 (ii).
Privileges and Election Com., 3rd Rep. of Com. *re* Lanctot Charges, (presented) 6756 (iv); (M.) to conc, 7873, Agreed to (Y. 98, N. 56) 8030 (v).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4482 (iii).
——— Vote re Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden). Personal Explanation, 4929 (iii).

GERVAIS, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8739 (v).
Debates, Official Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 6438 (iv).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8236 (v).
Montreal, Govt. Appointments since 1st Jan., 1904 (M. for ret.*) 3225 (ii).
Postal Conventions with Spain, Changes *re* (Ques.) 1104 (i).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Ltd., incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 1°, 6439; on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).

GILBERT, Mr. ARTHUR, *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Address, The, 624 (i).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).
——— (notice of motion) 5938 (iv).
——— Total Expenditure from Confederation (Ques.) 4302 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid (Ques.) 6158 (iv).
Militia Expenditures, Total Amount since Confederation (Ques.) 3467 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of, re Telegram delayed, &c., 1456 (i).
Railway Subsidies, Total Amount since Confederation (Ques.) 3467 (ii).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).
Lake St. John Repatriation Society, Cor., &c. (M. for cor.*) 9994 (v).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3117 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6239; (seeds) 6232 (iv).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S., *Kootenay.*
Arrow Lake Postal Clerk (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
B. C. Militia, Complaints *re* Treatment, Par. in B.C. Newspapers, 9248 (v).
Canadian Inter-Mountain Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 134) 1°*, 4740 (iii).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9063 (v).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8943 (v).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S.—*Con.*
Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of (remarks) 6912 (iv).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8712 (v).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8459 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5399 (iii).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8054 (v).
Flag Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4366 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. 8618, 8650 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1427, 1732, 1756 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6946 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9204 (iv).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9472 (v).
Nelson Postal Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blair) to Com. of Sup., 2322 (ii).
Postmasters Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iv).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10192 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4969 (iii).
——— Hamilton Cotton Co., Statement of Employees (read) 5747 (iii).
——— Lord Strathcona's Telegram (explanation) 5210 (iii).
——— Obstruction *re* Debate (remarks) 10043 (v).
——— Res. from Creston Fruit and Produce Association (read) 4119 (iii).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7628 (iv).
Seybold Building Elevator, Reimbursement for Installation of, &c. (Ques.) 1350 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (clerical assistance) 6065 (iv).
Fisheries (inspectors) 6637; (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6108 (iv).
Labour Dept. ('Labour Gazette') 4226 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C., (Cranbrook) 3013; (Revelstoke) 3017; Dominion (rents) 3212; Ottawa (lighting contracts) 3186; Yukon (Dawson) 3215 (ii).
Western Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board, Settlement, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9696 (v).
Woods Building, Lighting Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *Kent East.*
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s (B. 206) in Com., 8970 (v).
Coal imported from U.S. into Ont., Value of Duties, &c. (Ques.) 4041 (iii).
Supply—Fisheries (overseers) 3821 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. G., *Nipissing.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8824 (v).
Cobalt Mail Service, Delays and inefficient Service (remarks) 1649, 1663, 1804 (i).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6632 (iv).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8615 (v).
French River Dam (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7841; in Com., 7861 (iv).
Loughrin, Police Commissioner at Cochrane, Number of Convictions before (Ques.) 1568 (i).
Monetville Cut, Lake Nipissing Public Works, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 1495 (i).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 170) 1°*, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8233, 8519, 8535, 8642, 8916, 8956 (v).
North Bay Wharfs, Information *re*, 2556 (ii).
Northern Ontario, Settlement of, Govt. Assistance *re* (remarks) 6766 (iv).
Porcupine Disasters by Fire, Aid to (remarks) 9694 (v).
Reciprocity Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10062 (v).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (survey) 9564 (v); Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6632 (iv); Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3406; Public Works — Buildings—Ont. (Sudbury) 2627 (ii); (Tillsonburg) 2628 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P. (Minister of Railways and Canals), *Brockville.*
Accidents, &c. on Canadian Railways, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3927 (ii). *See* "Ry. Accidents".
Advertising Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv). *See* "I.C.R.".
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Cash) on Senate Amts., 6469 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com. 5079, 5253, 5630 (iii).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3027 (ii).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3459 (ii).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4240 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co. &c. (Ans.) 3853 (ii).
———, (explanation) 4048 (iii).
Baggage Smashing Prevention B. 124 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 4199 (iii)
Beauharnois Canal, Alienation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1713 (i).
———,Privileges, Advertisement *re* Tenders (Ans.) 1712 (i).
———, Grantees, Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 1712 (i).
———, Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2678 (ii).
———, Total Cost, Revenues from Grantees. Arrears, &c. (Ans.) 1713 (i).
Bradford Channel (remarks) in Com. or Sup., 6420 (iv).
British Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., 5127 (iii).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1683 (i).
Canadian General Development Co., Total Amounts paid by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 656 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. (B. 211) Guarantee Bonds (M.) for Com. on Res., 8704 (v); in Com. on Res. 8801; in Com., 9222, 9255 (v).
Canadian Northern Branch Lines Co.'s (B. 81) on Senate Amts., 6468 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com. 3454, 3456 (ii).
C.P.Ry., Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction of, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Cor., 769 (i).
———, Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1828 (i).
Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3062 (ii).
Canal Reciprocity for American Boats (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).
Canal Statistics (presented) 7019 (iv).
Cardinal Canal Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Carillon Water Power Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c. (Ans.) 2669 (ii), 8700 (v).
Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Clarry, L. F., Expenditure *re* Trent Canal Floods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of (Ans.) 2852 (ii).
Electric Railway Charters since 1896, Extensions *re* Constructions, &c. (Ans.) 4043 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractor, Completion &c. (Ans.) 7593 (iv).
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Depts (remarks) 2996 (ii).
Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c. (Ans.) 10196 (v).
See 'Parcel Post'.
Fish Ladders on Trent Canal (remarks) 4825 (iii).
Fish Preservation in Trent River, (remarks) 1504 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Commencement *re* (remarks) 2261 (ii).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii)
Govt. Railways, constructed previous to Confederation, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4829 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s inc. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8237, 8922 (v).
Grand Falls Ry.: *See* "St. John".
G.T.Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1079 (i).
G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 73 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3022 (ii).
G.T.P.Ry. Classification, Arbitrators' Report (Ans.) 696 (i).
———, Eastern Division, Overbreak, Agreement *re* (Ans.) 1571 (i).
——— Labourers working at Lafond, Amounts due, &c. (Ans.) 3670 (ii).
——— Lake Superior Division, Construction Limit, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 1493 (i).
——— Lumsden Investigation, Total Cost *re* (Ans.) 1493 (i).
———Pension Fund, Rules and Regulations (Ans.) 2153 (ii).
See 'Nat. Transcl. Ry.'
Halifax and St. John, Wharfage, &c. (Ans.) 7807 (iv).
Hillsborough Bridge, Material furnished, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 7593 (iv).
Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1425, 1794 (1).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 661 (i).
Hydro-Electric Co.'s Water Power Lease on Ottawa River (Ans.) 9430 (v).
I.C.R., Accidents, Causes of (remarks) 6678 (iv).
——— Accidents, Passes, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
——— Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
See "Advertising."

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Bell, Mr. G. W., Pass Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 6666 (iv).
——— Branch Lines Leasing (prop. res.) 9244; in Com. on Res., 9581, 9588 (v).
——— Branch Lines, Acquisition of (remarks) 6769 (iv).
——— Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 5833 (iii).
——— Dismissals, from Nov., 1908, Number reinstated (Ans.) 3666 (ii).
——— Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1174 (i).
——— Excursion Rates *re* Monument Nationale Demonstration in Montreal, &c. (Ans.) 1347 (i); (remarks) 2997 (ii).
See 'Rates.'
——— Freight Rates on Coal, Iron, &c., Classification, &c. (Ans.) 6157 (iv).
——— Freight Transfer, Letter to Agent at Moncton (Ans.) 654 (i).
——— Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* Appropriating Scrap Brass, &c. (Ans.) 6664, 7601 (iv).
——— Gross Earnings, Cost per Ton, &c. (Ans.) 5130 (iii).
——— Halifax Terminals (stmnt.) 2647 (ii). 9561 (v).
——— Hawke, Mr. J. T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds (Ans.) 6665 (iv).
——— Hay transported free from Quebec to Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 5134 (iii).
——— Ice Contract at Riviere du Loup (Ans.) 2438, 3853 (ii).
——— I.C.R. and G. T. Ry. Arbitration, Points to be determined, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3665 (ii); (remarks) *re* Answer, 4206 (iii).
——— Locomotives purchased since 1896, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 7033 (iv).
——— Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept. (Ans.) 6666 (iv).
——— Mileage, Value of Rolling Stock (Ans.) 3668 (ii).
——— Moncton Extension, Acquisition of Land from Builders' Woodworking Co. (Ans.) 6157 (iv).
——— Moncton Station, Site purchased (Ans.) 1291 (i).
——— Payments to Dr. C. A. Murray *re* Tickets (Ans.) 7032 (iv).
——— Petit Rocher Spur, Cost, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 6156 (iv).
——— Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
——— Porters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6340 (iv).
——— and P.E.I. Ry. Pension Fund, Delegation *re* Amendments (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Printing, Amounts paid to 'Globe' (corrected statement) 2886 (ii).
See "Advertising."
——— Rates, for Political Picnics at Truro (explanation) 3343 (ii).
See "Excursion."
———Ste. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 2436 (ii).
International Ry Traffic, Points of Crossing, &c. (Ans.) 4466 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9190 (v).
See 'Long Sault.'
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2596 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).
See 'International Waterways,' 'St. Lawrence.'
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024 (ii).
Milk and Cream shipped in Western Ont., Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).
N.T.Ry., Classification Arbitration, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1490 (i).
——— Completion of Eastern Division (Ans.) 1099; Correction in Figures, 1293 (i).
——— Contracts for Eastern Division (Ans.) 1095 (i).
——— Contracts Estimated Quantities, &c. (Ans.) 1491 (i).
——— Defaulting Contractors, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 1281 (i).
——— Eastern Div., Total Cost (Ans.) 2434 (ii).
——— Eastern Division, Total Cost up to Dec. 1910 (Ans.) 3064 (i); Corrected Answer (read) 3144 (ii).
——— Eastern Div., Question, Overbreak *re* (remarks) 2434 (ii).
——— Estimated Cost and Mileage of Fencing, &c. (Ans.) 1094 (i).
——— Execution of Work under Contract, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 6668 (iv).
——— Expenditure, Difference in Amount in Ret., (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
——— N.B. Section, Pusher Grade (remarks) 4051 (iii).
——— N.B. Section, Standard, Total Estimated Cost (Ans.) 4047 (iii).
——— Over Classification, Reduction *re* (remarks) 6273 (iv), 9899 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
N.T.Ry., Over Classification, on Inquiry for Information *re*, 9995 (v).
——— Payments, on Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
——— Provisions in Contract *re* taking over completed sections (Ans.) 1093 (i).
——— Rails and Fastenings, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 1099 (i).
——— Ry. Commission Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
——— St. Lawrence and Moncton Div., Dat of Completion (Ans.) 1711 (i).
——— Section Houses (Ans.) 1099 (i).
——— Shops, Specifications *re* Machinery &c. (Ans.) 1569 (i).
——— Shops, Specifications *re* Emplymt. of Mr. W. J. Press (Ans.) 2157 (ii).
——— Temiskaming and Northern Ont. Ry Co., Agreement *re* Running Rights, &c (Ans.) 2435 (ii).
——— Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 5135 (iii), 7591 (iv).
——— Total Cost up to 31st Dec. 1910, Estimated Cost of Winnipeg and Moncton Section (Ans.) 1497 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 1727 (i).
See 'G.T.P.Ry.'
Newmarket Canal, Expenditure for 1910, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 5831 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv)
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) on M. for Com., 8094 in Com., 8234, 8525, 8916 (v).
Parcel Posts System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9923 (v).
See 'Express.'
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for copies, 713; 1497 (i), 3069 (ii).
——— American Engineers consulted by Min. of Rys. (Ans.) 697 (i).
——— British Empire Bridge Co.'s Deposit, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 9981 (iv).
——— Caisson, Damage to (Ans.) 4045 (iii).
——— Commission of Expert Engineers, Amounts paid to (Ans.) 1714 (i).
——— Construction, Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 4324 (iii).
——— Contract, Advertisement *re*, on M (Mr. Lennox) for Copy, 713, 1497 (i).
——— Contract *re* Construction, Resignation of Chairman (remarks) 4205 (iii).
——— Contract, Plans, &c. (remarks) 7103 (ii).
——— Contract for Reconstruction (remarks) 4740 (iii).
——— Date of Completion, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2667 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Quebec Bridge, Estimated Cost, Tunnelling, &c. (Ans.) 3279 (ii), 6268 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* Investigations, &c (Ans.) 8102 (v).
——— Investigations *re* River Bed, Tests &c. (Ans.) 658 (i).
——— Members of Board of Construction (Ans.) 9981 (v).
——— Plans, Contract, &c. (remarks) 6273 (iv).
——— Plans and Specifications, Approval by Chief Engineer of G.T.Ry. Co. (Ans.) 4826 (iii).
——— Superstructure, Contract let (announcement) 6669 (iv).
——— Supervision, Amount expended (remarks) 6671 (iv).
——— Supervision, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6450 (iv).
——— Tenders *re*, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for copies of Advertisements, &c., 3069 (ii).
——— Tenders *re* Carriage Way &c. (Ans.) 9980 (v).
Railway Act (accidents) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 959, 1798 (i).
Ry. Act. (commutation tickets) Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Macdonnell) on M. for 1°, 1551 (i).
Ry. Act (express co.'s) Amt. B. 8, (Mr. S. Sharpe) on M. for 2°, 1299 (i).
Railways and Canals Dept. Act (equipment renewal) Amt. (B. 156) 1° m., 6188 (iv). 2° m., 8409; in Com., 8409 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Ant. (B. 197) 1° m., 8399 (v); in Com., 9312, 9377 (v).
Railway Accidents on running Trains, Construction Work, &c., on M. (Mr. R. Smith) for Ret. 714 (i). *See* "Accidents.'
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5246 (iii).
Railway Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Ry. Commission and Interstate Commerce Commission, Agreement *re* Traffic between Can. and U. S. (remarks) 3055 (ii).
Railway Commission Vacancy, Apptmt. of Farmer (Ans.) 1291 (i).
——— Apptmt. of French Canadian (Ans.) 1103 (i).
Railway Crossings, Action of Ry. Commissioners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Railway Express Rates: *See* "Express," "Parcel," &c.
Ry. Rates, Comparison with U.S. Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Railway Rates to Clergymen, Reduction of (Ans.) 2434 (ii).
Railway Sectionmen, Complaints *re* Overwork (Ans.) 9987 (v).
Railway Subsidies, Total Amount paid since Confederation (Ans.) 3467 (ii).
—— Corrected Stmnt., 6196 (iv).
Railway Telegraph, &c., Rates, Treaty *re* Control (remarks) 8357 (v).
Railway Traffic Connections, Arrangements between Provincial and Ry. Commissioners (Ans.) 697 (i).
Railways, Transportation Problem in Canada, Stmnt. on M. for Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) *re* handing in Statements, 6955 (iv).
Revillon Frères Trading Co., Limited incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).
Rideau Canal Lockmen, Increased Pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6414 (iv).
Rideau River, Removal of Stumps (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).
Roy, Mr. Ferdinand, Emplymt. by Govt. or N. T. Ry. (Ans.) 2852 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry. Branch Line Lease (B. 150) M. for Com. on Res., 4200 ; in Com. on Res., 5641 (iii); 2° m., 8410; in Com., 8411 (v).
St. Lawrence Power Co., Annual Payments *re* Light, Power, &c. (Ans.) 3468 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Damming, Protest *re* Bill now before U. S. Senate (remarks) 4217 (iii).
See "Long Sault."
St. Peter's Canal, N.B., Construction, &c. (Ans.) 8103 (v).
—— Answer to Question (remarks) 8356 (v).
Scugog River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).
Selkirk Route *re* Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Claims for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin (Ans.) 2853 (ii).
—— Rep. of Mr. Boyer *re* Administration (remarks) 6273 (iv).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3348 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay Dyke) 6411 (iv).
Canals—Cardinal (dock) 6410 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (Iberville bridge); 6356; (macadamizing) 6408; (machinery) 6357 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (enlarging office); 6409; (lock 17) 6409; (lock 19) 6409; (removing high spots) 6409; (Robertson's Culvert) 6409 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Canals—Farran's Point (lower entrance) 6409 (iv).
Canals—Galops (upper lock) 6410 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6358, 6410 tugs) 6359, 6388; (wharf's and basins) 6359 (iv).
Canals—Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6412 (iv).
Canals—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 6427; (surveys, &c.) 6452; (working expenses) 6452 (iv).
Canals—Murray (dredging) 6410; (scow) 6411 (iv).
Canals—Que. (dredging) 6411 (iv).
Canals—Rapide Plat (dredging) 6413 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (bridges) 6413 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste Marie (concrete walls) 6358; (lock gates, &c.) 6417; (mooring pier) 6397; (upper entrance) 6416 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6395 (iv).
Canals—St. Peter's (improvements) 6418 (iv).
Canals—Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6390; (machinery) 6389; (mooring posts) 6389; (protection works) 6390 (iv).
Canals—Trent (flood damages) 6453; (improvements) 6419; (lift lock) 6398 (iv).
Canals—Welland (enlargement) 6404; (Jane St. bridge) 6425; (Port Colborne) 6397; (stone protection) 6425 (iv); (survey) 9563 (v); (widening) 6408 (iv).
Canals—Williamsburg (electric power) 6396 (entrance pier) 6426; (iron mooring posts) 6426; (lockmaster's house) 6408; (machinery) 6426 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (salaries) 1473 (i).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6655 (iv).
Railways—G. T. P. (govt. director) 6449 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (air brakes) 5913, 5915; (bridge strengthening) 5914; (Campbellton) 5914, 5983; (Chatham) 5915; (draw bars) 5915; (facilities and acommodation) 5929; (fire extinguishers) 5927 ; (Fredericton) 5916; (Halifax) 5918 (iii); (Halifax docks) 9561 (v); (highways protection) 5917 (iii) ; 9560 (v) ; (Moncton car shops) 5926 (iii); (operation) 5983; (Pullman berths) 5991 (iv); (rolling stock) 5927 (iii), 8913 (v); (Str. 'Scotia') 5928; (surveys, &c.) 5928; (Sydnev Mines) 5929 (iii); (Windsor branch) 6352; (working expenses) 6338 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen's cars) 6446; (inspections, &c.) 6452 (iv); (level crossings) 9509 (v); (McGill University) 6445; (official cars) 6447; (Ry. Commissioners) 6427 (iv), 9508 (v).
Ry's. P.E.I., (Harmany-Elmira branch) 6352 (iv).
Transcontinental Ry. Eastern Div. Expenditure *re* Construction (Ans.) 9431 (v).
See 'G. T. P.' &c.
Truro Freight Shed Fire (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).
Waddington Power Development, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7210 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Water Carried Freight, Value, &c. (remarks) 6671 (iv).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 135 (Mr. Douglas) in Com., 6951 (iv).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*
Address, The, 77 (i).
——— Correction of figures in Hansard, 228 (i).
See 'Govt. Loans.'
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3181 (ii).
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 220), (M.) to place on Govt. Bills, 9350 (v).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3459 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3456 (ii).
Govt. Loans and Sinking Funds, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3774 (ii).
See 'Address.'
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com. 3182 (ii).
Railway Sel. Com. (M.) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3629 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4868 (iii).

HAGGART, Mr. A., *Winnipeg.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5080 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8840 (v).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8572 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8925 (v).
Coronation Holiday and Bank Holiday, (remarks) 5836 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8608, 8666 (v).
Fort Osborne, Purchase of Grounds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4469 (iii), 6054 (iv).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10251, 10290 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9515 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8549 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 9 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1792 (i).
Immigrants, Money Qualification, *re* Operation of Act (remarks) 150 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7853 (iv).

HAGGART, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Man. Legislative Building, Purchase of Fort Osborne Barracks, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 4469 (ii), 6054 (iv).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 6762 (iv).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6122 (iv).
Parliament Site, Winnipeg, Reservation in Crown Grants, &c. (M. for papers, &c*.) 7039 (iv).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8072 (v).
Post Office Supplies for Western Provs., Distribution of (Ques.) 1282 (i).
Priv. and Elections Com. (Mr. A. Lanctot) Charges *re*, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7888 (iv).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9332 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8389 (v).
Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers, on M. (Mr. Meighen) 10140 (v).
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2597, 3021, 3180, 3454, 3842 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3793 (ii); Quarantine (public health) 5981 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5173 (iii).
Indians—Man, &c. (annuities) 8885 (v).
Militia (Winnipeg drill hall) 6054 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3004; Man. (Winnipeg armoury) 3052 (ii); Ottawa (pavements) 8884 (v).
Winnipeg River Water Power Rights, Grants, Leases, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2162 (ii).
Winnipeg World's Fair, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G., *North Lanark.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5086 (iii).
Beauharnois Canal Grantees, Rentals from, Sums expended by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2196 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8804, 8818; in Com., 9222, 9259 (v).
C.P.Ry. Reducton of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1836 (i).
Copyright Act, B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8899 (v).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1319 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4662 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Drummond &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 479 (i).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2388 (ii).
Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2190 (ii).
——— Cancellation of (remarks) 2264 (ii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8559 (v).
G.T.R. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1075 (i).
Imperial Conference, Rep. presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10120 (v).
I.C.R. Special Trains *re* Monument Nationale, Montreal, Demonstration (remarks) 2999 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9099; in Com., 9156, 9216 (v).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Long Sault Dam, on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3238 (ii).
Niagara River Water Powers, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8893 (v).
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration (remarks) 672 (i).
Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 954 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Genl.'s Report, 834 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies, 3069 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4334 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 961 (i).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. B. 156 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8409 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9379 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to meet during sittings of the House, 9228 (v).
Railways, Transportation Problem , on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup. (reply) 5103 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8411 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1378 (i).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 6216; Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1467(i); Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2093 (ii).
Sussex Street, Deptl. Buildings, Alteration in Plans (remarks) 2079 (ii), 4824 (iii).
Yukon, Beer Import Tax Repeal, in Com. on Res., (Mr. Oliver) 1977 (ii).

HARRIS, Mr. Llyod, *Brantford.*
Globe Printing Co.'s (B. 121) 1°*, 4040 (iii).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 106) 1°*, 2828 (ii).
Morrison, Nellie Bridgland Relief (B. 182) 1°*, 7666 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 4877 (iii).
Reciprocity, Berlin Board of Trade Res., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) 5730 (iii).

HARTY, Mr. W., *Kingston.*
SUPPLY.
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2138 (ii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9222; on M. for 3°, 9334 (v).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2431 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Miller) to sit during Sessions of the House, 8355 (v).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7470 (iv).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1683 (i).
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3859 (ii).
Bronte Harbour Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3183-3454 (ii).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2227 (ii).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8953 (v).
Dom. Lands Act (O. Cs.) in Com., 8086 (v).
Elora Postoffice, Site, Price paid, &c. (Ques.) 6505 (iv).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8128 (v).
Express Rates, *See* 'Parcel.'
Sheldon, C. D. Illegal Use of Mails (re- M. (Mr. Foster) for copy, 2242 (ii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Farmers' Bank, Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation *re* Double Liability, &c. (Ques.) 4111 (iii).
—— Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8224 (v).
—— Royal Commission of Investigation (amt.) to Com. on M. for Ways and Means, 5295, Neg. (Y. 62, N. 97) 5523 (iii).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).
Forest Reserves B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. 8084 (v).
Govt. Bills, Withdrawal of (remarks) 2080 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1419 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6946 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amts., 3460 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8079 (v).
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2596 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3182 (ii).
Milton Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1871 (i).
Ministerial Association, Attack *re* by h. m. (remarks) 3372 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3184 (ii).
Parcel Post, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9936 (v).
Postoffice Act, (stamp vending machine) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2° 8069; in Com., 8070 (v).
Public Buildings in former Estimates, given Precedence over new Ones (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2114 (ii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8401; in Com., 9321 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5063 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7633 (iv).
—— Res. from Fruit Growers' Association, Burlington, (read) 4122 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6517, 6816 (iv).
—— Statistics, &c., Ques. *re* Vote of member for Labelle, 6839 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7625 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8579, 9166 (v).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2598 (ii).
Seed Control Act (seeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6189 (iv); in Com., 8078 (v).
Supply Bill, Interim (B. 160) on M. for 1°, 6440 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6235; (Patent Record) 6184; (seeds) 6217 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (macadamizing) 6408 (iv)
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1049; Mines (salaries) 1477; Public Works (salaries) 1033 (i).
Dom. Lands—Parks (buffalo) 6051 (iv).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6629; (modus vivendi licenses) 6160 (iv); (overseers) 3809; (protection service) 3807 (ii).
House of Commons (committees) 6170; (messengers) 6172; (pages) 6174; (servants) 6175; (sessional clerks) 6170; (stationery) 6178; (telephones) 6171 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5195 (iii).
Indians—N. W. T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6043; Que. (medical attendance) 6035 (iv).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6161 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4233 (iii); (technical education commission) 3804 (ii).
Miscellaneous (coronation decorations) 9566 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Campbellton) 1609; (Hampton) 1615 (i); Ont. (Dresden) 2108; (Fergus) 2111; (Essex) 2110 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 5996 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (freight cars) 5987 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6558; (meteorological service) 6566 (iv).
Senate (stationery) 6337 (iv).
Unprovided Items (generally) 6160 (iv).

HERRON, Mr. J., *Macleod.*
Adjournment for Coronation, Definite Date (remarks) 9090 (v).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1966 (i).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3181, 3392; (amt.) 3024 (ii).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5087 (iii).
Bellevue Mining Disaster, Information *re* (remarks) 1079 (i).
Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3062 (ii).
Census Omissions in Enumeration (remarks) 9719 (v).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Coal Strike in Alberta and B. C., Conciliation by Labour Dept. (remarks) 6197, 6363, (iv) 9070 (v).
Coal Strikes in West, Information *re* (remarks) 6908 (iv).
——— Present condition (remarks) 7105 (iv).
Dom. Lands in Alberta, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2271 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3508 (ii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8607, 8674 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8083 (v).
Land, Timber, Natural Resources, &c., of Alberta, Provl. Control of (M. for cor. *) 1500 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1240 (i).
McLeod Postoffice, Progress *re* (remarks) 9588 (v).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9315, 9416 (v).
Seed Grain, Distribution of, Complaints *re* Quality and Price (remarks) 8041 (v).
Seed Inspection and Sale Act B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8078 (v).
SUPPLY—
Charges of Management—(foreign and uncurrent coin) 6062; Dom. Lands—Parks—(buffalo) 6050; Indians—N. W. T. (Dr. J. D. Lafferty, payments to) 6046 (iv); Postoffice (postmasters' salaries) 4292 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3004 (ii).

HODGINS, Mr. G. F., *Pontiac.*
Emo, Matilda Relief (B. 130) 1° *, 4298 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 3529 (ii).
Quebec and Great Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 198) 1° *, 8476 (v).
Welland Canal Enlargement, Memorials, Pets, &c. (M. for copies *) 1500 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) to Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Naval Policy, 281 (i).
Advertising Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6394 (iv).
Alberta Rangers, Macleod Squadron, Organization of, Capt. D. J. Campbell's Connection therewith (Ques.) 7340 (iv).
Ancona Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3601 (ii).
Bermuda, Information *re* Annexation to Canada (remarks) 5216 (iii).
Boot and Shoe Lasts, Names of Manufacturers, &c. (M. for ret. *) 1340 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Bradford Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).
British Patriotic Songs in Western Schools and American Pupils (Ques.) 656 (i).
——— Remarks of Mr. Armstrong *re* (remarks) 4931 (iii).
Canal Reciprocity for American Boats (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).
Clifford W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of (remarks) 9997 (v).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8712 (v).
Coronation Ceremonies, and Cadets from Canada (Ques.) 706 (i).
——— Indian Contingent, Par. *re* (remarks) 6506 (iv).
——— Names of Officers, &c., Cadets, &c. (remarks) 7105 (iv).
Debates Committee, Status of (remarks) 7015 (iv).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, *re* Speeches (remarks) 153 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Attendance of Militia, Authority for (Ques.) 3219 (ii).
——— Govt. Authority re Decoration of Govt. Buildings (Ques). 925 (i); (remarks) 3369 (ii).
——— Guards of Honour, &c. (remarks) on Address, 289 (i).
——— Mess of Homage from Administrator of Can. Govt. (Ques.) 706 (i).
——— Militia Officers attending Reception, in Uniform (Ques.) 707 (i).
——— Public Procession, Authority of Govt. *re* State Officials (Ques.) 925 (i).
See 'Precedence.'
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5496 (iii).
Fenelon Falls Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Flags flying on Govt. Buildings on St. David's Day (remarks) 3671 (ii).
——— Neglect on St. George's Day (remarks) 7553 (iv).
——— Orders *re* (remarks) 2648 (ii).
See 'St. George's.'
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 1641 (i).
G. T. R. Trainmens' Strike, Reinstatement of Dismissed Employees (remarks) 1073 (i).
Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).
Homage: *See* Eucharistic..
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1411 (i).
House of Commons Ventilation, (remarks) 4209 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Indian Act Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 7020 (iv).
'Iroquois,' Str., Report *re* Wrecking (remarks) 7104 (iv).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10349 (v).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).
Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3241 (ii).
See 'St. Lawrence.'
Marriage Laws in Quebec, Action of Roman Catholic Church (Ques.) 7207 (iv).
Masonic Property stolen, Verdict of Montreal Jury *re* (Ques.) 7207 (iv).
—— (remarks) *re* Counsel's Action, 7552 (iv).
—— Apology to Counsel, Ques. of Priv. 7873 (v).
Militia Officers: *See* 'Eucharistic.'
Militia Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1008 (i).
Ministerial Association, Ottawa, Res. *re* (remarks) 3059 (ii).
Order Ques. of *re* Member asked to withdraw word 'Liar', 5562 (iii).
Oshawa Customs Collector, Mr. G. F. Blamey, Retirement of (Ques.) 3225 (ii).
Parliament Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 6768, 7023 (iv).
—— Water Supply, &c. (remarks) 7345 (iv).
Peat Gas Producer, Progress *re* Electric Power (Ques.) 708, 985 (i).
Pelagic Sealing Treaty between U.S. and G. B., Protection *re* (Ans.) 3671 (ii).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Newspapers (remarks) 10342 (v).
Postmaster General's Mission to Rome, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 3606 (ii).
Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 955 (i).
Printing Bureau Employees, Religious Status (Ques.) 3606 (ii).
Questions and Answers written, Copies given to Press (remarks) 990 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7126 (iv).
—— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10009, 10059 (v).
—— Debate, Ques. of Order *re* Talking' between Ministers, 7292 (iv).
—— Farmers's Interests, &c. (remarks) 5543 (iii).
Reciprocity, Negotiations by Mr. J. A. Macdonald of 'Globe', at Washington (remarks) *re* Speech at St. Catharines, 2560 (ii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Reciprocity ,Editorial in 'Globe' (remarks) 2743 (ii).
—— Attack of Ministerial Association, Ottawa (personal explanation) 3352 (ii).
Reciprocity, Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3608 (ii).
Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices, &c. (remarks) 6782 (iv).
—— Accepting as read and printing in Hansard (remarks) 6840 (iv).
—— Ques. of Order, Addressing the Chair, 6890 (iv).
Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7670 (iv).
—— Letter from 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7676 (iv).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service, Approval of Govt. (Ques.) 1288 (i).
—— Meaning of Word 'faction', Preparation of Answer (remarks) 1351 (i).
—— (remarks) 942 (i).
Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own Rifles while in England (Ques.) 1087 (i).
Ross Rifles loaned by Can. to G.B., Use at Bisley, &c. (Ques.) 1085 (i).
—— (remarks) 7552 (iv).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly the Flag (remarks) 7687 (iv).
See 'Flags.'
St. Lawrence River Damming, Diversion of the Channel (remarks) 3058 (ii).
—— Information *re* Bill before U. S. Senate (remarks) 4210 (iii).
See 'Long Sault.'
Scugog River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Small Pox Epidemic, Sanitary Condition of House of Commons (remarks) 7252 (iv).
See 'House.'
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7249 (iv).
Speaker's Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola (Ques.) 926 (i).
Speaker's Gallery, Discourtesy to Clergymen, &c. (remarks) 269 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 6184; (year book) 6184 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (Iberville bridge) 6357; (machinery) 6357 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6357; (wharfs and basins) 6359 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6396 (iv).
Canals—Trent (machinery) 6357 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Militia (salaries) 1021 (i).
House of Commons (Dep. Clerk Crown in Chancery) 6167; (electric light attendant) 6175; (messengers) 6173; (sessional clerks) 6167; (stationery) 6175; (telephones) 6172 (iv).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5557 (iii).
Justice—Dom (gratuities) 6161 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6455 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8079 (v).
Post Office—Outside Service (mail service) 6179 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lavatories) 2583; (water supply) 2583; Que. (Montreal barracks) 2569, 3148 (ii)
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6558 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (working expenses) 6[illegible]
P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira branch) 6353 (iv).
U.S. Army Deserters at Niagara Falls, &c., Subjects of Extradition, &c. (Ques.) 707 (i).
Victoria Museum, Defects in Building (remarks) 7350 (iv).
——— Cor. *re* Foundation, Inquiry for, 7666 (iv).

HUNT, Mr. A. B., *Compton.*
Orford Mountain Ry. (B. 100) 1°*, 2254 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7006 (iv).

JAMESON, Mr. C., *Digby.*
Accidents on Canadian Railways, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3943 (ii).
'Arctic,' Rep. of Capt. Bernier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Bait Freezer at Barrington Passage, Assistance *re* Construction (M. for papers*) 3947 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5039, 5293 (ii), 8791 (v).
Bay of Fundy Fishing Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries: *See* 'Hague Arbitration.'
Bear Indian Reserve, Medical Officer, Payments to (Ques.) 3223 (ii).
Bear River Rifle Range, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 3606 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5293 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers, in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Brier Island Light, Application *re* New House (Ques.) 4929 (iii).
——— Lightkeeper, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4929 (iii).
Canadian Naval Service, Applications from Canadians and British Navy (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction &c. (Ques.) 8983 (v).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 28 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8723 (v).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 28) 1° m., 699 (i).
Deep Brook, N.S., Wharf, Expenditure *re* (M. for cor.*) 4383 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5293 (iii).
Digby Public Works, Expenditures *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8440 (v).
Fisheries Generally (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6093 (iv).
Fish landed by Canadian Atlantic Fisheries since 1870, Quantities, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).
Fisheries Protection Service, Seizures by 'Rainbow' (remarks) 4116, 4208 (iii).
Fishery Regulations, Complaint *re* C. K. Golden, for Violation of (Ques.) 2367 (ii).
Fisheries Regulations agreed to at Washington (remarks) 2088 (ii).
——— Changes at Washington (remarks) on motion for Sup., 8502 (v).
Fish Tariff, Application *re* Reciprocity Treaty (Ques.) 2886 (ii).
Fishing Vessel Licenses (B. 27) 1° m., 698 (i).
Fishing Vessels and Customs Regulations, Request to place on Govt. Orders, 3373 (ii).
Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock (Ques.) 1976 (ii).
Grand Manan Fisheries, Prices charged per Hogshead, Weir Licenses, &c., (Ques.) 2367 (ii).
Hague Arbitration, Bay of Fundy, 4683 (iii).
Hague Arbitration, North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, Production of Papers, on M. for Sup., 4588 (iii).
Haskett, Havelock and New Tusket Post Offices, Distance between, &c., (Ques.) 8991 (v).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2018 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9218 (v).
'John B. Young', Str., Stranding of, Govt. Assistance *re* (Ques.) 2368 (ii).
Lunenburg, N.S., Dredging, Plans *re* (Ques.) 2157 (ii).
Meteghan Landing Place, Report *re* Defective Condition Ques.) 4043 (iii).
Meteghan Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).
Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 4929 (iii).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*
Montreal and Maritime Provs., Forwarding of Mails (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
N. T. Ry., Payments, Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
New Edinboro, N.S., Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1283 (i).
N. S. Breakwaters, Contracts *re* Construction in Digby County (Ques.) 657 (i).
Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 9782 (v).
Postmasters Association, Pets *re* Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).
Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3947 (ii).
Ry. Rates to Clergymen, Reduction *re* (Ques.) 2434 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6966 (iv).
——— Fishing Bounties, Payments *re* (remarks) 6670 (iv).
Rockliffe Rifle Ranges, Additional Land Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 8994 (v).
——— (M. for cor.*) 8994 (v).
Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c. (Ques.) 2853 (ii).
Seed Inspection and Sale Act B. 167 (Mr. Fsher) in Com., 8078 (v).
Sick Mariners Dues, Amount of Money in Trust, Investment, &c. (Ques.) 9993 (v).
Smelt Fishing in N. S., Pet. *re* Change for Open Season (Ques.) 9984 (v).
Statutes, French Translation, Corrections (remarks) 8090 (v).
Steam Trawlers, Application *re* Fishing Bounty (Ques.) 4046 (iii).
——— Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3129 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9088 (v); (tobacco production) 6264; (Year Book) 6184 (v)
Charges of Management—(foreign and uncurrent coin) 6061 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1054 (i); Postoffice (clerical assistance) 6063; (contingencies) 6070 (iv).
Fisheries (fish transportation) 6093; (fishways) 6659; (inspectors) 6658; (oyster culture) 6661 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (maritime road) 6543; (shipbuilding) 6488, 6498; (telephones, life stations) 6539 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers maintenance, &c.) 5815; (life saving awards) 5822; (patrol boats) 5829; (P. E.I. winter mail service) 5828; (schools of navigation) 5824 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Chatham) 1610 (i).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax, Dom.) 1592; (Halifax post office) 1587; (Weymouth) 1601 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. |Peterborough) 2616; Ottawa (lighting) 3173; (Rideau Hall) 8882 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Summerside armoury) 1602; (Tignish) 1603 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 1863; (Napierville) 1865 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Argyle Sound) 9504 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (Pullman berths) 5990; (surveys) 5929 (iii).
Scientific Institutions (meteorological service) 6565 (iv).
Steamboat Inspection (life belts &c.) 6572; (magnetic observatry) 6563 (iv).
Trawling: *See* 'Steam Trawling.'
Typhoid Epidemic in Ottawa (remarks) 4723 (iii).
Wesport Signal Stations, When erected, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 1091 (i).

KIDD, Mr. E., *Carleton, O.*
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6209 (iv).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8953 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com,. 8746 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 10572 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6234; (seeds) 6224 (iv).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G., (Minister of Labour) *Waterloo North.*
Accidents on Canadian Railways, Investigation *re* , on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3933 (ii).
Alcoholism International Congress, Delegates to (Ans.) 5632 (iii).
Alien Labour Law on Public Contracts, in B.C. (remarks) 10369 (v).
——— Administration at Sault Ste. Marie, on M. for Sup., 5530 (iii).
B.C. Coal Strikes, (remarks) 6363 (iv).
——— Agreement of Two Years past (remarks) 6366 (iv).
See 'Coal Strike.'
British Patriotic Songs and American Scholars in Western Schools (Ans.) 657 (i).
Cement Merger: *See* "Industrial Mergers."
Coal Strike in B. C. and Alberta, Conciliation *re* (remarks) 6197 (iv).
——— Further Information (read) 6908 (iv).
——— Present Condition (remarks) 7105 (iv).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G.—*Con.*
Coal Strike in B. C. &c., Remarks of Mr. Taylor, M.P., 9721 (v).
See 'Labour.'
Cocaine, Prohibition of Sale (prop. res.) 1803 (i); in Com. on Res., 2063 (ii).
See 'Opium.'
Combines Investigation Act, Changes *re* (Ans.) 663 (i).
——— Report *re* (remarks) 1987 (ii).
See 'Cement.'
Conciliation Boards, Principle *re* Actior (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4242 (iii).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 1302; in Com., 1318 (i).
Echo Lake Post Office, Application *re* Establishment of (Ans.) 8993 (v).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c. (remarks) 9001 (v).
Govt. Bills, Withdrawal of (remarks) 2080 (ii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, Apptmt. of Judge Barron (Ans.) 2158 (ii).
——— Arrangement re Reinstatement (Ans.) 654, 809, 811 (i).
——— (remarks) 1072, 1507 (i).
——— Conciliation Board (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).
——— Inaction of Labour Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5776 (iii).
——— Investigation by Judge Barron, Remuneration to (remarks) 1805 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4261 (iii).
——— Minister's Efforts a Success (Ans.) 811 (i).
——— Resolution from Order of Conductors (Ans.) 9988 (v).
——— Settlement of (remarks) 9692 (v).
——— Statements by Leaders of Ry. Organization (read) in Com. of Sup., 4246-7 (iii).
——— Status of Men reinstated (remarks) 3375 (ii).
——— Tel. from Minister of Labour to Messrs. Berry and Murdock (Ans.) 1105 (i).
Great Northwestern Telegraphers Co., Request *re* Board of Conciliation (Ans.) 5639 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1408, 1534, 1737 (i); on M. for 3°, 2870, (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works *re* Com., Printing of Proceedings (Ans.) 3280 (ii).
——— Representations re I.C.R. Workingmen (correction) 4116 (iii).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Amts. re (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G.—*Con.*
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Demand for Repeal (Mr. Rhodes) (remarks) 6931 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2940 (ii).
See 'U. S. Trusts.'
Industrial Training, Royal Commission, Incompetent Reporting (Ans.) 3463 (ii).
I. C. R. Telegraphers Board of Conciliation, Statute re Granting (Ans.) 2853 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9176 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9463 (v).
Labour Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Labour Strike, Remarks of Mr. Geo. Taylor, on Ques. of Priv., 9721, 9786 (v).
——— Letter from Mr. Geo. Taylor, M.P., re Militia (read) 10344 (v).
Match Factories using Phosphorus, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 1717, 1977 (i).
Matches, Manufacture, Prohibition of Phosphorus B. 10 (prop. res.) 1802; 1° m., 104; 2° m., 1576 (i).
——— (B. 96) in Com. on Res., 2021 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Contractors and Labour Conditions (remarks) 8597 (v).
North Atlantic Collieries, Protest re Nomination on Conciliation Board (remarks) 4209 (iii).
Opium Prohibition (B. 97) Prop. Res., 1803 (i); in Com. on Res., 1°*, 2062; 2° m., 2518, in Com., 2532; 3° m., 2740 (ii); on Senate Amts, 8090 (v);
——— (B .22) 1° m., 468 (1).
See 'Cocaine.'
Petawawa Military Camp, Damages by Fire (remarks) 9250 (v).
Quebec Bridge, Fair Wage Clause for Bridge Workers (Ans.) 5835 (iii), 6757 (iv).
Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3946 (ii).
Reciprocity, Res. of Berlin Board of Trade, Ques. of Priv., 5726 (iii).
——— Speech of Member for N. Oxford (remarks) 5545 (iii).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6817 (iv).
——— Special Rep. of Comparative Prices, laid on Table, 10468 (v).
——— (M.) to print, 10590 (v).
——— (remarks) 10469 (v).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Additional Land Purchase (Ans.) 8994 (v).
Springhill Mines Strike, Conciliation Board *re* Labour Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 4237 (iii).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G.—*Con.*
Springhill Mines Strike, Information *re* Condition (remarks) 2641, 2740 (ii), 6363 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (combines investigation Act) 4280 (iii); (conciliation board) 3384, 3393 (ii); (Labour Gazette) 4230 (iii), 6057 (iv); (salaries) 1484 (i); technical education commission) 3801 (ii).
Technical Education Commission, Progress *re*, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1721 (i).
——— Completion of Work (remarks) 1661 (i).
Trade Commissioner to Mexico, Date of Mr. Bouley's Apptmt. (Ans.) 8993 (v).
United Shoe Machinery Co., Application *re* Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 2672 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Combines Act (remarks) 4300 (iii).
——— Board of Investigation (remarks) 5954 (iv).
U.S. Trusts and Combines, Regulations, &c, U.S. Courts, on M. (Mr. Meighen) for Ret., 4345 (iii).
Western Coal Miners' Strike, Settlement of, Rep. of Conciliation Board, on M. (Mr. Goodeve) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9699 (v).
——— Conciliation Board (remarks) 9070 (v).
Workingmen's Wages, Increased Cost of living (Ans.) 3065 (ii).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Moosejaw.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1934 (i).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9014 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9034 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9523 (v).
Grain Growers Grain Co., incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8918 (v).
Healey, Fanny Mary Relief (B. 199) 1°*, 8476 (v).
Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation Co.'s incorp. (B. 56) 1°*, 1277 (i); in Com. 3994 (iii); on Senate Amts, 6952 (iv).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6151 (iv).
Postmasters Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6064 (iv).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. 8071 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) on Res., 6921 (iv).
——— Res. from Swift Current Board of Trade (read) 4119 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (clerical assistance) 6064 (iv).
Tariff Resolution, Par. in Moosejaw 'News,' Ques. of Priv., 2639 (ii).

KYTE, Mr. G. W., *Richmond (N.S.)*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 369 (i).
I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1140 (i).
Lymburner Contracts with Public Works Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3205 (ii).
Privileges and Elections (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7958 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S. in Com. on Res., 3956 (iii).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7632 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Mail Subsidies and SS.Subventions (Baddeck and Iona) 8764 (v).

LACHANCE, Mr. A., *Quebec Centre.*
Canadian Fisheries, Extent in Marine Miles, Amount realized, &c. (Ques.), 1289 (i).
Militia, Total Annual Cost from 1867 to 1910, &c. (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Quebec Civil Servants, Names of Permanent and Temporary Employees, since 1st Jan. 1905, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2376 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Depth at Low Tide below thirty feet (Ques.) 1718 (i).

LAFORTUNE, Mr. D. A., *Montcalm.*
Address, The, 615 (i).
Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 89) 1°*, 1710 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 8007 (v).
Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6833 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1892 (i).

LAKE, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1958 (i).
Agricultural Products imported into B. C. from U. S., Australia, &c. (Ques.) 7344 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work remarks) 7219 (iv).
Census Enumerators in Man., Apptmt. of, on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9024 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8726 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4661 (iii).
Dom. Lands. Sask., Gross Receipts, Cost of Administration, &c. (Ques.) 3221 (ii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Dom. Lands, S. W. ¼ Section 10, Twp. 38, Range 15, 2nd Meridian, Application *re* Entry, &c. (M. for copy*) 1501 (i).
Drummond, &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 472 (i).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3491 (ii).
Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets, 1910-11 (Ques.) 8096 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P. M. G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2268 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9532 (v).
Homestead Irregularities, Cancellation of Mr. John Bradley's Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5584 (iii).
Homestead Lands thrown open since 1908, Total Amount in Townships 21 to 33, Ranges 18 to 23 (Ques.) 4112 (iii).
See 'Pre-emptions.'
Immigrants entering Canada, Cognizance of Destination (Ques.) 814 (i).
Immigration into Western Can., Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions (M.) to adjn., 1551 (i).
——— Notice of Discussion, 1503 (i).
James Smith Indian Reserve, Burning of two Indians &c. (Ques.) 1082 (i).
Lajord Post Office, Change as Accounting Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Leech, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iii).
Natural Resources, &c. in Sask. and Alberta, Provincial Control, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 3462 (ii).
N. W. M. Police, Coronation Contingent, Number, &c. (remarks) 5836 (iii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission's Report, Inquiry for, 2004, 3672 (ii).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages *re* Fires (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8586 (v).
Post Office Estimates, on objections to passing (remarks) 4298 (iii).
Pre-emptions and Purchased Homesteads, Total Acreage, Amounts received, Annual Interest, &c. (Ques.) 812 (i).
Reciprocity—Opposition to, Ques. of Priv., 5739 (iii).
——— Speech of Min. of Agr. in Montreal, Ques. of Priv., 6199 (iv)
——— Statistics asked from Trade and Commerce Dept.; Reply of Dep. Min. (remarks) 6510 (iv).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Saskatchewan Post Offices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 6505 (iv).
School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re* (Ques.) 3462 (ii).
——— Total Acreage, Amounts realized, &c. (Ques.) 1908, (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (postal guide) 4280 (iii)..
Immigration (seed grain) 3837 (ii).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5583 (iii).
Labour (Labour Gazette) 6057 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8691 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3003; Sask. (Battleford) 2971 (ii).
R. N. W. M. Police—(pay of force) 8598; (subsistence) 8600 (v).
Sussex Street Deptl. Buildings, Ottawa, Alterations in Plans (remarks) 2075 (ii).
University of Sask., Land Endowment, Res. *re* (Ques.) 4111 (iii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827; in Com. 9265 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8719 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8913 (v).
Dunnville Postal Collections, Customs, &c. (Ques.) 3470 (ii).
Dunnville Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1668 (i).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5314, 5459 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1434, 1531 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8745 (v).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1206 (i).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9916 (v).
Public Buildings, Erection and Construction (prop. res.) 4319 (iii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9290 (v).
Railway Mail Service, Names and Dates of Apptmts. of Persons not passing Qualifying Examinations (Ques.) 3855 (ii).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Statement (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5058 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., Res. from Winnipeg Board of Trade (read) 4121 (iii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Correction *re* Stmnt. (Mr. Paterson) *re* Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario, 4223 (iii).
Speeches of Ministers distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3786 (ii); (seeds) 6229; (Quarantine, animals) 5963 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1666; (Napierville) 1866 (i).
Tilbury Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).
Wilhelm Telephone Factory, Seizure at, Compromise (Ques.) 7601 (iv).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).
Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c. (Ques.) 4825 (iii).
Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 80) 1°*, 1640 (i).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7567 (iv).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 201) on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8982 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9257 (v).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U.S. Officials (Ques.) 4672
Census, Omissions in Enumeration (remarks) 9714 (v).
Coroners' Inquests: *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'
Elevators Terminal at Port Arthur, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2425 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5399 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8216 (v).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9613 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Croket) 10261 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8237, 8542, 8918 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 223) in Com., 9510 (v).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8977 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1434, 1527, 1738, 1750 (i); on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 2874 (ii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
Imperial Conference Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 10112 (v).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7810 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B., 9 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 1527 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 977, 1511 (i).
Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3268 (ii).
Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10523 (v).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com., 8234, 8519, 8535, 8642, 8916; (amt.) 8956; 3° m., 8962 (v).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8340 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill, on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2849 (ii).
Public Works Contracts, Penalties *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1604 (i).
Public Works—Generally, Objection to Votes in full, 9552 (v).
Public Works Promised during Western Tour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1630 (i).
Quebec Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) 1639 (i).
Ry. Act (accidents, coroners, &c.) Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 8; 2° m., 956; on M. for 2°, 1407; Debate rsmd. on M. for 2°, 1797 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9377, (amt.) 9378 (v).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7281 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10016, 10036 (v).
——— Letter of 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7678 (iv).
——— North York, Challenge *re* Contest (remarks) 7224 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6781 (iv).
St. Catharines Drill Hall, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1680 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1726 (i).
Senate, Abolition of (prop. res.) 2680 (ii).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2600 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1374 (i).
Supply—Schedule of Proportion of Votes (remarks) 9567 (v).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (survey) 9563 (v).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3440 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Fairville) 1611; (Grand Falls) 1614; (Hampton) 1615; (Hartland) 1617; (Hillsborough) 1621; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (Tracadie) 1624 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax citadel) 1582; (Parrsboro) 1630 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2604; (Seaforth) 2626; (Tilbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2627; (Wiarton) 2636 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. improvements) 2590; (pavements) 2593; (water supply) 2589 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Tignish) 1602 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1665; (Aylmer) 1672; (Grosse Isle) 1677; (Lévis armoury) 1678; (Maisonneuve) 1685; (Marieville) 1697; (Megantic) 1710, 1860; (Montreal barracks) 1864; (Napierville) 1865; (Rigaud) 1887; (Roberval) 1887; (Rock Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (St. Lambert) 1895; (Shawinigan) 1890 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9501; Ont. (repairs, &c.) 9552 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax docks) 9562; (highway protection) 9561; (level crossings) 9509 (v).

LANCTOT, Mr. A., *Richelieu.*
Independence of Parlt., Charges *re* Govt. Employees, painting Private Dwelling, &c., on M. (Mr. Blondin) for Special Com., 4655 (iii).
—— Charges *re* obtaining lumber, &c., from Govt. Store (Ques. of Priv.), 8695 (v).

LANCTOT, Mr. R., *Laprairie-Napierville.*
Agriculture. Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup.. 6285 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Napierville) 1879 (i).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*
Address. The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 16 (i).
Quebec Members, Absence of *re* Extra Session (remarks) 10098 (v).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W., P.C., G.C.M.G., (Prime Minister), *Quebec East.*
Address, The, 44; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 441 (i).
—— Precedence *re* (M.) 5 (i).
—— (M.) to present. 694 (i).
—— Reply from His Ex., (read) 1487 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Address to His Majesty King George, Intention of Govt. *re* (remarks) 7824 (iv).
Adjournment of House (M.) 866 (i).
See 'Coronation,' &c.
Administrator of the Govt. during His Ex.'s Absence in Eng., Emoluments *re* (Ans.) 1089 (i).
Agricultural Implements, resuming adjnd. debate (remarks) 2253 (ii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission's Report (presented) 3952 (iii).
Aliens, Naturalization of, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6907 (iv).
—— Termination of (remarks) 2004 (iv).
—— (remarks) 2271 (ii).
Arbitration Treaty between G.B. and U.S., Information *re* (Ans.) 5834 (iii).
—— (remarks) 5619 (iii).
Ash Wednesday Adjournment (M.) 4115 (iii).
Atlantic, Que. and Western Ry.: *See* 'Charing Cross.'
Aylmer Post Office, Revenues for 1908-9, &c. (Ans.) 984 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1340 (i).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2431 (ii).
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., Ref. for Decision (Ans.) 1091 (i).
Bellevue Mining Disaster (remarks) 1080 (i).
Births and Deaths in Canada, Number, &c., on M. (Mr. McCarthy) for Ret., 2680 (ii).
Birthday of Prime Minister, Congratulations from Leader of the Opposition (remarks) 9 (i).
Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiations with U.S. (remarks) 1575 (i).
British National Songs in N.W. Schools, Remarks of Mr. Armstrong (remarks) 4932 (iii).
British Preference Trade Policy (remarks) 5619 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity,' &c.
Business of the House (remarks) 4117 (iii).
Business of the House for Thursdays (remarks) 1550 (i), 2065 (ii).
Canadian Commisioner to France, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 1971 (ii), 8103 (v).
Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency of, Charge *re* Frauds (Ans.) 1716 (i).
Canadian Light and Power Company, Plans *re* Improvements (remarks) 7261 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3455 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re*, on Personal Explanation (Mr Oliver) 8189 (v).
——— Proposed Motion, 8191 (v).
See 'Oliver, Hon. Mr.'
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 661 (i).
Canada and South America SS Service, Subsidies to (Ans.) 5290 (iii).
Canada and W. Indies SS Subsidy, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 5936 (iv).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr W. M. Martin) in Com., 8570 (v).
Cement Merger, Charges of Sir Sanford Fleming (remarks) 10468 (v).
Census Enumerators, Circulating Pets. *re* Reciprocity (remarks) 6508 (iv).
Charing Cross Bank, Cor. with Dom. Govt. on M. for Copy, 1726 (i).
China-Japan SS Subsidy (B. 103) prop. Res. 1802 (i); M. for Com. on Res., 2503 (ii); in Com., 8675 (v).
Chinese Immigration, Stmnt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion &c. (remarks) 2738 (ii).
——— Total Number, Capita Tax, &c. (Ans.) 788 (i).
Chinese Investigation, Rep. of Judge Murphy, Laid on Table, 9897 (v).
——— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9836 (v).
——— Discussion *re* Judge Murphy's Report, 9928 (v).
Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909 (Ans.) 1103 (i).
Christmas Adjournment: (M.) 1453 (i).
Civil Servants and Municipal Officers (remarks) on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor. 2220 (ii).
——— on Notice of M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1912 (i).
Cobalt Mail Service, Inefficient Service (remarks) 1663 (i).
Collingwood Corner Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ans.) 656 (i).
Colonial Conference, 1911, Canada's Proposals, &c. (Ans.) 1280 (i).
See 'Imperial.'
Commercial Relations, &c., Translation of Papers (Ans.) 3462 (ii).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 5 (i).
——— Lists (presented) 262 (i).
——— (M.) to add Name, 377 (i).
Companies Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Miller) on M. to place on Govt. Orders, 8789 (v).
Consuls General, Status at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 952 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1304 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8709 (v).
See 'Imperial Conference.'
——— Invitation to Members of Parlt (remarks) 1580 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Indian Contingent, (remarks) 6507 (iv).
Coronation Holiday and Bank Holiday (remarks) 5836 (iii).
Courtice, Howard, Emplmt. by Liberal Bureau (remarks) 9784 (v).
Customs Official, Halifax, Dismissal of *re* Municipal Office, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2220 (ii).
Dairy Industry, Nature of Memorials *re*, &c. (Ans.) 2672 (ii).
Debates Committee, Status *re* Duties (remarks) 7015 (iv).
Declaration of London, Consideration by Govt. (Ans.) 5935 (iv).
Deputy Governor, Tel. of Mr. Justice Girouard to Cardinal Vannutelli (Ans.) 702 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election (remarks) on Address, 54 (i).
——— Quotations from Notary Begin, Ques. of Order, 57 (i).
——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* quotations from 'Le Devoir', Ques. of Order, 472 (i).
Easter Adjournement (M.) 6758 (iv).
Electricity Exportation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 1°, 2260 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8120 (v).
Estimates, 1912 (presented) 695 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Authority of Govt. *re* State Officials in Procession (Ans.) 925 (i).
——— Mess. of Homage by Administrator (Ans.) 702, 707 (i).
——— Reception by Federal Govt., &c. (Ans.) 5935 (iv).
——— Reception to Cardinal Vanutelli, (remarks), 6522 (iv).
See 'Speaker'.
Fabre, Mr. Hector, Date of Apptmt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 5933 (iv).
See 'Can. Commissioner.'
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5395 (iii).
——— (remarks) 1510 (i), 7560 (iv).
——— Application *re* Charter, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1970 (ii).
——— Assets, Keeley Mine, Value, &c. (Ans.) 2152 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Farmers' Bank, Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2247 (ii).
——— Endorsation of Premier, Letters read, 2264 (ii).
——— Question *re* Incorp. (remarks) 1904 (i).
——— Representations to Fin. Dept. *re* Stability, &c. (Ans.) 2151 (ii).
Farmers' Delegation, Article in Grain Growers' Guide *re* Hudson Bay Ry., Denial of Stmt., 1574 (i).
——— Speeches, &c. (M.) to print, 3054 (ii).
——— Distribution of Copies of Report (remarks) 6908 (iv).
See 'Western'.
Favoured Nation Treaties, Par. in Toronto 'Globe' *re* Abrogation (remarks) 5292 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity, &c.'
Fenian Raid Veterans' Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9605 (v).
See 'Veterans.'
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8108 (v).
Fish Hatchery at Snake Island, Winnipegosis Lake, Apptmt. of Keeper (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
Fisheries Regulations between Can. and U.S., Proclamation *re* (stmt.) 1725 (i).
——— Modification of (remarks) 1804 (i).
——— Changes at Washington (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8512 (v).
See 'Hague.'
Fraser Mills Postmaster, Defalcation of Funds, Bonds, &c. (Ans.) 1567 (i).
Fruit and Vegetable Growers, Report of Proceedings (M.) to print, 3952 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk), Objection to motion, 5161 (iii).
——— Estimates *re* (remarks) 2005 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Globe' *re* Commencement (remarks) 2261 (ii).
Govt. Business, Morning Sittings (M.) 10095 (v).
——— Precedence on Mondays (M.) 4114 (iii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 3143 (ii).
See 'Business.'
Gov. General, Apptmt. of Duke of Connaught (remarks) 1726 (i).
Grain in Fort William and Port Arthur Elevators, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 3605 (ii).
Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8095, 8536 (v).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S. (remarks) 1725 (i).
——— Fisheries Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1805 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
——— *See* 'Fisheries,' 'North Atlantic'.
Halifax Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 653 (i).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10102 (v).
Hay Claims, Delay in repayment to Canadian Exporters (Ans.) 5103 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1436, 1532, 1743, 1754 (i).
House of Commons, Appointments (M.) 5288; (M.) to conc., 5409 (iii).
——— Galleries of H. of C., Applause in (remarks) 4469 (iii).
——— Number of Persons residing in (Ans.) 3848 (ii).
——— Restaurant, Joint Com. (M.) 469 (i).
——— Restaurant and Speaker's Rooms, Number of Employees (Ans.) 1085 (i).
——— Sessional Clerks, Application *re* Increase of Salary (Ans.) 5404 (iii).
——— Translation Staff Promotions (M.) 527 (i); (M.) *re* Apptmt., 7015 (iv).
——— Water Supply for Parlt. Biuldings *re* Typhoid Epidemic (remarks) 2004 (ii).
Hydro-Electric Commission, Toronto, Mr. McGann's Application *re* (remarks) 1574 (i).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' Conditions *re*, (remarks) on M. (Mr. Lake) 1566 (i).
Imperial Conference, Attendance *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8034-7 (v).
See 'Coronation.'
——— Questions to be submitted by Canada (remarks) 4299 (iii).
——— Secretariat Formation, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7372 (iv).
See 'Secretariat.'
Imperial Conference, Precis Rep. and Verbatim Rep. (remarks) 9693, 9783 (v).
——— Complete Report presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10111 (v).
——— Cor. with Mr. Harcourt (read) 10338 (v); (M.) to print, 10340 (v).
——— Defence Papers laid on Table, 10467 (v).
Imperial Defence Conference, on M. (Mr. Monk) for copies, 2217 (ii).
Imperial Defence Committee Report, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 948 (i).
Indian Act, (Treaty) Amt. (B. 177) 1° m., 7019; on M. for 2°, 7830 (iv); on M. for 3°, 8105 (v).
I.C.R. Terminals at Halifax, Accommodation *re* (remarks) 2376 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1524 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex., 377 (i).
International Waterways Commission (prop. res.) 695 (i).
—— Names of Members, Amounts paid to (Ans.) 3861 (ii).
—— Apptmt. of Chairman (remarks) 4741 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 3 (M Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 874 (i).
See 'Long Sault.'
Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid (Ans.) 6158 (iv).
Jackson, Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ans.) 656 (i).
Japanese Treaty: *See* 'Anglo-Japanese.'
Jardine, John, Claims *re* Govt., Par. in 'Daily Times,' (Ans.) 3847 (ii).
Judicial Vacancy in P.E.I., Apptmt. *re* (remarks) 7553 (iv).
See 'P. E. I.'
Juvenile Delinquents Act. Discussion *re* (remarks) 4383 (iii).
Kelly, Robt., Employmt. by Govt. at Vancouver, B. C., (Ans.) 2665 (ii).
Langdon Subdivisions of C. P. Ry., Mail Service in Northwest (Ans.) 1347 (i).
Lemieux, Hon. Mr., Mission to Rome, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 3607 (ii).
Letter Carriers, Free Transportation *re* Tramways (Ans.) 1104 (i).
—— Superannuation, Amt. to the Act (Ans.) 1488 (i).
Library of Parlt., Joint Com., (M.) 309 (i).
—— Apptmt. of Mr. O. Souliere (M.) 8789 (v).
Lt.-Governor, N. S., Cor. *re* Continuance as Director of N. S. Steel & Coal Co. (Ans.) 2670 (ii).
Long Sault Dam, on St. Lawrence River, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).
—— Cor. between Govt. and Brit bassador (remarks) 3530 (ii).
—— Rep. of American Commissioners, &c., (remarks) 1652 (i).
See 'International Waterways,' 'S Lawrence.'
Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions *re* (Ans.) 1285 (i).
See 'Rural.'
Mails, Illegal Use of for Fraudulent Schemes (Ans.) 802 (i).
—— Illegal Use of by C. D. Sheldon, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 1358 (i).
See 'Sheldon.'
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals, on M. for Sup., 6201 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Man. Boundaries, Speech of Prime Min. at Winnipeg *re*, Cor. &c. (Ans.) 710 (i).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c., (remarks) 6764, 6915 (iv).
Matches, White Phosphorus, Manufacture Prohibition B. 10 (Mr. King) on M. for 2°, 1577 (i).
——B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2052 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex., Estimates (1912) Presented, 695 (i).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2791 (ii).
—— on Explanation (Mr. Boyce) 2439 (ii).
—— Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7444 (iv).
Minister of Militia. Absence from Hse., *re* N.S. Elections (remarks) 2265 (ii).
Minority Representation, Intention *re* Redistribution Bill (Ans.) 9998 (v).
Mormon Propaganda, Prevention by Govt. (Ans.) 5136 (iii).
Mounted Police, Coronation Contingent (remarks) 5836 (iii).
—— Death of Inspectors, &c., (remark in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iv); 8598 (v).
—— Pay and Allowance, &c., (Ans.) 8101 (v).
N. T. Ry., Contracts, Security Deposit, Amount of (Ans.) 1972 (ii).
Natural Resources in Alberta and Sas., Prov. Control, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 3462 (ii).
Naval Conference, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Protocol 3074 (ii).
Naval Construction, Tenders *re* (remarks) 8355 (v).
Naval Defence, Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 54 (i).
—— Direct Contribution in Resolution (remarks) 548 (i).
Naval Service, 'Rainbow', Type of Guns, (Ans.) 1490 (i).
Netherlands Land Mortgage Co., Investments in Canada, Cor. with W. T. R. Preston (Ans.) 789 (i).
—— Further Cor., Reps., &c. (Ans.) 5639 (iii).
—— on Inquiry for Cor., 7349 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co.'s Investments in Canada, on M. for Rep. of W. T. R. Preston, 778; Letter of Chief Justice Sir Charles Fitzpatrick (read) 779 (i).
—— on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) for Com., 781 (i).
—— Statement by Mr. Preston *re* Chief Justice Fitzpatrick, Official Notification (Ans.) 2669 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, Hague Award, Distribution of (remarks) 8094 (v).
See 'Hague.'
North Shore Taxpayers and Voting at Federal Election (Ans.) 1082 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, 1 (i).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy (M.) for Com. of Investigation, 8309 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8315 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv., 8032 (v).
——— (M.) for Com., *re* Investigation, 8791 (v).
——— Information *re* Committee (remarks) 9900 (v).
See 'Can. Northern.'
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6134 (iv).
——— on M. to introduce, 2829 (ii).
Orders Discharged (M.) 4464 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, on using word 'liar', apology insisted on (remarks) 463 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission's Rep., on Inquiry for, 2004 (ii).
Parcel Post Service, Loss *re* (Ans.) 806 (i).
Pelagic Sealing, Treaty between G.B. and U.S., re Protection (remarks) 3670, 3769 (ii).
See 'Seal.'
Pork Packing Industry, Inquiry for Rep. of (remarks) 3530 (ii).
Postal Conventions with Spain, Changes *re* (Ans.) 1104 (i).
Post Office Revenue for Tilbury, &c., for 1904-10 (Ans.) 807 (i).
Post Office Savings Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1563 (i).
Post Office Service in N.S., Weekly and Bi-Weekly (Ans.) 982 (i).
Post Office Supplies for Western Provs., Distribution of (Ans.) 1282 (i).
Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 952 (i).
See 'Eucharistic.'
P.E.I., Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments (remarks) 6927, 7430, 7803 (iv), 8355 (v).
See 'Judicial,' 'Senate,' &c.
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7688, 7798 (iv).
Printing, Joint Com. (M.) 309 (i).
Private Bills (M.) to extend time, 1454 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com. (A. Lanctôt) 3rd Rep. (remarks) 6756 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Warburton) and Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 823 (amt. to amt.) 827; Agreed to (Y. 98; N. 74) 864 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, and Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (remarks) 310 (i).
Questions answered Orally (remarks) 700, 990, 1080 (i).
Questions, Incomplete Answers, &c. (remarks) 1013 (i).
Race Track Gambling, on M. (Mr. Miller) to print evidence, 10467 (v).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 967 (i).
——— B. 4 (Mr. Martin) on M. for 2°, 3946; in Com., 3946 (ii).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5235 (iii).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10193 (v).
Railways, Telegraph Rates, Treaty *re* Control (remarks) 8357 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4741 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4873 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4057 (iii).
——— Assurance *re* Farmers' Interest (remarks) 5542 (iii).
——— Butter and Eggs, Prices in London, Information from Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce (remarks) 6509 (iv).
——— Debate (remarks) 3143 (ii).
——— Debates, Articles in Press *re* Obstruction (remarks) 10001 (v).
——— Debate, Resuming of (remarks) 5939 (iv).
——— Farmers and Manufacturers Interests, Speech of Mr. Nesbitt (remarks) 4663 (iii).
——— Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Rep. *re* Delegation (remarks) 3529 (ii).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1654 (i).
——— On Inquiry for Protocols, 2555 (ii).
——— On Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2439 (ii).
——— Lord Strathcona's Telegram *re* Reported Interview (read) 5126 (iii).
——— Negotiations between Can. and U.S. (remarks) on Address, 48 (i).
——— Negotiations with U.S., Information *re* (remarks) 1506 (i).
——— Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 2070, 2271 (ii).
——— Negotiations, Mr. J. A. Macdonald's Connection *re* (remarks) 4299 (iii).
——— Negotiations at Washington, Submission to Hse. before Signed (remarks) 1805.
——— Procedure *re* Resolutions, &c., (remarks) 5753 (iii).
——— Protests *re* (remarks) 3952 (iii).
——— Pulp and Paper Duties *re* (remarks) 2639 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., on Ques. of Order, *re* referring to previous debate (remarks) 8255 (v).
—— *re* Question (Mr. Monk) 4114 (iii).
—— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5950 (iv).
—— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609 (ii).
—— Statistics, Accepting as Read and printing in Hansard (remarks) 6857 (iv).
—— Trade Statistics with U.S. (remarks) 6675 (iv).
—— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7671 (iv).
—— letter from 'Globe' reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7678 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5736 (iii).
—— on Inquiry for (Mr. Campbell), 5954 (iv).
Returns, Notice to Members of bringing down (remarks) 5939 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8579 (v).
Rivière des Prairies Dredging Rep., on M. (Mr. Wilson) for Copy, 2163 (ii).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Defense at Public Functions (remarks) 941 (i).
Rosendale Mail Service on C.N.R., Pets. *re* (Ans.) 1291 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Manufacture of Stamps and Postcards &c. (Ans.) 983 (i).
—— Number &c. (Ans.) 983 (i).
Rural Mail Routes operating in Man. (Ans.) 1105 (i).
Rural Mail Service in East Elgin, Number, &c. (Ans.) 983 (i).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service (remarks) 9995 (v).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., on Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) *re* Amendments, 5723 (iii).
St. Johns, P.Q., Postmaster, Refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir' (Ans.) 1090 (i).
St. Lawrence River, Damming Long Sault Rapids, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3229 (ii).
—— Information *re* Bill before U.S. Senate (remarks) 4210 (iii).
—— on Inquiry for Papers, 3058 (ii).
—— Legislation *re* at Washington (remarks) 3283 (ii).
—— Letter from Gov. Dix (remarks) 3840 (ii).
—— (remarks) *re* Mr. Allison's letter, 3769 (ii).
See "Long Sault".

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re* (Ans.) 3462 (ii).
See 'Natural Resources.'
Seal Fisheries Negotiations (remarks) 9594 (v).
—— Cor. *re* (remarks) 10197 (v).
—— Papers laid on Table, 10337 (v).
See 'Pelagic.'
Secretariat at London, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Papers, 5836 (iii).
—— on Inquiry for Papers, 1507 (i).
See 'Imperial Conference,' &c.
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2663 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2709 (ii).
—— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1726 (i).
Senate, Reform of, on Prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4314 (iii).
Senate Vacancy in P. E. I. (remarks) 2074 (ii).
See "Judicial."
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1373 (i).
See "Mails."
Small Pox Epidemic, Condition of House of Commons (remarks) 7252 (iv).
See 'Typhoid.'
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7248 (iv).
South African Parlt., Report of P. M. G. (remarks) 1580 (i).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3346 (ii).
Speaker of the House, Wearing of Official Robes, &c. (Ans.) 706 (i).
Speakers' Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola (Ans.) 926 (i).
—— Purchase of Birds (Ans.) 928 (i).
—— Purchase of Glassware (Ans.) 929 (i).
—— Purchase of Gramophone Records (Ans.) 927 (i).
—— Rental of Piano, &c. (Ans.) 927 (i).
Stamp Cancelling Machine, Cost, Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 806 (i).
Supply, (M.) for Com., 695 (i).
Supply, for Public Works (remarks) 10354 (v).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (public health) 5981 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1485; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 1013; High Commissioner (salaries) 1486 (i); Privy Council (clerkships) 8750 (v); (salaries) 1013 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8752; (Baddock and Iona) 8763 (iv); (Bonaventure River

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

and N. B.) 8764 (iv); (Canada and Australia) 8764 (v); (Canada and Cuba) 6058 (iv), 8775; Canada and G. B.) 8773; (Canada and Mexico) 8781; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8783; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 8785; (Port Mulgrave, &c.,) 8786; (P. E. I. and G. B.) 8788; (Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Islands, B.C.) 8787; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 8788 (v).

Miscellaneous—(Coronation, members and senators) 8680 (Imperial Conference ministers expenses) 8679; (Paris agency) 8694; (Pelagic sealing conference) 8678 (v).

Mounted Police (Coronation contingent) 8752 (pay of force) 8598);(subsistence) 8599 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax citadel) 1581 (i).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act) 6058; (commercial agents) 6059; (inspectors) 6059 (iv).

Taylor, Mr. Geo., Retirement as Chief Whip (remarks) 5 (i).

Trade Commissioners, Names of Countries, &c. (Ans.) 2156 (ii).

Trade Relations with Germany (remarks) 8403 (v).

Typhoid Epidemic, Prorogation of House (Ans.) 4676 (iii).

See 'Smallpox.'

U. S. Immigration Agents and Canadian Travellers (remarks) 6119 (iv).

—— Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations *re* (Ans.) 984 (i).

—— Trusts and Combines, Regulations in U. S. Courts, &c., on M. (Mr. Meighen) for Ret., 4346 (iii).

U. S. Warships on Great Lakes, Armament of (Ans.) 7026; (remarks) 6362 (iv).

—— Passing through Canadian Canals, Permission from Govt. (Ans.) 10335 (v); (remarks) 6118, 7254 (iv).

University of Sask., Land Endowment *re*, (Ans.) 4111 (iii) .

Unorganized Districts, Deferred Elections (remarks) 10100 (v).

See 'Voters.'

Veterans, Grants to (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5217 (iii).

See 'Fenians.'

Voters Lists in Unorganized Territories, Delay, &c. (remarks) 9909 (v).

'Wanda' Yacht, Valuation by Customs (remarks) 5628 (iii).

Water Powers, Conservation of (remarks) 7261 (iv).

Water Powers owned by Dom., Legislation *re* Regulating (Ans.) 7804 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

See 'Long Sault,' &c.

Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 695 (i).

Wentworth, Number of Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret., 2557 (ii).

Westbrook Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1103 (i).

Western Farmers' Delegation, Control of Rates, &c. (remarks) 1508 (i).

See 'Farmers.'

Western Tour, and Tariff Promises (remarks) on Address, 45 (i).

W. Indies SS. Service, Specification *re* Contract (Ans.) 4466, 4674, 4925 (iii).

Whips, &c.: *See* 'Taylor.'

Winnipeg International Exposition, Govt. Assistance to (Ans.) 708 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).

Yukon Bear Import Tax Repeal B. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 1979 (ii).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*

Reciprocity with U. S., Res. from Yarmouth Farmers' Association (read) 4122 (iii).

—— Yarmouth Board of Trade, Res. *re* (read) 5550 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R. (Postmaster General), *Gaspé.*

Arrow Lake Postal Clerk (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of (remarks) *re* Question, 2373 (ii).

Bark Lake Post Office, Closing and Opening (Ans.) 6270 (iv).

Barrington Passage Bait Freezers Ret. (stmnt) 8889 (v).

Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal, Grantees, Rentals paid, Sums expended by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2197 (ii).

Birch Grove Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).

Cable, G.B. and Canada State-owned, Proposal *re* by G.B. and Can. (Ans.) 1905 (i).

See 'Telegraphs.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8815 (v).

Canso and Guyborough Mail Service, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 8994 (v).

Chemin Gouin Postmastership. Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 7038 (iv).

—— Postmaster A. C. Miquelon, Pension, &c. (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2506 (ii).

Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. (B. 217) in Com. on Res., 8906, 8924 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Cobalt Mail Service to Cochrane (remarks) 1804 (i).
Coronation Celebration at Ottawa, Invitation to Ministers (remarks) 10353 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Apptmt. of Col. Landry (remarks) 8093 (v).
Dixon Post Office, Pets. *re* Change of Location (Ans.) 4670 (iii).
Don. Post Office, Mail Service to Toronto, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 9987 (v).
Dunnville Postal and Customs Collections (Ans.) 3470 (ii).
Elora Post Office, Site, Price, &c. (Ans.) 6505 (iv).
English Mails to Mar. Provs.: *See* 'Mail Service.'
Escott Postmastership, Apptmt of, Charges against late Postmaster (Ans.) 4926 (iii).
—— Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6181 (iv).
—— Postmaster's Salary, Date of Increase (Ans.) 7602 (iv).
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Decoration of Govt. Buildings (remarks) 3369 (ii).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, Speech of P. M. G. at Montreal (remarks) 2080, 2268 (ii).
Franking for Fraudulent Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
See 'Mails.'
Fraser River Mail Service, Application *re* (Ans.) 3463 (ii).
Gaspe Mail Service, Revenue *re* (Ans.) 3854 (ii).
Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders (Ans.) 7038 (iv).
Hall's Prairie Post Office, Pet. *re* Location, &c. (Ans.) 3468 (ii).
Haskett, Havelock, and New Tuskett Post offices, Distances between &c. (Ans.) 8991 (v).
Herron Post Office, Progress *re* (remarks) 9588 (v).
I. C. R. Mail Clerks allowing friends to ride in Mail Cars (Ans.) 8584 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9457 (v).
Leamington Post Office, Cost in Detail (Ans.) 9782 (v).
Letter Carriers, New Westminster, Free Transportation *re* Tramways, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2194 (ii).
Mails Delayed and mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c. (Ans.) 2372 (ii), 4668 (iii).
Mail Delivery, Free, Conditions *re* (Ans.) 4925 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c. (Ans.) 9538-9 (v).
Mail Service Estimates, Objections *re* passing (remarks) 4297 (iii).
Mail Service in Mar. Provs., Delivery of English Mails (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9544 (v).
—— (remarks) 8794 (v).
Maritime Mail Service, Delay *re*, Representations by Board of Trade, Halifax (remarks) 2376 (ii).
Montreal and Maritime Provs. Mail, Forwarding of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).
Meteghan Centre Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4296 (iii).
Ministers Speeches, distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).
Ministers Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7441 (iv).
Mississippi Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9252 (v).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. B. 48 (Mr. Brodeur) on Senate Amts., 9534 (v).
Montreal Letter Carriers, Addition to (remarks) 2647 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec (B. 222) 1° m., 9228; in Com., 9495 (v).
Naval Coronation Contingent, Names of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 9375 (v).
Naval Service, Medical Examiners for Recruits (Ans.) 8991 (v).
Nelson Postal Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Newspapers, Postal Regulations *re* Distribution of (remarks) 10341 (v).
Newspaper Trains, Special, Cost of Operation (Ans.) 9983 (v).
Parcel Post Rates, Reduction *re* (Ans.) 5934 (iv).
Parcel Post, Express Rates (remarks) 9915, 9937 (v).
Peel County Mail Service (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
—— Rural Mail Delivery, Generally (remarks) 10361 (v).
Postage Stamps, Canadian Design (remarks) 7108 (iv).
—— Refusal of Imperial Design (remarks) 6908 (iv).
Postage Stamps, New Issue, Condemnation *re* (Ans.) 9990 (v).
—— Prizes, Inspection *re* (Ans.) 5402 (iii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Increases to, Classification *re* Offices, &c. (Ans.) 5934 (iv).
—— Pets. *re* Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (stamp box) Amt. (B. 104) 1° m., 2736 (ii); 2° m., 8065 (v).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. (B. 216) M. for Com. on Res., 8585; in Com. on Res., 8906; in Com., 9567-8, 9577 (v).

Post Office Collections, Revenue in Cities (Ans.) 3862 (ii).

Post Office Dept., Overcrowding in Basement (Ans.) 6667 (iv).

Post Office Matters, Generally (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).

Post Office Revenue and Expenditure, Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 10355 (v).

Post Office and Customs, Revenues for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw (Ans.) 4673 (iii).

Pratt's Siding Post Office, Request *re* Establishment (Ans.) 3067 (ii).

Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Sale of (remarks) 7109 (iv).

Railway Mail Clerks, Injuries, &c., Grants *re* (Ans.) 3860 (ii), 9537 (v)

——— Minimum and Maximum Salary, Claims *re* Increase (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

——— Names of Persons not passing Qualifying Examination, Date of Apptmts., &c. (Ans.) 3855 (ii).

See 'Post Office, B. 216, 'Supply.'

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 4005 (iii).

——— Mr. Bryce's Instructions *re* (remarks) 4141 (iii).

——— Denial *re* Annexationist (remarks) 4054 (iii).

'Review of Reviews' Collection of Extra Postage (Ans.) 2371 (ii).

Rural Mail Delivery in Renfrew County (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).

See 'Mail Routes,' 'Peel,' &c.

Saskatchewan Post Offices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 6505 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

Sheldon, C. D., Return to Canada (remarks) 6201 (iv).

Sorel Shipyard, Inquiry for Official Rep., 10203 (v).

Stamp Vending Machine: *See* 'P. O. B., 104.'

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Post Office (clerical assistance) 6063 (iv); (salaries) 4280 (iii).

Immigration (agents) 5185 (iii).

Post Office (Curren, R.C., gratuity) 4283; (letter carriers' boots) 4283 (iii); (mails) 6076; (mail service) 6179; (miscellaneous) 6182 (iv); (postmasters' salaries) 4290; (ry. mail clerks) 4281, 4286 (iii), 6082, 6179; (ry. mail clerks, compensation) 6088 (iv); (rural postmasters) 4281 (iii); (salaries) 6178 (iv); (stamps) 4280; (superannuation) 4285 (iii).

Public Works—Building—Ont. (Athens) 2092 (ii).

Tadousac Postmaster, Charges *re*, Apptmt. of Successor (Ans.) 5133 (iii).

Telegraph and Cable Services Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9641 (v).

——— *See* 'Cable.'

Thibodeau, Mr. Frank, Salary as Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 8100 (v).

Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause (Ans.) 3466 (ii).

Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance *re* (Ans.) 3861 (ii).

U.S. Tax on Canadian Shipping (remarks) 9248 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods Act Amt. (B. 212) 1°*, 8887; in Com., 9348 (v).

Windsor Letter Carrier, Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H., *Simcoe South.*

Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 220 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 9225, (i).

Aliens outside of Canada, Inquiry for Ret., 7554 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9221 (v).

Bank Act, Legislation this Session (remarks) 6441, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).

Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3602 (ii).

Barlow, John R., Emplymt. by Geological Dept. (Ques.) 8583 (v).

Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits *re* cutting Timber, Agent's Name, &c. (Ques.) 4304-5 (iii).

——— Place of Residence (Ques.) 5238 (iii).

See 'Christian.'

Big Bay Point Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).

Bookkeeping of Depts., Names of Employees in Departments, &c. (Ques.) 1718 (i).

——— *See* 'Falconer.'

Bradford Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6120 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8822; in Com., 9258 (v).

C.P.Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1834 (i).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3063 (ii).

Canada West Loan Corporation incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8564 (v).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8569 (v).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9722 (v).
Christian Island Indian Reserve, Answer to Question (remarks) 4567 (iii).
——— *See* 'Beauscleil.'
Chrysler, Mr. F. H., Amounts paid by Govt. *re* Legal Service from 1896 to the present (M. for ret.*) 1727 (i).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy re, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2224 (ii).
Clarry, Mr. L. F., Payments to by Govt. for Professional Services (Ques.) 813 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7811 (iv).
Copyright Act Amt., Legislation *re* (remarks) 7557 (iv), 9594 (v).
Declaration of London. Consideration by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 5935 (iv).
Elevators, Terminals, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3499 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on Prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2381 (ii).
Falconer System of Book-keeping, Adoption of (Ques.) 1904 (i).
——— *See* 'Book-keeping.'
Farmers' Bank, Negligence of Govt., Protection (amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 8193, 8209, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 97) 8232 (v).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compention, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9617 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6639 (iv).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8655 (v).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) Ques. of Order, 9523 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238 (v).
G.T.Ry. Pension Fund, Rules, Regulations, &c. (Ques) 2153 (ii).
G.T.R. Trainmen's Strike, Agreement *re* reinstatement, &c. (Ques.) 811 (i).
——— Minister's efforts a Success, &c. (Ques.) 810 (i).
——— Conciliation Board (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
——— Status of Men Reinstated (remarks) 3375 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry., Development Co. (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 2666 (ii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry., Eastern Division Overbreak, Agreement *re* (Ques.) 1570 (i).
——— Lumsden Investigation, Total Cost *re* (Ques.) 1493 (i).
——— *See* 'Natl. Transcl. Ry.'
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9305 (v).
Holland Peat Investigations, &c. (Ques.) 4303 (iii).
Imperial Conference, Questions to be submitted by Canada, Par. from 'Morning Post' quoted, 4298 (iii).
——— Secretariat, &c., on M for Com. on Ways and Means, 7378 (iv).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 905 (i).
Judges appointed since 1896, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 8095 (v).
Legal Agents, appointed by Govt., Precautions *re* acting for Private Parties (Ques.) 813 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3249 (ii).
Mineral Deposits, Circular *re* Information by F. H. Forchet (Ques.) 4305 (iii).
Ministers, Speeches of, distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9254 (v).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2777 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9241; in Com., 9496 (v).
N.T.Ry., Classification, &c., Arbitration Rep., *re* Investigation (Ques.) 1490 (i).
——— Completion of Eastern Division (Ques.) 1099 (i).
——— Construction Work, Estimated, Quantity, Cost, Bridges, &c. (M. for ret.*) 785 (i).
——— Contracts for Eastern Division, &c., (Ques.) 1095 (i).
——— Contracts Security Deposit, Amount of (Ques.) 1971 (ii).
——— Customs Duties on Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 8583 (v).
——— Defaulting Contractors, Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 1281 (i).
——— Eastern Division, Expenditure *re* 21 Contracts (M. for ret.) 5136 (iii).
——— Eastern Division Overbreak, Agreement *re* Progress Estimates (Ques.) 2434 (ii).
——— Eastern Division, Section Houses &c. (Ques.) 1099 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

N.T.Ry., Eastern Division, Total Cost, to 31st Dec., 1910 inclusive of Quebec Bridge (Ques.) 5130 (iii).

——— Eastern Div., Total Expenditure *re* Construction &c. (Ques.) 9430 (v).

——— Estimated Cost and Mileage of Fencing, &c. (Ques.) 1094 (i).

——— Execution of Work under Contract, Delay *re* (Ques.) 6668 (iv).

——— Expenditure, Difference in Amount in Ret. &c. (Ques.) 4827 (iii).

——— Haney, Quinlan & Robertson, Contract *re* Construction of Locomotive Shops east of Winnipeg (M. for copy*) 785 (i).

——— Labour Conditions, Charges *re* Supplies (remarks) 8596 (v).

——— Over-Classification, Investigation, Reps. (M. for copy*) 4677 (iii).

——— Over-Classifications, Reduction *re* (remarks) 6272 (iv); 9899, 9995 (v).

——— Provision in Contract *re* G.T.P. taking over completed Sections (Ques.) 1093 (i).

——— Total Cost to complete Construction (Ques.) 5135 (iii).

——— Western Div., Total Cost *re* Construction (Ques.) 7591 (iv).

See "G.T.P. Ry."

Newmarket Canal &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10515 (v).

New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co's B. 170, on M. for Com., 8094 (v).

Niagara Falls Water Power, Quantity developed, &c. (Ques.) 5132 (iii).

Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8348, (amt.) 8350; Neg. (Y. 65; N. 99) 8353 (v).

Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8594 (v).

P.E.I. Judicial Vacancy, Delay in Apptmt. (remarks) 7431 (iv).

P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Richards) for Copies, 2182 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Blocking Public Accounts Com., 990 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Warburton) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 527, 818 (amt.) 823 (i).

——— Proposed Amendment (notice) 696 (i).

Public Buildings for Post Offices, &c., Number, Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.°) 786 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3954 (iii), 7347 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders *re* Contract (M. for copies) 713, 1497 (i), 3068 (ii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge, American Engineers consulted by Min. of Rys. (Ques.) 697 (i).

——— Amount expended *re* Supervision (remarks) 6671 (iv).

——— Construction, Information *re* (prop. res.) 4319 (iii).

——— Contract with M. P. Davis, dated July 27th, 1903, Transfer of Same to Govt. &c. (M. for ret.*) 785 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 4567 (iii).

——— Employment of Mr. Cooper *re* Inspection (Ques.) 6663 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* Investigations, &c. (Ques.) 8102 (v).

——— Financial Loan, Interest, &c. (Ques.) 4665 (iii).

——— Investigation *re* Tunnel Construction (Ques.) 6268 (iv).

——— Plans, Contract, &c. (remarks) 6273 (iv).

——— Plans and Specifications, Approval by Chief Engineer of G.T.Ry. Co. (Ques.) 4826 (iii).

——— Plans and Specifications, Instructions *re* (M. for papers*) 4677 (iii).

——— Remuneration, Supervision, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6449 (iv). 6670 (iv).

——— Superstructure Contract (remarks) 6670 (iv).

Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8400; in Com., 9314, 9379 (v).

Ry. Act Amt. (1903) c. 31, Proclamation *re* (M. for copy*) 786 (i).

Railway Crossings, Action of Ry. Comission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).

Ry. Shelter for Sectionmen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6437 (iv).

Railway Traffic Connections, Arrangements between Provinces and Ry. Commissioners (Ques.) 696 (i).

Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5053 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 3681 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) Ques. of Order, 7550 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) Globe's Report *re* (remarks) 7602, 7671 (iv).

——— British Tariff Commission, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 6268 (iv).

——— Correction *re* Figures in Speech in Hansard, 3770 (ii).

——— Cor. *re*, Inquiry for, 2988 (ii).

——— Denial of Stmnt. *re* Member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) 5029 (iii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Reciprocity with U.S., Farmers' and Manufacturers' Interests, Speech of Mr. Nesbitt, 4663 (iii).

—— French Imports, Quantity, Value, Rates of Duty &c. (Ques.) 8097 (v).

—— Obstruction by Opposition (remarks) 9887 (v).

—— Ques. of Order, 5030 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Order *re* Interruptions, 4451 (iii).

—— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5953 (iv).

—— Statistics, Accepting as Read, and Printing in Hansard (remarks) 6858 (iv).

—— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Ques. of Order, 6892 (iv).

—— Statistics, Question *re* Vote of Member for Labelle, 6839 (iv).

—— U. S., Govt. Publication *re* Bureau of Statistics (remarks) 6673 (iv).

Returns, Delays in Preparation (remarks) 7555 (iv).

—— Inquiry for, 7256 (iv).

—— Notice to Members (remarks) 5939 (iv).

'Rexall', Registration by United Drug Co. ing, &c., (Ques.) 4672 (iii).

Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9171 (v).

Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2650 (ii).

Senate Chamber, Expenditure for Decoratting, &c. (Ques.) 1100 (i).

Senate, Reform of, on prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4312 (iii).

South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3347 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (seeds) 6223; Quarantine (animals' health) 5976 (iv).

Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6411 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (macadamizing) 6408 (iv).

Canals—Cornwall (enlarging office) 6409 (iv).

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 6410 (iv).

Canals — Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6412 (iv).

Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6358; (tugs) 6359 (iv).

Canals—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 6427; (surveys, inspections, &c.) 6452 (iv).

Canals—Murray (dredging) 6410 (iv).

Canals—Que. (dredging) 6411 (iv).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (lock gates, &c.) 6417; (upper entrance) 6416 (iv).

Canals—Trent (flood damages) 6454; (improvements) 6420 (iv).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6399; (stone protection) 6425 (iv).

Canals—Williamsburg (entrance pier) 6426; (machinery) 6427 (iv).

Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6639; (legal expenses) 6661; (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6197 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3383, 3410; Ques. of Order, 3450 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8752 (v).

Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8681 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Lunenburg) 1595 (i); Ottawa (McGillivray's contract) 5994 (iv).

Public Works — Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Amaguadees Pond) 9500; (Argyle Sound) 9501 (v).

Railways—G.T.P. (govt. director) 6448 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Fredericton) 5916 (iii); (freight cars) 5985 (iv); (Halifax) 5919; (highways protection) 5917; (Str. Scotia) 5928 (iii); (working expenses) 6341 (iv).

Railways—Miscellaneous (inspections) 6452; (McGill University) 6445; (official cars) 6447; (ry. commissioners) 6427; (remunerations) 6449 (iv).

Victoria Museum, Defects in Building (remarks) 7351 (iv).

Water Carried Freight, Value, &c. (remarks) 6671 (iv).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N., *Huron, West.*

Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 417 (i).

Baggage Smashing Prevention (B. 129) 1° m., 4198 (iii).

Bank Act Amts. (B. 297) 1° m., 8695 (v).

Business of the House, Public Bills for Thursdays (remarks) 2064 (ii).

Canada Shipping Act (registration) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 6116 (iv).

Commercial Agent at Washington (remarks) 9511 (v).

Criminal Code (homicide by hunters) Amt. (B. 40) 1° m., 987 (i).

Daylight Saving (B. 26) 1°*, 663 (i).

Food Supplies in Cold Storage (B. 112) 1° m., 2983 (ii).

Foreign Consuls, Official Status (remarks) 9511 (v).

Gov. General, Duke of Connaught, Rumours *re* Apptmt. (remarks) 1725 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (marking) Amt. (B. 154) 1° m., 6034 (iv).

Load Lines on Ships (B. 98) 1° m., 2063 (ii).

Militia Regulations governing Admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1001 (i).

Offensive Weapons (B. 86) 1° m., 1642 (i).

—— Pets. *re* Legislation (Ques.) 3064 (ii).

—— Sale of, Par. in Montreal Papers *re* (remarks) 2557 (ii).

Ottawa City Health Conditions (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6367 (iv).

Pickford and Black SS. Service between Can. and W. Indies, Contract *re* (Ques.) 4465 (iii).

Poisons (Cocaine) Sales (B. 13) 1° m., 259 (i).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*
Secret Commissions (B. 87) 1° m., 1646 (i).
Sewage Disposal (B. 122) 1° m., 4039 (iii).
Water for Drinking Purposes (B. 131) 1° m., 4564 (iii).
Wireless Telegraphy on Ships (B. 41) 1° m., 988 (i).

LOGGIE, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*
Fisheries Act (B.C. licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8447 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10239 (v).
Herring Traps, Close Season *re* (remarks) 2086 (ii).
I.C.R. Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1160 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 863 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) 10084 (v).

LORTIE, Mr. J. A., *Soulanges.*
Canadian Light and Power Co., Lease between Govt. &c. (M. for copy*) 1501 (i).
Reciprocity, Vote *re*, Par. in "Le Canada", Ques. of Priv., 3953 (iii).
Sevigny Island, Change of Name, &c. (Ques.) 1491 (i).
Water Powers on St. Lawrence, Concessions granted (Ques.) 9780 (v).

LOW, Mr. T. A., *Renfrew, South.*
Bankers' Association, Agreement *re* Competition (Ques.) 3466 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5297 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7186 (iv).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*
Address, The, 567 (i).
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2172 (ii).
British National Songs in N. W. Schools, Remarks of Mr. Armstrong (remarks) 4932 (iii).
C.P.Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1856 (i).
Dom. Steel Company of Canada, Date of Incorporation, Capital, &c. (Ques.) 9690 (v).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Ques. of Order, 144 (i).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8464 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P. M. G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2270 (ii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr Beattie) 4361; (M.) to adjn., Debate, 4364; Agreed to (Y. 89; N. 49) 4380 (iii).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8975 (v).
Imperial Conference, Secretariat Formation, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7390 (iv).
I. C. R., Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1159 (i).
—— Telegraphers Board of Conciliation, Statute *re* Granted (Ques.) 2853 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9177 (v).
Negro Immigration, Restrictions *re* (remarks) 6527 (iv).
Newfoundland Export Trade, Total Value, Imports, &c. (Ques.) 2854 (ii).
Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8594 (v).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3890 (ii).
Public Works promised during Western Tours (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1632 (i).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5114 (iii).
Reciprocity, Agricultural Implements (remarks) 5745 (iii).
SUPPLY.
Lighthouse and Coast Service ('Earl Grey') 6485 (iv); Postoffice (ry. mail clerks) 4285 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Parrsboro) 1632 (i).
West Indies Trade, Exports and Imports, Total Value (Ans.) 2854 (ii).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *Toronto, South.*
American War Vessels, passing through Canadian Canals, Request from Washington *re* (Ques.) 10334 (v).
Baby Farm, Toronto, Sale of, Competition *re* (Ques.) 2155 (ii).
See 'Toronto Barracks.'
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7573 (iv).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8566 (v).
Census, Omissions in Enumerations, in Toronto (remarks) 10099 (v).
Coal Miners' Strike in West, Rep. of Conciliation Board, &c., on M. (Mr. Goodeve) 9704 (v).
Copyright Law and Imperial Copyright Conference, Canada's Action *re* (Ques.) 5124 (iii).
—— Legislation *re* (remarks) 9595 (v).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Coronation, Naval Cadets, Method of Selection, &c. (Ques.) 9986 (v).

Curran, R. E., Compensation for Injuries *re* Ry. Mail Service (M. for cor.*) 3948 (ii).

Customs Collections in Cities, Revenues, &c. (Ques.) 4012 (iii).
See 'Postoffice.'

Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. (B. 37) 1° m., 924 (i).

Don Post Office, Mail Service to Toronto, &c., Name of Contractor (Ques.) 9987 (v).

Donlands Postoffice, Removal of Site (M. for cor.*) 9994 (v).

Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff (Ques.) 10196 (v).

Empire Life Insurance Co., of Canada, incorp., (B. 71) 1°*. 1488 (i).

Farm Labourers, O.C., *re* Immigration Regulations from U.S., (remarks) 10099 (v).

Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr Beattie) 4355 (iii).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8664 (v).

Garden Seeds purchased for Indians in N. W., Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1717 (i).

Gas Meters in Toronto, Complaints *re* Excessive Measurements (Ques.) 3280 (ii).

Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U. S. and British, Authority *re* (Ques.) 9965 (v).

Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8550 (v).

G. T. Trainmen's Strike, Apptmt. of Judge Barron as Investigator (Ques.) 2158 (ii).

——— Resolution from Order of Ry. Conductors, (Ques.) 9988 (v).

——— Tel. sent by Minister of Labour to Messrs. Berry and Murdock (Ques.) 1105 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1421, 1548. 1729, 1761 (i).

Humber River Bridge, G. T. Ry. Plans *re* (Ques.) 2885 (ii).

Hydo-Electric Power Commission, Toronto, Mr. McGann's Application *re* (remarks) 1574 (i).

Immigrants, Efficient Medical Inspection, &c., (Ques.) 1716 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1520 (i).

International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 878 (i); in Com., 9193 (v).

International Waterways Commission, Names of Members, Amounts paid to, &c.. (Ques.) 3861 (ii).

——— Regulations *re* (remarks) 7259 (iv).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

International Waterways Commission, Inquiry for Ret., 4569 (iii).

Letter Carriers Superannuation, Amt. to the Act (Ques.) 1488 (i).

Levis Dry Dock, Plans Filed by Sir Robt. Perks, Subsidy, &c., (Ques.) 712 (i).

Minority Representation, Redistribution Bill, Intention *re* (Ques.) 9988 (v).

——— Speech of Sir Richard Cartwright (remarks) 9693 (v).

Munderloh and Company Limited Patent Relief (B. 203) 1°*, 8582 (v).

N. T. Ry. and Temiskaming and Northern Ont. Ry., Agreement *re* running Rights, &c., (Ques.) 2435 (ii).

Naval Cruisers ordered for Canada, Stmnt. in 'Navy,' (Ques.) 793 (i).

Navigation Licenses on Great Lakes, Regulations by U. S. Govt. (Ques.) 2375 (ii).

Orders Discharged (M.) 4464 (iii).

Postoffice Collections. Revenue in Cities, &c., (Ques.) 3862 (ii).

Postoffice and Customs Revenue for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw from 1906 to 1910 (Ques.) 4673 (iii).
See Customs.

Printing Bureau, Paper purchased, Inspection of (Ques.) 2373 (ii).

Ry. Act (commutation tickets) Amt. (B. 78) 1° m., 1551 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8402 (v).

Ry. Employees Protection B. 114 (Mr. R. Smith) on M. for 1°, 3219 (ii).

Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10191 (v).

Railway Mail Clerks, Accidents to, Grants *re* Injuries, &c. (Ques.) 3859 (ii).

——— Maximum and Minimum Salary, Claims *re* Increase. &c., (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

Railway Sectionmen, Complaints *re* Overwork, &c. (Ques.) 9987 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 9938 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4078 (iii).

———Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10016 (v).

——— North York, Challenge to Contest Riding (remarks) 7220 (iv).

——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, &c., (remarks) 6791, 6895 (iv).

Roman Catholic Church, Attack *re* by Member, Protest *re*, 3371 (ii).

Steel Bounties. Total Amount paid, &c., (Ques.) 3470 (ii).

Toronto Barracks Site, (Baby Farm) Re-Valuations, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 981 (i).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Toronto Barracks Site, (Ques.) 2153 (ii).
——— (remarks) 7557 (iv).
See 'Baby,'
Toronto Federal Buildings, Plan of Erection (remarks) 8479 (v).
Toronto Harbour Consolidation Act Amt. (B. 175) 1°*, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8235, 8535 (v).
Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal of (Ques.) 2367 (ii).
Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re* and Fair Wage Clause (Ques.) 3466 (ii).
Toronto Post Office, Addition to, Change *re* Specifications (Ques.) 805 (i).
Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance to Widow (Ques.) 3861 (ii).
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Members, Reps., O. Cs., &c., (M. for copies*) 1339 (i).
See 'International.'

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *York, South.*
Address, The, 98 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1341 (i).
B.C. Ry. Belt and Peace River Water B. 124 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4110 (iii).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c. (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 1806 (i).
——— (remarks) 1573 (i).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2509 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, &c., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9620 (v).
——— (remarks) 9999 (v).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of (remarks) 1507 (i).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10103 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1425 (i).
Imperial Conference Rep. presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 10117 (v).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2949 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1518 (i).
Mail Service with Allan SS. Co. (remarks) 4428 (iii).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9909 (v).
Questions and Motions proposed to be Introduced, Notice of, 1502 (i).
Ry. Act (commutation tickets) Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 1°, 1551 (i).
Railways, Capitalization of, 5233, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5246 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Railway Rates in the West (remarks) on Address, 104 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2459 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4856 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4062 (iii).
——— Amendments *re*, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4125 (iii).
——— Announcement *re*, Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2643 (ii).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10020 (v).
——— Notice of Motion, 4049 (iii).
——— Pulp and Paper Duties, Information *re* (remarks) 2646 (ii).
——— Pulp and Paper Duties, Par. in New York 'Herald' (read) 2638 (ii).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2654 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2719 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1372 (i).
Telegraph and Cable Service Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9636 (v).

MacNUTT, Mr. T., *Saltcoats.*
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2398 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7262 (iv).

McCALL, Mr. A., *Norfolk.*
Canadian Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnstone before Com. on Ag. (remarks) 2993 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8854 (v).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2700 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (enlargement) 6401 (iv).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp, (B. 93) 1°, 1969 (ii); in Com., 5079, 5568, 5630; 3° m., 5252 (iii).
Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 162) 1°*, 6756 (iv).
Births and Deaths in Canada, Number, &c. (M. for ret.) 2679 (ii)
Dakin, Violet Jane Relief (B. 190) 1°*, 8187 (v).
Elbow and Bow River Water Powers, Applications *re* (Ques.) 1345 (i).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*
Elbow River, Conserving of Water Flow (M. for cor.*) 1912 (i).
——— Water Power License, Agreements, &c. (M. for copies) 1501 (i).
Grazing Leases in the Foothills, Applications *re* (Ques.) 1492 (i).
Langdon Subdivision of C.P.Ry., Mail Service in Northwest (Ques) 1346 (i).
Manitoba and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s Charter, Transfer, &c. (M. for cor.*) 6505 (iv).
N.W. Ter. School Lands, Complete Procedure *re* Disposal, &c. (Ques.) 800 (i).
School Lands in Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, Revenues from Sales (M. for ret.*) 1911 (i).
——— Revenues from, &c. (Ques.) 1488 (i).
School Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Procedure *re* Disposal (Ques.) 1345 (i).

McCOIG, Mr. A. B., *Kent West.*
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5944 (iv).

McCOLL, Mr. J. B., *Northumberland West.*
British Crown Assurance Co.'s (B. 65) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8839 (v).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatoon.*
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) 1°*, 1969 (ii).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5572 (iii).
British Columbia and Central Canada Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 5127, 5253 (iii).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 201 (Mr. W. M. Martin) on M. for 2°, 8581; in Com., (amt.) 8981 (v).
C. P. Ry. (B. 108) 1°*, 2983 (ii).
Canadian Surety Co.'s incorp. (B. 151) 1°*, 5933 (iv).
Canada West Loan Corporation Co.'s incorp. (B. 169) 1°* 6906 (iv); in Com., 8563 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3501 (ii).
Hornell, Ethel May, Relief (B. 144) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. Knowles) in Com., 3994 (iii).
La Banque du Canada B. 123 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 5776 (iii).
Reciprocity—Saskatchewan Boards of Trade Res. (read) 5751 (iii).
——— Stmnt, of Mr. Shepherd (remarks) 5752 (iii).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E.—*Con.*
Regina and Moose Jaw Town Sites, C.P.R.'s Interest *re* (Ques.) 3281 (ii).
Seed Grain Indebtedness, Amount still owing by Farmers (Ques.) 3848 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2706 (ii).

McGIVERIN, Mr. H. B., *Ottawa City.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His. Ex.'s Speech (moved) 10 (i).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2222 (ii).
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 1069 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (water supply) 2588 (ii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D., *Cape Breton North.*
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change (M. for cor.) 2166 (ii).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5081 (iii).
All Red Steamship Route incorp. (B. 105) 1°*, 2827 (ii); in Com., 4239 (iii)
See 'Imperial.'
Bait Freezers, Construction in Louisburg, &c., (M. for cor.*) 6505 (iv).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2226 (ii).
——— and Political Contests (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1061 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2015 (ii).
Imperial Steamship's Co.'s incorp. (B. 105) on Senate Amts., 6610 (iv).
I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, (prop. res.) 1106 (i).
See 'All Red.'
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 970 (i).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2547 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2331 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 5014, 5260 (iii).
Reciprocity Debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Northrup) *re* Quotation, 5410 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1061 (i); Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3434 (ii).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 875 (i).

McLEAN, Mr. H. H., *Sunbury & Queen's (N.B.)*

Canada Shipping Act (coal barges) Amt. (B. 118) 1° m., 3664 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Militia (allowance) 8532 (v).

McLEAN, Mr. M. Y., *Huron South.*

Combines Investigation Act, Restraint *re* United Shoe Machinery Co.'s Investigation (remarks) 5953 (iv).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5438 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7110 (iv).

Reciprocity—Agricultural and Farmers Associations, Res. approving Tariff (read) 5546 (iii).

Senate of Canada, Reform of (prop. res.) 4306 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 6219 (iv); Railways—I.C.R. (freight service) 5988 (iv).

MADDIN, Mr. J. W., *Cape Breton South.*

Alien Labour Law, Emplymt. of Foreign Labour on Public Contracts (remarks) 10374 (v).

Birch Grove, Pet. *re* Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6073 (iv).

Bonded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 4464 (iii).

Bricks, Tiles, &c., Amount imported from G. B. and U. S., 1909-10 (Ques.) 2369 (ii).

Combines Investigation Act, Report *re* (remarks) 1987 (ii).

Customs Preventive Officers, Duties &c. (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

Fire Brick, imported into N. S., Number, Ports, &c. (Ques.) 3471 (ii).

Fish Wardens in Victoria, N. B., (inquiry for ret.) 5629 (iii), 6672 (iv).

—— (remarks) on Ret., 5733 (iii).

Glace Bay Bait Association, Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c. (Ques.) 4044 (iii).

—— Payments to from 1906-10, Dates &c. (Ques.) 3670 (ii).

—— (M. for copy*) 3948 (ii).

G. T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 5803 (iii).

Guysborough Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

Hague Arbitration, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Fundy Bay)on M.(Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup., 4618, 4687 (iii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com.. 1441 (i).

MADDIN, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1127 (i).

McGillivray, Judge, and Conciliation Boards (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4274 (iii).

Naval Service, Medical Examiners *re* Recruits (Ques.) 8991 (v).

North Atlantic Collieries, Application *re* Conciliation Board (M. for cor.*) 3947 (ii).

—— Protest *re* Nomination on Conciliation Board (remarks) 4209 (iii).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 10550 (v).

Springhill Mines Strike, Conciliation Board Settlements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1058 (i).
Labour Dept. (conciliation board) 3401 (ii) 4262 (iii).
Militia (allowance) 8533 (v)
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8693 (v).

Post Office—Outside Service (mails) 6073 (iv); (superanuation *re* clerks) 4284 (iii).

'Wanda' Yacht, Valuation of (remarks) 5627 (iii).

Westville Post Office, Number of Bricks used (Ques.) 3471 (ii).

Wharfs, N. S., Contracts *re* Construction (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A., *Medicine Hat.*

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s (B. 51) 1°*, 1277 (i).

Animal Industry in Canada, Reps. Data &c. (M. for copies) 4677 (iii).

Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8123 (v).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8607 (v).

Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7850 (iv).

International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 874 (i); on M. for 2°, 9101; in Com., 9212 (v).

Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).

Milk River and St. Mary's Boundary: *See* "Long Sault" International Waterways (B. 36).

Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9321 (v).

Railway Charters, Granting by Parlt., Conditions *re* (remarks) on Railway Estimates, 5122 (iii).

Railway Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5122 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 8373 (v).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents) 5196 (iii); Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9548 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Alta (Lethbridge) 3009 (ii); Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (repairs) 9553 (v).

Talbot, Hon. Senator, Application *re* Irrigated Lands Reserve (Ques.) 803 (i).

MAJOR, Mr. C. B., *Labelle.*

Reciprocity—Statistics &c. Hearing of Motion read. Vote *re* 6839 (iv).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *Elgin East.*

Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

——— Post Office Revenue for 1908-1909 &c. (Ques.) 984 (i).

Canned Peas, Number of Cans imported and Amount of Revenue *re* &c. (Ques.) 3221 (ii).

Census Appointments for East Elgin, Names &c. (Ques.) 4302 (iii).

Fish Hatchery in East Elgin, Construction *re* (remarks) 5137 (iii).

Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6620 (iv).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 3276 (ii).

Port Stanley, Port Burwell and Aylmer Customs Collections &c. (Ques.) 985 (i).

Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9327 (v).

Railways—Transportation Problem. on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5101 (iii)..

Rural Mail Service in East Elgin, Number &c. (Ques.) 983 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6242; (seeds) 6222; Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6620 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Printing Bureau) 2363 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8874 (v).

MARTIN, Mr. A. M., *Wellington North.*

Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6829 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2614 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal, St. Marys.*

Beauharnois Canal, Alienation Reps. *re*, on M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2215 (ii).

——— Grantees, Rentals, &c., Sums expended, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2200 (ii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4114 (iii).

Montreal Letter Carriers, Additional Numbers (remarks) 2647 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. M.—*Con.*

Railway Act Amt., (B. 4), 1°*, 148 (i); 2° m., 3943 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 2570 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M., *Regina.*

Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s. (B. 201) 1°*, 8476 (v); 2°m., 8581 (v).

Casualty Co., of Canada, incorp. (B 174) 1°, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8566 (v).

Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William Terminals, Investigations *re* Mixing of Grain (prop. res.) 2377 (ii).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5456 (iii).

Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8543 (v).

Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief (B. 200) 1°*, 8477 (v); in Com., 8971 (v).

Grant, Maud Gertrude, Relief (B. 138) 1°*., 5619 (iii).

Half-Breed Scrip issued to J. W. Malboeuf, (M. for cor.*) 2161 (ii).

High River, Saskatchewan & Hudson Bay Ry. Co"s incorp., (B. 202) 1°* 8582 (v); 2°m., 8642 (v).

Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7844 (iv).

Kirkland, Walter Harvey Relief (B. 164) 1°*, 6756 (iv).

N. W. Mounted Police, Pay and Allowance &c., (Ques.) 8101 (v).

Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages *re* Fires (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8589 (v).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Advances, &c., (Ques.) 7245 (iv).

Reciprocity,Fleming Grain Growers Ass'on. Res. (remarks) 5551 (iii).

———Tels. from Saskatchewan Municipalities (read) 5534 (iii).

St. Peter Indian Reserve Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5883 (iii).

Sterling Trusts Corporation incorp., (B. 32) 1°*, 817 (i); in Com., 2596, 2648, 3021, 3180, 3453, 3841 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6609 (iv).

SUPPLY—

R. N. W. M. Police (subsistence) 8603 (v).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A., *Portage la Prairie.*

Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties (prop. res.) 1915 (i).

——— Resuming Adjnd. Debate (remarks) 2253 (ii), 4383 (iii).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Assiniboine River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii), 6006 (iv).
Austin Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).
Battleford Public Buildings, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3031 (ii).
Casualty Co., of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8571 (v).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4585 (iii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res., (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2401 (ii).
Ennis. D. N., Claims *re* Immigration Expenses (Ques.) 3847 (ii).
Estimates *re* Man., Discussion *re* (remarks) 2970 (ii).
Farmers' Delegation from the West, Control of Ry. Rates, &c. (remarks) 1508 (i).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res., (Mr. Beattie) 4353 (iii).
Floods on the Assiniboine, Pets. to Govt., Political Interference *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10255; 10293 (v).
Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8540, 8541 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1429, 1756 (i).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6000 (iv).
Markey Fishing Leases, Inquiry for Ret. 6119 (iv).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to. on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2811 (ii).
Minnedosa Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3049 (ii).
Neepawa Post Office, Mail Route, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8351 (v).
Public Buildings in former Estimates, given precedence over new ones (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).
Public Works Building Plans, approved by Depts, previous to Aug. 5th, &c. (Ques.) 698 (i).
Railway Act (animals killed) Amt. (B. 23) 1° m., 529 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9401 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res. (remarks) 4498 (iii).
Reciprocity Papers, Comparative Prices, Printing of (remarks) 10469 (v).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A.—*Con.*
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of (remarks) 10524 (v).
Scrip to Northwest Settlers, Claims of Pioneers (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10121 (v).
——— Refusal of Claims (remarks) 1293 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 4730 (iii); Militia (salaries) 1029; Public Works (salaries) 1034 (i).
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8683 (v).
Post Office—Outside Service (ry. mail clerks compensation) 6088 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Dresden) 2105; (Gananoque) 2112 (ii); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2130; (Listowel) 2141; (Midland) 2142; (Mitchell) 2148; (Peterborough) 2608; (Seaforth) 2626; (Sudbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2628; (Waterloo) 2634 (ii);
Public Works — Buildings — Que. (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1892 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2972 (ii).
U.S. Trusts and Combines, Regulations in U.S. Courts, &c. (M. for ret.) 4342 (iii).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7856 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 1301 (i).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S., *Grey, North.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 423 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop, Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1939 (i).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3026 (ii).
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Termination of, Cor. *re* (remarks) 2003, 2271 (ii).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7480 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7560 (iv).
Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities dredged, Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 1905 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9260 (v).
Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c. (Ques.) 3608 (ii).
Civil Servants and Political Contests (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9708 (v).
Cold Storage in Can., Govt. Aid to, &c. (Ques.) 1455 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Capital Cost, Dimensions, &c. (Ques.) 10337 (v).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

Combines Investigation at, Charges *re* (Ques.) 663 (i).

Coronation Contingent from Canada, Regulations *re* Apptmts (Ques.) 3220, 3277 (ii).

Dissolution of Parlt., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Opposition (remarks) 5737 (iii).

Drill Halls Generally, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2129 (ii).

Explosives, Number of Factories, Employees, &c. (Ques.) 2374 (ii).

Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of, M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2191 (ii).

Farmers Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5324 (iii).

—— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8217 (v).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9595; Amt. Neg. (Y. 45; N. 61) 9633 (v).

—— Estimated Number surviving, Pensions, &c. (Ques.) 1715 (i).

—— Grants to (Ques.) 1089 (i).

Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).

Fishery Regulations at Washington, *re* Newfoundland (remarks) 2071 (ii).

See "International".

Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup., 8487 (v).

Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4364 (iii).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8622, 8652, 9346 (v).

Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8240, 8920 (v).

G.T.R., Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1078 (i).

Homesteading in Western Ters., Acreage available, &c. (Ques.) 1907 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1436, 1530, 1741 (i).

Indian Act Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8407 (v).

Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8078 (v)

I.C.R. Special Trains *re* Monument National Demonstration, Montreal (remarks) 2997 (ii).

International Fisheries Regulations, Ratification of (remarks) 1654 (i).

International Waterways Treaty (boundary water) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9097 (v).

International Railway Traffic, Points of Crossing, &c. (Ques.) 4466 (iii).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3062 (ii).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c. (Ques.) 9538 (v).

Meaford Harbour Improvements, Adoption of Plan, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8338 (v).

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6122 (i).

Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2532 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8091 (v).

Owen Sound Dock, Work *re* Construction (Ques.) 10337 (v).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9316, 9380 (v).

Ry. Commission and Interstate Commerce Commission, Agreement *re* Traffic between U.S., and Can. (remarks) 3054 (ii).

Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9228 (v).

—— on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10192 (v).

Ry. Telegraph, &c., Rates, Treaty *re* Control (remarks) 8356 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2465 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4535 (iii).

—— Absence of Ministers during discussion (remarks) 8372 (v).

—— Articles in Press *re* Obstruction (remarks) 9999 (v).

—— Cor. *re* (remarks) 2989 (ii).

—— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5950 (iv).

—— Res. by Associated Boards of Trade, Ont. (read) 4121 (iii).

—— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609 (ii).

—— Statistics of Comparative Prices, 6797 (iv).

Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2601 (ii).

Steel Bounties, Renewal of (remarks) 3275 (ii).

Stone, Cut, Duty Between U.S. and Can., Value, &c. (Ques.) 1287 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9087 (v).

Civil Govt., Customs (salaries) 1067; Public Works (salaries) 1041 (i).

Fisheries (fish transportation) 6105 (iv); Ont. (inspectors) 6620 (iv); (overseers) 3819 (ii); (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6106 (iv).

Indians—N. W. T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6036 (iv).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Fergus) 2111; (Kingston, R. M. C.) 2136; (Peterborough) 2605 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1688 (i).

'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings, &c., for 1910 (Ques.) 2159 (ii).

MILLER, Mr. H. H., *Grey, South.*

Address, The, 229 (i).

Adjournment, Extension of Time (remarks) 9566 (v).

Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum (M.) 2365, 2429, 3599 (ii).

——— (M.) to sit during Sessions of the House, 8355 (v).

Canadian Railways, Accidents *re*, Investigation, &c. (prop. res.) 3922 (ii).

Canada West Loan Corporation incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8564 (v).

Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8576 (v).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 7) M. to place on Govt. Orders, 8789 (v).

Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1309 (i).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5354 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8227 (v).

——— Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2241 (ii).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9346 (v).

Interest Act Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 149; 2° m., 968; agreed to (Y. 87; N. 24) 975; in Com., 976, 1294, 1510-11; on Order for Com., 1406 (ii).

Ministerial Association, Ottawa, Res. *re* (remarks) 3059 (ii).

——— Attacks *re* by h. m. (remarks) 3372 (ii).

Minister of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2768 (ii).

Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 229 (i).

Quebec Bank Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 9345 (v).

Race Track Gambling, (M.) to print Evidence, 10467 (v).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Com. on Res., 4906, 4937 (iii).

Révillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8580 (v).

Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2652 (ii).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2721 (ii).

MILLER, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*

South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3348 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (animals health) 5978; Ques. of Order, 5934 (iv).

House of Commons (telephones) 6337 (iv).

Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8690 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Lambert) 1900 (i).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Ry. Commission) 6434 (iv).

MOLLOY, Mr. J. P., *Provencher.*

Absence from H. of C., Ques. of Priv., 1353 (i).

Continental Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 196) 1°*, 8403; in Com., 8968 (v).

Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4373 (iii).

Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s (B. 148) 1°*, 5726 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com., on Res., 4183 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 5908 (iii).

MONK, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Acton Vale, Upton and St. Pie, Post Office Revenues (M. for ret.*) 980 (i).

Address, The, 111 (amt.) 133; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 595 (i).

Address to His Majesty King George, Intention of Govt. *re* (remarks) 7824 (iv).

Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 220, on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to place on Govt. orders, 9350 (v).

Arthabaska and Drummond Elections, Cor. laid on Table, 194 (i).

See 'Drummond.'

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6304, 6324 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal, Alienation of, Reps. *re* (M. for cor.) 2214 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1713 (i).

Beauharnois Canal Grantees, Improvements, Value of Franchise, &c. (Ques.) 1711 (i).

——— Rentals, Sums expended by Govt., &c. (M. for ret.) 2194 (ii).

——— Privileges, Advertisement for Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1712 (i).

——— Total Cost, Revenue from Grantees, Arrears, &c. (Ques.) 1713 (i).

Canadian Commissioner for France, Vacancy, Apptmts. *re* (Ques.) 1971 (ii), 8103 (v).

Canadian General Development Co., Total Amounts paid to, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 655 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Canadian Light and Power Co.'s Plans *re* Improvements (remarks) 7261 (iv).
——— Plans, &c., Date of Approval (Ques.) 7591, 7805 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9265 (v).
C.P.R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction, &c. (M. for cor.) 766 (i).
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid *re*, Complaints, &c. (Ques.) 661 (i).
Carillon Water Power Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c. (Ques.) 8700 (v).
See 'Ottawa River.'
Carrier-Laine Works, Purchase of by Govt. Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 8992 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9049 (v).
Census Enumerators, Names, Number, &c. (Ques.) 4465 (iii).
Census, Hochelaga Division, Names of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 9372 (v).
Census for Jacques Cartier, Names of Enumerators, &c. (Ques.) 9431 (v).
——— Names of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 9372 (v).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2504 (ii).
Coeli, Mr. Treau de, Payments to *re* Immigration (Ques.) 8308 (v).
Co-operation Credit (B. 11) 1° m., 194; 2° m., 1302; in Com., 1302 (i).
Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity (Ques.) 7025 (iv).
Declaration of London, Adoption of, Inquiry for Papers, 3530 (ii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, 'pounding England' Speech of Notary Begin (remarks) 57 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order, *re* Mr. Gauvreau's insulting language (remarks) 77 (i).
——— quotations from Speeches, &c., on Address, 125 (i).
Fabre, Mr. Hector, Date of Apptmt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 5933 (iv).
Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Delegation, Rep. *re* (remarks) 3529 (ii).
——— French Edition, Inquiry for, 9075 (v).
Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re* (Ques.) 1489 (i).
Gaspé Mail Service, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 3854 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Use of by Americans (Ques.) 7804 (iv).
Govt. Printing, Amounts paid to Newspaper Offices (M. for stmnt.) 944 (i).
G.T.R. Trainmen's Strike, Basis of Settlement by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 809 (i).
MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Great Northwestern Telegraph Co., Request for Board of Conciliation, &c. (Ques.) 5639 (iii).
Hay Claims, Delay in repayment to Canadian Exporters (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
Hochelaga Census Enumerators, Names, &c. (Ques.) 9432 (v).
Hydro-Electric Co., Limited Water Power Lease on Ottawa River (Ques.) 9430 (v).
——— Tenders called, &c. (Ques.) 9352 (v).
Imperial Conference, Report *re*, Complete, presented to Parlt. (amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10103 (v).
——— Information *re* Precis Rep. and Further Rep. (remarks) 9783 (v).
——— Inquiry for Rep., 9690 (v).
——— Precis *re* (remarks) 9694 (v).
——— Premier's Return from, Amount expended (Ques.) 9780 (v).
Imperial Defence Committee Report (M. for copy) 944 (i).
——— Additional Copies (prop. res.) 2215 (ii).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re* (prop. res.) 2927, 2967 (ii).
I. C. R., Ice Contracts at Riviere du Loup Terms, &c. (Ques.) 2437, 3853 (ii).
International Naval Conference, Final Protocol, (M. for copy) 3073 (ii).
International Prison Congress, Canadian Representative, &c. (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
International Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Crairman, Mr. George Gibbons (remarks) 4741 (iii).
Lafleur, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt., Interference in Elections (Ques.) 1907 (i).
Lanctot, Mr. A.: *See* Priv. and Elections.
'Le Devoir,' Quotations from, *re* Drummond Elections, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brodeur) 471 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Dates of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.) 771 (i).
Mail Delivery Free in Towns, &c., Conditions *re* (Ques.) 4925 (iii).
Maple Sugar Adulteration, Pet. *re*, Amt. to Foods Act (Ques.) 5131 (iii).
Marieville Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 4636 (iii).
Mergers, Competing Industries, Notice of Discussion, 2736 (ii).
See 'Industrial.'
Military School, Montreal, Selection of Site, Price, &c. (Ques.) 1713 (i).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) on M. for 3°, (amt.) 7717, 7560; in Com., 7718 (iv).

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).
Statutes, French Translations, Corrections (remarks) 8089 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—External Affairs (salaries) 1472; Secretary of State (salaries) 1472 (i).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of, (remarks) 10096 (v).
Yukon Ter. Ordnances (presented) 8 (i).

NANTEL, Mr. W. B., *Terrebonne.*
Address, The, 179 (i).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6312 (iv).
Arthabaska and Drummond Election (remarks) on Address, 179 (i).
Laurier Reception at Montreal, Montreal Harbour Commission's Expenditure (Ques.) 9982 (v).
Militia Surveys, Expenditure in each of last five years (Ques.) 1102 (i).
Naval Service for Can.. Par. in Ottawa 'Journal' *re* Cruiser building, 196 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7988 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9427 (v).
Richelieu Electoral District, Charges against Mr. Lanctot *re* Painting Private Dwelling, Notice of Motion, 4566 (iii).
Rigaud Postoffice Buildings, Contract *re* (Ques.) 3067 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 8130 (v).
Ste. Thérèse Postoffice, Purchase of Site (Ques.), 1715 (i).

NEELY, Mr. D. B., *Humboldt.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. *re* Naval Policy, 325 (i).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on Prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2403 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer System, *re* Operation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3488, (amt.) 3491, Agreed to (Y. 96, N. 54) 3524 (ii).
Fiscal Policy of Can., Speech of P. M. G. at Manufacturer's Banquet, Montreal (remarks) 2079 (ii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4368 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9517 (v).
Homestead Irregularities, Punishment *re*, on Ques. of Order, 5563 (iii).
Ploughs exported to U. S., Number, Value, &c. (Ques.) 3223 (ii).

NEELY, Mr. D. B.—*Con.*
Privileges, Ques. of, *re* Speech by Member for Dauphin as to Selection of Capital for Saskatchewan, 5620 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 3563 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5560, 5595 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 3007 (ii).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W., *Oxford, North.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup.. 6297 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s. incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5081, 5572 (iii).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3026 (ii).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4241 (iii).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 2433, 3604 (ii).
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6212 (iv).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 201, on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8982 (v).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 69) 1°*, 1487 (i); in Com., 3182, 3454 (ii).
Conciliation Board, Settlement of Strikes, Ques. of Order, 4267 (iii).
Co-operative Credit Society's B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1311 (i).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5424 (iii).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Company's incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8550, 8919 (v).
Grand Trunk Railwaymen's Strike, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4257 (iii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7856 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8082, 8747 (v).
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2596 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3062, 3182 (ii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1232 (i).
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024, 3181 (ii).
Milk and Cream shipped in Western Ont., Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6436 (iv).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*

Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 7723 (iv).

New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com., 8522; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster, 8958 (vi).

Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2337 (ii).

Peoples Ry. Co.'s, (B. 110), 1°*, 2983 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6611 (iv).

Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9326, 9390 (v).

Railway Committee (M.) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) 7549 (iv).

——— (remarks) 7627 (iv).

——— British Preference, Increase of (remarks) 7214 (iv).

——— Farmers' Interests, &c., (remarks) 5544 (iii).

Revillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8966 (v).

Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp., B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2596, 2649, 3180, (ii); on Senate Amts., 6610, (iv).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2703 (ii).

Sheldon. C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, (remarks) 1390 (i).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 817 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6238; (seeds) 6219 (iv); Labour Dept., (conciliation board) 4257 (iii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *Hastings, East.*

Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 378 (i).

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5080, 5570 (iii).

Canada Cement Co.'s (B. 205) 1°*, 8582 (v).

Dini, Victor, Release from Penitentiary, &c.. (Ques.) 8582 (v).

External Affairs, Absence of Minister from Washington Negotiations (remarks) 1658 (i).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission to Investigate, on Amt., (Mr. Henderson) 5363 (iii).

G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of men, Apptmt. of Judge Barron (M. for cor.*) 2376 (ii).

——— Inaction of Labour Dept., (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

——— (M. for cor.*) 786 (i).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *Hastings East.*

G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1077 (i).

——— Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4248 (iii).

Lymburner Contracts with Govt. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 3206 (ii).

Matches, Phosphorus, Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2041 (ii).

Printing Bureau Investigation (M.) for Royal Commission 7687, Neg. (Y. 56; N. 92) 7801 (iv).

——— Evidence under Oath, Printing, Dismissal of Mr. R. E. Cook (Ques.) 2672 (ii).

Private Bills, Second Readings and in Com. (remarks) 8641 (v).

Quebec Bridge, Investigations *re* River Bed, Tests, &c. (Ques.) 658 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8402 (v).

Rainbow' and 'Niobe', Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c. (Ques.) 792 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4861 (iii).

Reciprocity, Denial of Statement of Member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) Ques. of Priv., 5035 (iii).

——— Quotation by Member for Cape Breton (Ques. of priv.) 5293, 5407 (iii).

Reciprocity, Letter of 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7677 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 4248 (iii).

United Shoe Machinery Co., Application *re* Investigation, Govt. Representative, &c. (Ques.) 2672 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F. (Minister of the Interior), *Edmonton.*

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5083, 5568 (iii).

Algoma Timber Permits, Amount of Dues paid (Ans.) 4674 (iii).

Aylwin Irrigation Grant, Papers *re*, on Inquiry for, 8192, 9076 (v).

Bear Indian Reserve, Medical Officer, Payments to (Ans.) 3224 (ii).

Beausoleil Indian Agent at Christian Island, Place of Residence (Ans.) 5289 (iii).

Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits to cut Timber, Agent's Name, &c. (Ans.) 4304-5 (iii).

See 'Christian.'

Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of (Ans.) 3464 (ii).

Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application *re* Homestead (Ans.) 3221 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Interior (boundary surveys) 9546 (v); (Dom. lands, homesteads) 5553. 5581 (iii); (Dom. lands, surveys) 9547 (v); (immigration agents) 4729 (iii); (seed grain) 9551; (water investigations) 9550 (v).

Swertlove, Berel, Deportation by Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 1723 (i).

Talbot, Hon. Senator, Lands reserved, &c. (Ans.) 803 (i).

Timber Berths in B.C., Removal of from Hall's Prairie (Ans.) 3282 (ii).

Timber Lands, &c., on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3955 (iii).

Timber Licenses in New Westminster District, Pets. against Renewals, &c. (Ans.) 3222 (ii).

Water Powers Conservation B. 49 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 1°, 1278 (i).

Western Farmers as Immigration Agents to Europe (Ans.) 799, 1284 (i).

Winnipeg River Water Powers, &c., on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bradbury) 3955 (ii).

Yukon Beer Import Tax, Repeal of, in Com. on Res., 1977 (ii).

OSLER, Mr. E. B., *Toronto West.*

Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 1302; in Com., 1303 (i).

Farmers' Bank Proceedings, Stmnt. *re* Warning to Fin. Minister (remarks) 10472 (v).

Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10517 (v).

OWEN, Mr. C. L., *Northumberland East (O.)*

Brighton Wharf, Vote *re* (remarks) 1655 (i).

Census Enumerators, Inaccuracies in Quebec (remarks) 7217 (iv).

Fish Ladders on Trent Canal (remarks) 4824 (iii).

Fish Preservation in Trent River, Action of Govt. (remarks) 1503 (i).

Homestead Applications in New Westminster Districts, Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).

Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1237 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to refer Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 845 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2449 (ii).

—— Opposition to in Riding, Ques. of Priv., 6767 (iv).

—— Ques. of Priv. *re* Vote, 3343 (ii).

OWEN, Mr. C. L.—*Con.*

—— Tel. of Senator Cummins, *re* Manufactured Products (remarks) 4115 (iii).

Supply for Public Works, &c. (remarks) 10354 (v).

Victoria Museum, Ottawa, Inspection *re* Defects in Building (remarks) 7349 (iv), 9252 (v).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Address, The, 197 (i).

Agriculture, Govt Aid to, on Amt (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6287 (iv).

Archives Dept., Commission of Historical Work, Care of Documents, &c. (Ques.) 2156 (ii).

—— Names of Staff (Ques.) 2155 (ii).

Census Commissioner, French Apptmt. (Ques.) 2155 (ii).

Cold Storage Depots during 1907-10, Total Amounts paid (Ques.) 2437 (ii).

Cruisers manned by Canadian Marines, Names, &c. (Ques.) 805 (i).

English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters (Ques.) 1080 (i).

Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Negotiations *re* Transfer (Ques.) 799 (i).

Exhibition Grants, Subsides paid *re* (Ques.) 2437 (ii).

Fisheries Service, Control by Federal Govt. (Ques.) 983 (i).

—— Number of Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 805 (i).

Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4378 (iii).

Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplmt. by Govt., fined for Electoral Corruption (Ques.) 2673 (ii).

Immigration, Amount expended in Belgium and France (Ques.) 9990 (v).

—— Amount expended in U.S. (Ques.) 9991 (v).

—— Commission to Agents in Western Canada (Ques.) 9991 (v).

—— Number received from Europe, Names of Agents, &c. (Ques.) 809 (i).

—— Number from G.B., U.S., &c., Amount expended, Names of Agents, &c. (Ques.) 807 (i).

—— Premiums by Canadian Govt. for 1910-11 (Ques.) 9991 (v).

I.C.R. Mail Clerks allowing friends to travel in mail cars (Ques.) 8584 (v).

Naval Bill, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) on Address, 197 (i).

Nicolet Military Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 8585 (v).

Nicolet Customs Collections for 1906-11 (Ques.) 8584 (v).

PAQUET, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Nicolet Post Office Building, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 8584 (v).
——— Amount paid to Guardian, Rent collected, &c. (Ques.) 8789 (v).
——— Pet. *re* Annex, &c. (Ques.) 8584 (v).
Nicolet River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ques.) 8585 (v).
Paper Imports into U.S., Value, &c. (Ques.) 2674 (ii).
Paris Exposition, 1900, Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 7602 (iv).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 8019 (v).
——— Ques. of Order, 8010 (v).
Pulp Wood Exports to the U. S., Value of (Ques.) 2674 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Advances to, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 2851 (ii).
——— Members *re* (Ques.) 2436 (ii).
Railway Commission, Aptmt. of French Canadian (Ques.) 1103 (i).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents) 5182 (iii).
Trade Commissioners for Can., Names of Countries, &c. (Ques.) 2156 (ii).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *Lambton, West.*
Currie, Wm. Francis Relief (B. 215) 1°*, 8955 (v).
Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 1069 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7836 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2959 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1518 (i).
Ontario, Michigan Ry. Co.'s (B. 168) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
Railway Locomotive Boiler Inspection (B. 30) 1° m., 699 (i).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (overseers) 3810; Public Works —Buildings, Ont. (Brantford) 2098 (ii).
U.S. Immigration Officers residing in Can., &c. (Ques.) 1723 (i).

PATERSON, Hon. W. (Minister of Customs), *Brant.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 346 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Imports into Can. since 1908, Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 1350 (i).
——— Complaints *re* Manipulation of Duties &c. (remarks) 1359 (i).
Agricultural Products imported into B.C. from U.S., Australia, &c. (Ans.) 7345 (iv).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Agricultural Products and Dairy Produce imported from U.S., Value, &c. (Ans.) 9992 (v).
Agricultural Products imported into Canada, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 5402 (iii).
Beef, Pork, &c., Quantity imported from Oct. 1910 to Feb. 1911 (Ans.) 6265 (iv).
Bounded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 4464 (iii).
Bricks, Tiles, &c., Number imported from G.B. and U.S., 1909-10 (Ans.) 2370 (ii).
Butter, Cheese and Meats imported into Canada, Weight, Value, &c. (Ans.) 4927 (iii).
Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada for Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911 (Ans.) 4671 (iii).
——— Suppl. Answer laid on Table, 6177 (iv.)
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U.S. Officials (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
Canada and W. Indies Trade Relations Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Canned Peas, Amount imported, Revenue received (Ans.) 3221 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. (B. 208) M. for Com. on Res., 8477; in Com. on Res., 8715 (v).
Coal and Coke, Quantity, Value imported into Canada from U.S. (Ans.) 4674 (iii).
Coal imported from U.S. into Ont., Value of Duties (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
Coasting Trade Act, Changes *re* (Ans.) 4675 (iii).
Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity (Ans.) 7025 (iv).
Customs Act Schedules, Average Value in 1910 and 1896 (Ans.) 801 (i).
Customs Collections in Cities, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 985 (i), 4042 (iii).
Customs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Customs Entries at Vancouver, by Kelly & Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Barnard) for Copies, 713 (i).
Customs Free Entry of Goods, Date of last Entry (Ans.) 804 (i).
Customs Goods entered free at Vancouver by Kelly & Co., on M. (Mr. Bernard) for Copies, 932 (i).
Customs Preventive Officers, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).
Dairy and Farm Products, Quantity, Value, &c. of Importation from U.S. (Ans.) 9362 (v).
Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron (Ans.) 6268 (iv).
Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value on Articles in Schedules of Customs Act, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Ret., 1105 (i).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9082 (v).
Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coin) 6060 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1485 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 6065 (iv).
Fisheries (Robichaud, Wm. compensation) 6106 (iv).
Geological Survey (explorations) 9551 (v).
Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9548 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 8777; (Canada and Mexico) 8782; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8784; (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 8786; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8788 (v).
Militia (allowances) 8533 (v)
Miscellaneous — (Coronation decorations) 9565; (coronation trip, members and senators) 8681 (v).
Mounted Police (pay of force) 8598; (subsistence) 8602 (v)
Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Chatham) 1610; (Fairville) 1611; (Hartland) 1619; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (St. John drill hall) 1624 (i).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Parrsboro) 1629 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2619 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (generally, repairs) 1675; (Lévis armoury) 1679; (Maisonneuve) 1692; (Marieville) 1698; (Quebec custom house) 1885; (Quebec immigrant) 1886; (Roberval) 1887; (Rock Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (Three Rivers) 1902; (Westmount) 1903 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax docks) 9561; (highway protection) 9560 (v).

PICKUP, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*
Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 1277 (i).
SUPPLY—
Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8769 (v).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *Hastings, West.*
Belleville Docking Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6011 (iv).
Belleville Public Building, Draping for His Maj.'s Death (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board, incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7565 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8850; in Com., 9268 (v).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7818 (iv).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5321, 5487 (iii).
Fisheries Appointments, Inquiry for Ret. 5836 (iii).

PORTER, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7829 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Contractors and Labour Conditions (remarks) 8597 (v).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidies, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8336 (v).
Ontario Fisheries Service, Number of Officers, Services, Salaries, &c (Ques.) 6157 (iv).
Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages *re* Fires (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8590 (v).
Port Credit Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7712 7771 (iv).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9318, 9381 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 9745 (v).
——— on Ques. of Order, referring to previous debate, 8258 (v).
——— Res. from Trent River Paper Co. (read) 4117 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, Quarantine, &c (animals health) 5962; (dairying) 6244 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8768; (Canada and Cuba) 8776 (v).
Mounted Police (subsistence) 8599 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers) 6027; (quarantine stations) 6027; (draping buildings) 6026 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville drill hall) 6033; Ottawa (heating, &c.) 6027 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (L'Ardoise) 6029; Margaree) 6029; Ont. (Victoria) 6023 (iv).

PRICE, Mr. W., *Quebec West.*
Dry Dock at Quebec, Construction *re* by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 9988 (v).
Freight Car Service, I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Contract, Plans, &c. (remarks) 7103 (iv).
Reciprocity, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6820 (iv).
——— (remarks) 6894 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 1697 (i); Railways—I.C.R. (freight car service) 5983 (iv).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*
Constantineau, Judge, Number of Motions Heard, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 982 (i).

PROULX, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Hawkesbury Interprovincial Bridge (remarks) *re* Answer to Questions, 4227 (iii).
Naval Defence, Govt. Policy (remarks) on Address, 497 (i).

PROWSE, Mr. L. E., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3901 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W. (Minister of Public Works), *St. John City and County.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5568 (iii).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3392, 3459 (ii).
Armouries, &c., in Canada, on Inquiry for Ret., 1461 (i).
Assiniboine River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7470 (iv).
Bathurst, N.B., Dredging, Total Quantity and Cost (Ans.) 803, 1285 (i).
Battleford Public Buildings, Cor. (read) in Com. of Sup., 3005 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3030 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal, Grantees, Rentals, Sums expended, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2201 (ii).
Belleville Docking Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6012 (iv).
Bracebridge Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).
Breakwaters in Digby County, N.S., Contracts *re* Construction (Ans.) 657 (i).
Brighton Wharf, Vote *re* (remarks) 1657 (i).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1683 (i).
Bronte Harbour Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iv).
Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 7341 (iv).
—— (remarks) *re* Questions, 7349 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7561 (iv).
Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities dredged, Earnings, &c. (Ans.) 1905 (i).
Canadian Light and Power Co., Date of Approval of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 7591, 7806 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8840; in Com., 9265 (v).
Canada West Loan Corporation incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8564 (v).
Carman Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3020 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Carrier-Lainé Public Works, Purchase of, &c. (Ans.) 8992 (v).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8566 (v).
Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ans.) 8984 (v).
Chatham, N.B., Public Buildings, Purchase of Site, Names of Owners (Ans.) 5132 (iii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Capital Cost, &c. (Ans.) 10337 (v).
—— Subsidy (prop. res.) 9244 (v).
Coronation Celebration in Ottawa, Absence of Ministers (Ans.) 9990 (v).
—— Invitation to Ministers (remarks) 10353 (v).
Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for current year (Ans.) 814 (i).
Drill Halls Generally, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2116 (ii).
Drill Halls in Man., Cost of (Ans.) 1975 (ii).
Dry Dock at Quebec, Construction *re*, &c. (Ans.) 9988 (v).
Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by "International", on M. (Mr. S. Sharpe) for Ret., 1498 (i).
Eastern Dredging Co., Letting of Contracts to (Ans.) 813 (i).
Ellis, J. A. & Ottawa Lighting Contracts: *See* 'Woods.'
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Dept., (remarks) 2994 (ii).
—— *See* 'Public Works,' &c.
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Number of Buildings decorated at Govt. Expense (Ans.) 4667 (iii).
—— Authority of Govt. *re* Decorations of Govt. Buildings (Ans.) 925 (i).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4350 (iii).
Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders *re* (remarks) 2648, 3671 (ii), 4724 (iii).
—— Names of Days ordered by Dept., 4382 (iii).
See 'St. George's.'
Fredericton Pavement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
French River Dam (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re* (Ans.) 1489 (i).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10248 (v).
Georgetown Govt. Buildings, Drainage *re* (Ans.) 3469 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup, 5157 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8543, 8917 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Returns, on Inquiry for, 4570 (iii).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7257 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8577, 9166 (v).
Rigaud Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3067 (ii).
Riviere des Prairies, Completion of Deepening, &c. (Ans.) 1714 (i).
—— Rep. of *re*, on M. (Mr. Wilson) for Copy, 2164 (ii).
St. Andrews. Man., Dam Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3039 (ii).
St. Andrew's Dam, Sum for Completion, (remarks) 1509 (i).
St. Andrews Rapids, Fish Ladder, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
St. Andrew's Wharf, P.Q., Tenders *re* Construction Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3608 (ii).
St. Charles Rifle Range, Winnipeg, Sale, Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 7343 (iv).
St. Croix River, N.B., Construction of a Public Work, Proposal *re* (Ans.) 1348 (i).
St. Gabriel de Stratford Wharf, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4666 (iii).
—— Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 1489 (i).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly the Flag (remarks) 7553, 7687 (iv).
See 'Flags.'
St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 2675 (ii).
St. John Drill Hall, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 5129, 5631 (iii).
St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 814 (i).
—— Rental of Office, &c. (Ans) 2673, 3065 (ii).
St. John River Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5646 (iii); in Com., 8411 (v).
St. Lambert Govt. Lands, Options on Land, &c. (Ans.) 2677 (ii).
St. Lambert Public Buildings, Option *re* (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 2577 (ii).
St. Lambert River Dam, Legislation *re* at Washington, 3283 (ii).
—— *See* 'Long Sault.'
Ste. Marie Post Office Division, Defective Site, &c. (Ans.) 10336 (v).
St. Peter's Breakwater, Repairs, &c. 7344 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
St. Peter's Bay Wharf, Repair of (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
Ste. Therese Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 1715 (i).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9168 (v).
Seagull Dock, Date of Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1349 (i).
Security (Stirling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2600, 2655 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6609 (iv).
Senate Chamber, Expenditure *re* Decorations (Ans.) 1100 (i).
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue, &c., (Ans.) 4826 (iii).
Smallpox Epedimic, Condition of House of Commons, 7253 (iv).
See 'House of Commons.'
South African Parliament, Rep. of Postmaster General (remarks) 1580 (i).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry, (Mr. Blain) for Ret., 3346 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Militia— (salaries), 1027; Public Works (contingencies) 1047 (i); 5993 (iv); (salaries) 1032 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Calgary) 3007; (Lethbridge) 3009; (Macleod) 3003; (Strathcona) 3011; (Vegreville) 3011; (Wetaskiwin) 3011 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Chilliwack) 3012; (Cranbrook) 3013; (Duncan) 3014; (Fernie) 3014; (Grand Forks) 3015; (Greenwood) 3015; (Nanaimo) 3015; (Nelson) 3016; (Prince Rupert) 3016; (Revelstoke) 3017; (Vancouver) 3018; (Vernon) 3018 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers, &c.) 6027; (electric power) 3210; (engineers, salaries) 3212; (fire escapes) 3160; (quarantine stations) 3213 (ii), 6027 (iv); (renewals) 2969; (rents, &c.) 3212 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3157; (immigration buildings) 3156; (sundries) 3161 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 3019; (Souris) 3019; (Winnipeg) 3018, 3029; (Winnipeg armoury) 3052 (ii).
Public Works—Buildngs—N. B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Chatham) 1610; (Fairville) 1611; (Fredericton pavement) 1612; (Grand Falls) 1614; (Hampton) 1614; (Hartland) 1617; (Hillsborough) 1621; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (St. John drill hall) 1624; (Tracadie) 1625 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) 1592; (Halifax citadel) 1581; (Halifax post office) 1583; (Lunenburg) 1592, 1625; (Parrsboro) 1598, 1625; (Weymouth) 1601;

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(Wolfville) 1599; (iv); (Yarmouth) 1600 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2088 (ii); (Belleville drill hall) 6033 (iv); (Brantford drill hall) 2098; (Chesley) 2103; (Dresden) 2105; (Dundas) 2109; (Elora) 2109; (Essex) 2110, (Fergus) 2111; (Fort William) 2111; (Gananoque) 2112; (Goderich) 2115; (Harriston) 2115; (Kingston P. O.) 2130; (Kingston, R. M. C.) 2130, 3156; (Listowel) 2141; (Midland) 2142; (Mitchell) 2146; (Mount Forest) 2149; (Peterborough) 2603; (Seaforth) 2626; (Sudbury) 2626; (Tilbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2627; (Uxbridge) 2630; (Wallaceburg) 2634; (Waterloo) 2634; (Wiarton) 2636 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevators) 3161; (furniture) 3163; (heating, &c.) 2590, 3162 (ii), 6027, (iv); (H. of C. improvements) 2590 (ii); (lavatories) 2583; (lighting) 3173, 3187 (ii); (McGillivray's contract) 5993 (iv); (pavements) 2593, 2602 (ii), 8883 (v); (Printing Bureau) 2361, 2582; ; (Rideau Hall) 3170 (ii), 8872 (v); (steel cases) 2582; (Sussex St. block) 3172; (telephones) 3169; (water supply) 2583; (Woods building lighting) 3175 (ii).

Public Works — Buildings—Miscellaneous (coronation decorations) 9565 (v); (draping buildings) 6026 (iv); (tobacco curing stations) 3161 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—P. E. I. (Summerside armoury) 1602; (Tignish) 1602 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1665; (Aylmer) 1672; (generally, repairs, &c.) 1675; (Grosse Isle) 1675; (Levis armoury) 1678; (Maisonneuve) 1685; (Marieville) 1697; (Megantic) 1710, 1860; (Montreal barracks) 1863 (i), 2567, 3144 (ii); (Montreal postal station) 1861; (Montreal P.O. alterations) 1862; (Napierville) 1865; (Que. custom house) 1885; (Quebec drill hall) 1886; (Quebec immigrant) 1886; (Rigaud) 1887; (Roberval) 1887; (Rock Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1890; (St. Lambert) 1894; (Shawinigan) 1890; (Three Rivers) 1901; (Westmount) 1903 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2970, 3001; (Battleford cor. read) 3005; (Humboldt) 3007; (Lloydminster) 3009; (Melfort) 3010; (Moosejaw) 3010; (Saskatoon) 3010; (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3215; (salaries) 3214 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 9555 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Amaguadees Pond) 9501; (Argyle Sound) 9501 (v); (Cribbins Point) 6029 (iv); (generally) 9554 (v); (L'Ardoise) 6029; (Margaree) 6029; (Upper Prospect) 6030; (West Dublin Bay) 6030; (Yarmouth) 6030 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ontario (Port Arthur, &c.) 5994 (iv); (repairs, &c.) 9551 (v); (Victoria) 6021 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. and Alberta (repairs, &c.) 9553 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Telegraphs, B. C. (Okanagan) 6033; Sask. and Alta., (maintenance) 6034 (iv).

Railways—I. C. R. (Halifax) 5922 (iii); (Halifax docks) 9561 (v).

Sussex Street, Ottawa, Deptl. Buildings, Alterations, &c. (remarks) 2077 (ii).

See 'Ottawa,' 'Supply—Public Works—Ottawa.'

'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings for 1910 (Ans.) 2159 (ii).

Three Rivers Harbour Commission, Amount paid in Interest, &c. (Ans.) 814 (i).

Three Rivers Post Office, Temporary Building (Ans.) 8984 (v).

Tilbury Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).

Toronto Federal Buildings, Plans of Erection (remarks) 8479 (v).

Toronto Harbour Consolidation Act Amt. B. 175 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 8234, 8536 (v).

Toronto Post Office, Addition to, Change *re* Specification (Ans.) 805 (i).

Typhoid in Ottawa: *See* 'House of Commons, Ottawa,' &c.

Uxbridge Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 1084 (i).

—— Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 9782 (v).

Vancouver Dry Dock Subsidy, Nature of (Ans.) 3469 (ii).

Victoria Memorial Museum, Ottawa, Total Cost, Space allotted (Ans.) 1975 (ii).

—— Cor. *re* Foundation, on Inquiry for (Mr. Hughes) 7666 (iv).

—— Cracking of Tower, &c. (Ans.) 5938 (iv).

—— Inspection *re* Defects in Building (remarks) 7350 (iv).

Walkerville Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of (Ans.) 1101 (i).

Water-Power on St. Lawrence, Concession *re* (Ans.) 9780 (v).

—— *See* 'Long Sault.'

Waterways Treaty, on Inquiry for Plans, 3681 (ii).

—— *See* 'International Waterways' B. 36.'

Westville Postoffice, Number of Bricks used (Ans.) 3471 (ii).

Wharfs, N.S., Contracts *re* Construction (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of (Ans.) 6272 (iv).

Wingham Public Building Clock, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 6664 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Winnipeg, Govt. Buildings, Pavements, &c., Corrected Stmnt., 8923 (v).
——— Rifle Range: *See* 'St. Charles.'
Wolfe Island Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Woods and Canadian Buildings, Cancellations of Heat and Lighting Contract (Ans.) 795, 1088, 1344 (i).
——— Cor. with Mr. Ellis (read) 3672 (ii).
——— Inaccurate Answer to Question (remarks) 1000 (i).
——— Stmnt., *re* Discrepancy in figures, 1011 (i).
——— Last Cheque paid to Imp. Realty Co. (Ans.) 1280 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3175, 3187 (ii).
See 'Supply — Pub. Works — Buildings — Ottawa.'

RANKIN, Mr. J. P., *Perth North.*
Commercial Travellers' Accident Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 52) 1°*, 1277 (i).
Guelph and Goderich Ry. Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 817 (i).
Imperial Traction Co.'s incorp. (B. 102) 1°*, 2434 (ii).
Logan, Robt. William, Relief (B. 173) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
Meyer, Paulina Verena, Relief (B. 145) 1°*, 5933 (iv).
Robertson, Lorne Forbes, Relief (B. 142) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Western Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 1969 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*
Advertising Policy of Government. Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6284 (iv).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4239 (iii).
'Alva' Str., Purchase of, Dimensions, &c. (Ques.) 1909 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* to Philip & Son (Ques.) 2438 (ii).
Baggage Smashing Prevention B. 124 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 4199 (iii).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2432 (ii).
Boat painted by Govt. Officials, Denial *re*, 7942 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9261 (v).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3455 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Cardinal Canal Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Civil Service Apptmt. of Coloured Persons (remarks) 4930 (iii).
Coal Miners' Strike in West, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9709 (v).
Coloured Person appointed to Experimental Farm (remarks) 5039 (iii).
Conciliation Boards, Principle *re* Action (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4244 (iii).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8713 (v).
Courtice, Howard, Emplymt. by Liberal Bureau (remarks) 9784 (v).
Customs Free Entries of Goods, Date of last Entry (Ques.) 803 (i).
Drummond, &c., Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 479 (i).
'Earl Grey,' Ice-breaker, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Depts. (remarks) 2994 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9612 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10235 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s. incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8916 (v).
Grand Trunk Trainmen's Strike, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
——— Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1078 (i).
House of Commons Galleries, Applause by Visitors (remarks) 4468 (iii).
I. C. R., Accidents, Causes of (remarks) 6680 (iv).
——— Construction, Letter of Gloucester Farmers Union (read) in Com. of Sup., 5985 (iv).
——— Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1162 (i).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 913 (i); on M. for 2°, 9099 (v); in Com., 9157, 9182 (v).
Lighthouse Construction, and Marine Purchases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2397 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3231 (ii).
See 'International B. 36,' 'Long Sault.'
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchasing of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 6764, 6914 (iv).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Montreal Legal Firms, Amounts paid for Services (Ques.) 984 (i).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8887 (v).
Naval Service, Date and Port of Sailing of 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow' (Ques.) 1091 (i).
Negroes in Civil Service: *See* 'Civil Service.'
Order, Ques. of *re* Homestead Irregularities (remarks) 5563 (iii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2282 (ii).
——— Plaza, Removal of Poles, &c. (remarks) 6507 (iv).
——— Sussex St. Deptl. Buildings, Tenders *re* (remarks) 4824 (iii).
P. E. I. Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments (remarks) 6925 (iv).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7731 (iv).
Privileges and Elections Com., (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7970 (v).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 857 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 700 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., Alterations, &c., Better Information placed before House (remarks) 4933 (iii).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10062 (v).
——— Importations from Favoured Nation Countries (Ques.) 4111 (iii).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer, 4113 (iii).
——— Names of Countries affected by Treaty *re* importations into Canada, 4131 (iii).
——— Oshawa Fruit Growers' Association (remarks) 5747 (iii).
——— on Ques, of Order *re* Referring to previous debate (remarks) 8253 (v).
——— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3610 (ii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6829 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Prices, Information *re* from Trade and Commerce Dept. (remarks) 6512 (iv).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, Statement (read) 6840 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., on Ruling (Dep. Speaker) *re* Amendments, 5723 (iii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
St. Lawrence River, Damming the Long Sault, Letter from Mr. J. Wesley Allison (read) 3767 (ii).
——— Legislation at Washington, &c. (remarks) 3282 (ii).
——— Letter from Gov. Dix (read) 3839 (ii).
——— Protests *re* Bill now before U.S. (remarks) 4210 (iii).
——— *See* 'Long Sault.'
Sadler, Maggie Florence Relief (B. 137) 1°*, 6116 (iv).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9171 (v).
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp., B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3843 (ii).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry (Mr. Blain) for Ret., 3345 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3790 (ii).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6395; Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6392; Welland (Port Colborne) 6400 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3810 (ii).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5613 (iii).
Labour Dept. (conciliation board) 4244 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6460; (lighthouses) 6461 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8769; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8783; (Canada and South Africa) 8784; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 8788 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevators) 3161; (furniture) 3163; (heating) 3162; (lighting contracts) 3196(ii); (Rideau Hall) 8874 (v); (Rideau Hall Grounds) 3170; (telephones) 3169 (ii)
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 3002 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (freight cars) 5985 (iv).
Woods Building Lighting Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3196 (ii).

RHODES, Mr. E. N., *Cumberland.*
Athol Mail Route, Establishment of, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 2161 (ii).
Battleford Public Buildings, Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 3029 (ii).
Civil Servants in Political Contests (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1054 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of (remarks) 6913 (iv).
Collingwood Corner Postmaster, Name, Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 656 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8712 (v).
Crittenden, Mary Kathleen Relief (B. 180) 1°*, 7666 (iv).

RHODES, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*
Cumberland Coal and Ry. Co., Strike of Employees, Reports, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1340 (i).
Drummond, &c., Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 480 (i).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P.M.G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2269 (ii).
Fisheries Regulations, Penalties *re* Violation of, Inquiry for Ret., 1806 (ii).
G. T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5779 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1753 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Demand for Repeal, &c., (remarks), 6929 (iv).
I. C. R., Accidents, Pars. from N.S Newspaper (read) 6676 (iv).
—— Branch Lines, Acquisition of (remarks) 6769 (iv).
—— Hay transported free from Quebec Prov. to Mar. Proves. (Ques.) 5134 (iii).
Jackson Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ques.) 656 (i).
Parrsboro, N.S., Public Building, Instructions *re* Plans, &c. (M. for copy) 1727 (i).
—— Inquiry for, 8535 (v).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 854 (i).
Railways, Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5078 (iii).
Reciprocity Announcement, Par. in Winnipeg 'Free Press,' *re* Treatment of Reporters (remarks) 2642 (ii).
—— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks 10066 (v).
—— Kentville Board of Trade Res. (read) 5749 (iii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 1001 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1054; Militia (salaries) 1021; Public Works (salaries)) 1033 (i).
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3378 3399 (ii).
Mounted Police (subsistence) 8600 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg) 3029 (ii); N.S. (Lunenburg) 1625; (Parrsboro) 1625 (i); Ont. (Wiarton) 2636 (ii); Ottawa (lighting) 3174 (ii); Sask. (Battleford) 2978, 3001 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (airbrakes) 5913; (airbrakes, freight cars) 5915; (bridge strengthening) 5914; (Campbellton) 5915; (draw bars) 5915; (fire extinguishers) 5927; (Fredericton) 5916; (Halifax) 5924; (highways protection) 5918; (rolling stock) 5927; (Truro) 5929; (surveys) 5928 (iii).

RHODES, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*
Vancouver Dry Dock Subsidy, Nature of (Ques.) 3469 (ii).
Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of (Ques.) 1101 (i).
Woods Building Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3195 (ii).

RICHARDS, Mr. J. W., *Prince, P.E.I.*
P.E.I. and Mainland Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3879 (ii).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorial Reps., &c. *re* Survey (M. for copies) 176 (ii).

RIVET Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*
Address, The, 208 (i).
Goldschmidt Thermit Co. Patent Relief B. 165) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1514 (i).
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2595 (ii).
Munderloh and Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 203) in Com., 8970 (iv).
Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 208 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 2574 (ii).

ROBB, Mr. J. A., *Huntingdon.*
Beauharnois Canal, Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2677 (ii).
—— Rentals, Sums expended, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2199 (ii).
C.P.R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Cor., 769 (i).
Commission to Immigration Agents, Total Amount paid (Ques.) 2436 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3487 (ii).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8460 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7328 (iv).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J., *Marquette*
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1361 (i).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N. W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9041 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3519 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2417 (ii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8085, 8631 (v).
Fort Osborne, Purchase of Grounds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Homestead Irregularities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5616 (iii).
Homesteading by Women, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 1284 (i).
Immigration Act. Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2018 (ii).
Minnedosa Public Building, Purchase of Site (Ques.) 9993 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3046 (ii).
Ry. Rates, Comparison with U. S. Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6431 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., Fleming Grain Growers' Association Res. (read) 5550 (iii).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7623 (iv).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Pet. *re* Withdrawal of Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8636 (v).
St. Andrews Dam Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3046 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 4728 (iii).
Immigration (seed grain) 3836 (ii).
Indians—N.W.T. (Dr. J. D. Lafferty, payments to) 6046 (iv).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5616 (iii).
Militia—(Winnipeg rifle range) 6053 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic) 6089 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Ry. Commission) 6431 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (inspectors) 6059 (iv).
Western Farmers as Immigration Agents to Europe (Ques.) 799, 1284 (i).

ROSS, Mr. D. C., *Middlesex West.*
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).

ROY, Mr. C., *Montmagny.*
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1770 (i).
I. C. R. Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1168 (i).
Light-House Keepers, Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 775 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of, Montmagny Electors, Correction in Hansard, 1356 (i).

ROY, Mr. E., *Dorchester.*
Naval Service for Can. (remarks) on Address, 204 (i).

RUSSELL, Mr. J., *Toronto East.*
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8721 (v).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8913, 8928 (v).

RUSSELL, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of (remarks) 9996 (v).
Postoffice Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9570 (v).

SUPPLY.
Canals—Miscellaneous (working expenses) 6453; (Newmarket) 6453; Welland (Port Colborne) 6397 (iv).
Indians—Man., &c. (annuities) 8885 (v).
Post Office (letter carriers' boots) 4283; (ry. mail clerks) 4286 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers, &c.) 6027 (iv); Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 8882 (v).

RUTAN, Mr. W. W., *Prince Albert.*
Alberta, Saskatchewan Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 133) 1°*, 4740 (iii).
Canadian Loans and Investments in U. S., Amount, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6505 (iv).
Farm Products, Dutiable Exports from Provs. for 1908-10 into U.S. (Ques.) 7026 (iv).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. (B. 171) 1°*, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8095, 8236, 8536, 8916 (v).
Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway Co.'s incorp. (B. 166) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
Imports by Provinces into U. S., Total Amounts (Ques.) 5634 (iii).
Railways owned, Operated in U. S. and Can., Mileage, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6158 (iv).
Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7626 (iv).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1941 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8807 (v).
Chacastapasin Indian Reserve, Owner, &c. (Ques.) 4301 (iii).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, System *re* Operating (prop. res.) 3472, Neg. (N. 96; Y. 54) 3524 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2414 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8122 (v).
Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c. (Ques) 10196 (v).
——— *See* 'Parcel.'
Farmers' Bank, Par. in 'News' *re* Endorsation of Premier (remarks) 2264 (ii).
Farmers' Delegation *re* Tarifl Changes, Distribution of Copies (remarks) 6908 (iv).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8610 (v).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9526 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8095, 8243 (v).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull,' Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1558 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 968 (i).
Leech, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iii).
Order, Ques. of *re* Homestead Irregularities (remarks) 5562 (iii).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9923 (v).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9313 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8281 (v).
——— Consolidated Boards of Trade, Sask., Despatch from W. A. Shepherd (read) 5752 (iii).
——— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10019 (v).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6815 (iv).
Rural Mail Routes, Number operating in Man. (Ques.) 1105 (i).
SUPPLY—
Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coin) 6060 (iv).
Dom. Lands—(Forestry convention) 6053 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5171 (iii); (seed grain) 6048 (iv).
Indians—N. W. T. (Dr. J. D. Lafferty, payments to) 6046; (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6038 (iv).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5587 (iii).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4230 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Prince Rupert) 3016; Man. (Souris) 3019; Sask. (Humboldt) 3007; (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).
Typhoid Epidemic and Water Supply (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4481 (iii).
Yukon Beer Import Tax, Repeal Bill (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 1978 (ii).

SCHELL, Mr. M. S., *Oxford South.*
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6212 (iv).
Canadian Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnson before Agricultural Com. (remarks) 2992 (ii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1258 (i).

SEALEY, Mr. W. O., *Wentworth.*
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 7341 (iv).
——— (remarks) *re* Question, 7348 (iv).

SEALEY, Mr. W. O.—*Con.*
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8995 (v).
Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 101) 1*, 2434 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7530, (amt.) 7547 (iv).
——— Vote *re* Amendment, Ques. of Priv., 7666 (iv).
Selkirk Route, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6398 (iv).

SEXSMITH, Mr. J. A., *Peterborough, East.*
Cement Production, Total Production annually since 1900 (Ques.) 10196 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8952 (v).
Haileybury Dock, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 7806 (iv).
Indian Reserves in Ont., Fences, Settlement of Disputes *re* (Ques.) 1910 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8079 (v).
Marriages, Validity of, Law respecting (Ques.) 6269 (iv).
Milk and Cream exported, Quantity for 1910 (Ques.) 6269 (iv).
Potatoes exported, Quantity, Value from 1901 to 1910 (Ques.) 6271 (iv).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Statement (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5072 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7224 (iv).
——— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8372 (v).
——— Par. *re* Quaker Oats Co. (read) 4120 (iii).
——— Peterborough Board of Trade Res. (read) 5750 (iii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6814 (iv).
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6190 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c (animals health) 5963; (dairy experiments) 6235; (seeds) 6221 (iv).
Canals—Trent (improvements) 6419 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 1478 (i).
Post Office—Outside Service (rural) 6089 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2603 (ii).
Victoria Museum, Cracking of Tower, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 5937 (iv).

SHARPE, Mr. S., *Ontario, North.*
Agricultural Imports into Canada, Quantity, Average Price, &c. (Ques.) 5401 (iii).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Agriculture and Militia Expenditure from 1867 to 1910 (Ques.) 9371, 9432 (v).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5079, 5574, 5630 (iii).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 14) 1° m., 261 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 9335 (v).
Bank Failures, Statement of Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses (Ques.) 2670 (ii).
See 'Farmers' Bank.'
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., Ref. to Justice Dept. (Ques.) 926, 1091 (i).
See 'Justice.'
Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency, Charge *re* Frauds (Ques.) 1716 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9277 (v).
Census of North and South Ontario, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 9431 (v).
Companies Act (annual stmnts.) Amt. (B. 7) 1° m., 149; 2° m., 1296 (i).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr Monk) in Com., 1336 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4662 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (counting ballots) Amt. (B. 16) 1° m., 377 (i).
Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron (Ques.) 6288 (iv).
See 'Steel.'
Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by 'International' (M. for ret.*) 1498 (i).
Eclipse Mfg. Co., Office Specialty Co., and Ahearn & Soper, Payments to, Contracts *re*, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
Ellis, Mr., Ottawa City Lighting Co. *See* 'Woods.'
Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission, *re* (remarks) 1510 (i).
——— Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston (Ques.) 4826 (iii).
——— Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5465 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9624 (v).
Govt. Savings Banks, Number of Depositors, &c. (Ques.) 794 (i).
Graham, Mr. Duncan, Apptmt. as Indian Agent (Ques.) 5291 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8921 (v).
G.T.P, Classification, Arbitrator's Rep. (Ques.) 696 (i).
Hague Arbitration *re* Newfoundland Fisheries, Counsel, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 797 (i).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1408, 1527 (i).
House of Commons, Sessional Employees since 1896, &c. (M. for ret.) 3471 (ii).
Immigration Bonuses paid *re* Three Swiss Girls, &c. (Ques.) 2436 (ii).
Imperial Realty Co.: *See* 'Woods.'
Indian Act (fences) Amt. (B. 95) 1° m., 1969 (ii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8408 (v).
I.C.R. Freight Rates on Coal, &c., in Mar. Provs., Classification, &c. (Ques.) 6156 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1522 (i).
Justice, Deputy Minister of, acting as counsel for outside Cases (remarks) in Sup., 1014 (i).
See 'Bank of Montreal.'
Loans, Negotiations for, 1909, 1910, Financial Agents, &c. (Ques.) 797 (i).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c. (Ques.) 3281 (ii).
Militia and Agriculture, Expenditure from 1867 to 1910 (Ques.) 9371, 9432 (v).
Militia Regiments, Number in Montreal, Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 7595 (iv).
Ministers of Crown, Absence on Public Business, for 1908-10, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1340 (i).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses for 1908-9-10 (Ques.) 817 (i).
——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7442 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10502 (v).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup.. 2300 (ii).
——— New Leases, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 1281 (i).
Ottawa Municipal Lighting Plant, Number of Govt. Buildings lighted (Ques.) 1280 (i).
See 'Woods.'
Parry Sound Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1881 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 849 (i).
Railway Accidents, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3933 (ii).
Railway Act (express cos.) Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 149; 2° m., 1298 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9312, 9320 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9227 (v).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 10151, 10310 (v).
—— Conferences Length of Sessions, Names of Representatives, &c. (Ques.) 7036 (iv).
—— Stmnt. in White Book, &c. (Ques.) 10193 (v).
—— Statistics, Purpose of Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 7037 (iv).
—— Trade with other Countries affected (Ques.) 3667 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4569 (iii).
Ross Rifles, Number issued to Queen's Own Regiment (Ques.) 9781 (v).
St. Lambert Govt. Buildings, Option on Lands (Ques.) 2677 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2577 (ii).
St. Lawrence Power Co., Annual Payments *re* Light and Power, &c. (Ques.) 3468 (ii).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9167 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, (remarks) 1385 (i).
Steel and Iron Bounties, Subsidies *re* (M. for memorials*) 3948 (ii).
—— Govt. Inspectors, Salaries, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 5936 (iv).
—— Renewal of (remarks) 3274 (ii).
—— Total Amounts paid since 1896 (Ques.) 3607 (ii).
See 'Dumping.'
Sub-targets, Number purchased by Govt., Price, &c. (Ques.) 8583 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 1014; Militia (salaries) 1029 (i).
Militia (allowance) 8518 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2610; (Seaforth) 2626; (Tilbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2628; (Uxbridge) 2630; (Wiarton) 2637 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Quebec (Napierville) 1867; (Roberval) 1888; (Rock-Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (St. Lambert) 1895; (Shawenegan) 1890 (i).
Uxbridge Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 1084 (i).
—— Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 9782 (v).
'Wanda' Yacht, Appraising by Customs, &c. (M. for reps.*) 4678 (iii).
—— Changed from American to Canadian Register, Date, &c. (Ques.) 4300 (iii).
—— Date of Entry at Canadian Port, Notice to Customs Dept. (Ques.) 5933 (iv).
—— Length, Motive Power, &c. (Ques.) 5834 (iii).
—— Valuation by Customs, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Paterson) 5624 (iii).
See 'Farmer's Bank.'

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Whitby Post Office Site, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1867 (i).
Woods and Canadian Buildings, Heating and Lighting Contract, Cancellation of (Ques.) 794, 1088, 1344 (i).
—— Inaccurate Answer (remarks) 999 (i).
—— (M. for cor.*) 3948 (ii).
—— Lighting Contracts, *re* Cor. with Mr. Ellis (remarks) 3675 (ii).
—— Lighting Contracts (remarks) 1011 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3176 (ii).
—— Date of last cheque paid to Imperial Realty Co. for Lighting (Ques.) 1279 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'

SHARPE, Mr. W. H., *Lisgar.*
Battleford Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
British Preference Trade Policy (remarks) 5545, 5619 (iii).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9726 (v)
Coal Mining Rights in School Lands, Leases issued, &c. (Ques.) 5291 (iii).
Elevators, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3495 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8125 (v).
Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Milk Average, Sale of Eggs, &c. (Ques.) 662, 1285 (i).
G.T.P. Developing Co., Land Purchase from (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
—— Govt. Reserve on Homestead Lands (Ques.) 3466 (ii).
—— Number of Acres sold by Govt., Price, &c. (Ques.) 2366 (ii).
Homestead Irregularities &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5593 (iii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, Policy, &c. (Ques.) 660 (i).
Interest Act Amt B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°. 972 (i).
Lands, Mineral Rights, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 3955 (iii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1253 (i).
Pembina Fish Dam, Placing of Ladder, &c. (Ques.) 1090 (i).
See 'St. Andrews.'
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5052 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8162 (v).
—— British Preference, &c. (remarks) 5545, 5619 (iii).
—— Farm Products imported from other countries (Ques.) 3668 (ii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

St. Andrews Rapids, Fish Ladder, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
See 'Pembina.'

St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of (remarks) 10509 (v).

Seed Grain Indebtedness, Amount *re* (Ques.) 3225 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 6226 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 1484 (i).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5587 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Wetaskiwin) 3011 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. Chilliwack) 3013; (Cranbrook) 3013; (Fernie) 3015; (Nanaimo) 3016; (Prince Rupert) 3016 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg) 3032, 3053 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 3008; (Melfort) 3010; (Moosejaw) 3010; (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).

Wheat Prices in West and in Canada and Liverpool Market (Ques.) 6267 (iv).

SIFTON, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6146 (iv).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4385 (iii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H. *Guysborough.*

Canadian Northern Ry., Guarantee of Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8862 (v).

Grain Stored in Port Arthur and Ft. William Elevators, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 3605 (ii).

Guysborough, 'Times,' Application *re* Postal Privileges, (M. for cor.*) 6505 (iv).

I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1115 (i).

——— Westbound and Eastbound Traffic for five Years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2162 (ii).

Life Saving Rewards, Names of Recipients (Ques.) 3849 (ii).

Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2774 (ii).

Post Office Service in N.S., Weekly and Biweekly, &c. (Ques.) 982 (i).

Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7626 (iv).

Shipping from Guysborough County, Number of Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 4467 (iii).

Sick Mariners, Law *re* Payment of Dues, &c. (Ques.) 1904 (i).

Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting (prop res.) 3074, 3138 (ii).

Steam Trawlers, 'Wren' and 'Croquette,' Registration in Can. (Ques.) 4046 (iii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (farm bulletins) 6187 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1057 (i).
Fisheries (fish transportation) 6101 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8760 (v).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8688 (v).
Ocean and River Service—Govt. Steamers —(maintenance, &c.) 5813 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2609 (ii).

Water Carriage of Goods Act (wood) Amt. (B. 21J) 1°*, 8887, in Com., 9349 (v).

SMITH, Mr. A. W., *Middlesex, North.*

Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1248 (i).

Reciprocity Treaty, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6776 (iv).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 402 (i).

British Columbia and Central Can. Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 113) 1°*, 3143 (ii), in Com., 5127, 5253 (iii).

Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s (B. 204) 1°*, 8582 (v).

Chinese Immigration, Stmt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion with Prime Minister (remarks) 2738 (ii).

——— Total Number, Capita Tax, Exempts, &c. (Ques.) 788 (i).

Co-operation (B. 29) 1° m., 699 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1431 (i).

Immigration into Western Canada, Article in "John Bull", Conditions *re* (remarks) 1564 (i).

'Iroquois,' Str., Report *re* Wreck (remarks) 7104 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Number landed, Special Applications, &c. (Ques.) 790 (i).

Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 548 (i).

Netherland Mortgage Loan Co., Rep. of W. T. R. Preston, Cor. with Govt., &c. (Ques.) 789 (i).

Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2352 (ii).

Pacific and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 167) 1°*, 6906 (iv).

Railway Accidents, since 1st April ,1909, on running trains, construction work, &c. (M. for ret.) 713 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6709 (iv).

SMITH, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Ry. Employees Protection (B. 114) 1° m., 3218 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Nanaimo) 3016 (ii).
Truesdell, Frances Whittington Relief (B. 183) 1°*, 7666 (iv).
Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 377 (i).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Stormont.*
Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3240 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland—(enlargement) 6407 (iv).

SMYTH, Mr. W. R., *Algoma, East.*
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie, 4371 (iii).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 8959 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6141 (iv).
Porcupine Disasters by Fire, Aid by Govt. (remarks) 9635 (v).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. to Com., 827 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 9966 (v).
—— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10011 (v).
—— Resolutions *re*, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com., 10146 (v).
SUPPLY—
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8681 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1695 (i).
Thessalon Breakwater, Construction of (remarks) 10532 (v).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Delay, &c. (remarks) 9907 (v).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C..) *Bonaventure.*
Address, The, Order, Ques, of *re* 'coward,' member asked to withdraw expression, 462, Apology asked for, 463 (i).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6321 (iv).
Alien Labour Law, Emplymt of Foreign Labour in B.C., Members remarks checked 10372 (v).
Bank Act Bill, Discussion *re* (remarks) 6442 (iv).
Beauharnois Canal Grantees, &c, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., Member's remarks checked, 2213 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C.)—*Con.*
Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 4231, 6574 (iii), 9536 (v).
Bois Blanc Island Dam: (ruling) *re* Discussion, 1575 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Oliver) Member's remarks checcked, 8190 (v).
Cobalt Mail Service, Members' remarks checked, 1650 (i).
Divorce Bills, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Ethier) Members' remarks checked, 4204 (iii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Electoral District, Certificate *re*, 259 (i).
—— Election, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Gauvreau) insulting language (ruling) 77 (i).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Macdonald) 144 (i).
—— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) (ruling) 472-3 (i).
Electricity Exportation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 1°, 2260 (ii).
—— Ruling *re* Introduction of, 2364 (ii).
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 159 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Objection (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Amt. (Mr. Monk) (ruling) 5164 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox) 9524 (v).
Hours of Labour Bill, on M. for 3° (ruling) *re* Ques. of Order (Mr. Lancaster) 2874 (ii).
House of Commons Speaker's Gallery, Rules *re* Allotment of Seats (remarks) 270 (i).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions (ruling) 1551 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Limiting remarks, 6946 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amts., 3460 (ii).
Labour Strikes, Cor. with Mr. Geo. Taylor (ruling) 10349 (v).
Mails, Illegal Use of *re* C. D. Sheldon (ruling *re* M. to adjn. hse., 1357 (i).
See 'Sheldon.'
Markey Fishing Leases, Cancellation of, Members remarks checked, 6763 (iv).
Ministerial Association Ottawa, Res. *re* Member checked, 3059 (ii).
Ministers' Speeches distributed by Postmasters, Members' remarks checked, 9255 (v).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Boyce) 2769, 2814 (ii).
Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse., Members' remarks checked, 2262 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C.)—*Con.*
National Battlefields in Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on Regularity of Proceedings (ruling) 9500 (v).
Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) Members' remarks checked, 10522 (v).
Offensive Weapons, Sale of (Mr. Lewis) Members' remarks checked, 2559 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill (Mr. Conmee) on M. to introduce, 2829, Ruled out of Order, 2850 (ii).
——— Printing in English (remarks) in Com., 3184 (ii).
——— Ruling *re* Procedure, 2883 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, Member asked to apologize for using word 'liar,' (remarks) 463 (i).
——— Member asked to withdraw and apologize, 462 (i).
Parliament, Opening of, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 1 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Ques. of Order, 7974 (v).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Boyce) irrelevancy of debate, 6361 (iv).
——— (Mr. Paterson)—(remarks) 5626 (iii).
——— (Mr. Geo. Taylor) Unparliamentary Language (ruling) 9784 (v).
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies, Ques. of Order (ruling) 3073 (ii).
Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Perley) on Ques. of Order (ruling) 10202 (v).
Questions, Procedure *re* Answering, Orally or Written (remaks) 700 (i).
Railways, Capitalization of, Member asked to withdraw words, 5258 (iii).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to meet during sittings of the House (ruling) 9228 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., Absence of Miinsters, Ques. of Order, 8359 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk). Ques. of Order. (Mr. Currie) 4055 (iii).
———Answers of Ministers to Questions (ruling) 4137 (iii).
——— Importation from other Countries, Members' remarks checked, 4114 (iii).
——— Members' remarks checked, 5545 (iii).
——— Negotiations at Washington, Instructions to Mr. Bryce *re* (ruling) *re* answers of Ministers, 4141 (iii).
——— Objections *re* Interruptions (remarks) 4451 (iii.)
——— Obstruction *re*, Member requested to withdraw stmnt., 10008 (v).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox), Sustaining of Deputy Speaker's Ruling (ruling) 5032 (iii).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C.)—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U. S., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Obstruction by Ministers of the Crown (ruling) 4124 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) Remarks checked, 5744 (iii).
——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5948 (iv).
——— Statistics, Members' remarks checked, 4473 (iii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6835 (iv).
——— Tel. read by Mr. Burrell, Remarks checked, 3771 (ii).
——— Vote of Member for Labelle. 6839 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 7616 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7675 (iv).
Returns, Notice of, Member's remarks checked, 5939 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Ltd., incorp. B. 159 (Mr. Devlin) on M, for 1°, 6439 (iv).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly the Flag. Member's remarks checked, 7687 (iv).
St. Lawrence Dam, Member's remarks checked, 4211 (iii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Bradbury) 5865 (iii).
Senate Amendments to Public Bills, Consideration of (ruling) 3845 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (ruling) *re* M. (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).
See 'Mails.'
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) Member's remarks checked, 3350 (ii).
Speech from Throne (read) 2 (i).
Sterling Trusts Corporation incorp., B. 32 (Mr. Martin) on Senate Amts.. 6609 (iv.)
SUPPLY—
House of Commons (charwomen) 6174; (committees) 6170; (debates) 6171; (Dep. Clerk Crown in Chancery) 6167; (electric light attendant) 6175; (messengers) 6172; (pages) 6174; (servants) 6175; (sessional clerks) 6168; (stationery) 6176; (telephones) 6171, (Senate stationery) 6337 (iv).
Typhoid Epidemic in Ottawa, Member's remarks checked, 4657 (iii).
Vacancy, Arthabaska and Drummond Electoral District (notification) 1 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy, (McIntyre, Mr. G. H.), *Perth South.*
'Arctic,' Capt. Bernier's Report, Member's remarks checked, 6541 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy, (McIntyre, Mr. G. H.)—*Con.*
British Columbia Development Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., Objection to proposed Amt., 5127 (iii).
Canada Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Middlebro) 7564 (iv).
Canada and Japan Trade Relations, on Ques of Order, 9484 (v).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 201, on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8982 (v).
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. 206 (Mr. D. A. Gordon) in Com., 8970 (v).
Conciliation Board and Labour Dept., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Nesbitt) 4267 (iii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir', 482 (i).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8921 (v).
Grand Falls and St. John Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., (ruling) *re* Power of Govt. to introduce word 'Equipment,' 5721 (iii).
Homestead Irregularities, &c., on Ques. of Order (rulings) 5561-3 (iii).
Hours of Labour B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., Irrelevancy of deb. (remarks) 1433 (i).
Indian Act (Treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. (remarks) *re* discussion 7857 (iv).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in com., 9158, 9180 (v).
—— Irrelevancy of debate, 9177 (v).
Lethbridge, Speech of Member for Pictou, Acceptance of Denial (remarks) 1877 (i).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 7724 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Irrelevancy of Debate, 10523-4 (v).
Order, Ques. of, Member asked to withdraw word 'Liar', 5561 (iii).
Postoffice Estimates, on objection to passing (remarks) 4298 (iii).
Public Buildings, Cost of (ruling) *re* Ques. of Order, on Discussion in Com. of Sup., 2101 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., Interruptions not relevant (ruling) 7527 (iv).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) Quotations, &c. (read) 7548 (iv).
—— Interruptions to speakers (remarks) 5030 (iii).
—— Letter read by member for Saltcoats, Giving of Names (ruling) 7265 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy, (McIntyre, Mr. G. H.)—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U. S., Letter of Sir Charles Tupper (ruling) *re* reading, 8279 (iv).
—— Member (Mr. Geo. Taylor) referring to previous debate (ruling) 8252 (v).
—— Obstruction by Opposition (remarks) 9889 (v).
——on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) *re* 'Cowardice' applied to Minister of Crown, 10564 (v).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3705 (ii).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Guthrie) *re* ref. to former debate, 3690-91 (ii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices, Irrelevancy of debate (ruling) 6899 (iv).
—— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Ques. of Order *re* Addressing the Chair, 6890 (iv).
—— Talking of Ministers, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 7293 (iv).
—— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (explanation) 7670 (iv).
—— (remarks) 7619 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com. on amts. 8966 (v).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9168 (v).
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2649 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture (animals health) member's remarks checked, 5964; (dairying) Member's remarks checked, 6247 (iv); (exhibitions) Member's remarks checked, 3796 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board), Ques. of Order, 3448 (ruling) 3448, 3450, 3451 (ii).
Marine—Public Works—St. Lawrence ship channel, Discussion *re*, 6555 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Mitchell) 2148 (ii).
Whitby Postoffice Site (ruling) on Ques. of Order, 1870 (i).
Winnipeg World's Fair, Irrelevancy of debate, in Com. of Sup., 5982 (iv)
Woods Building Lighting Contract, Ques. of Order, 3194 (ii).
SPROULE, Mr. T. S., *Grey East.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 334 (i).
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Cash) on Senate Amts., 6469 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5080; on M. for 3°, 5252 (iii).
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 220 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 9225; on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to place on Govt. Orders, 9350 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3459 (ii).
Anglo-American Arbitration Treaty, Communication *re* (remarks) 5619 (iii).
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Favoured Nation Clause &c. (remarks) 6758 (iv).
——— Cor. *re* Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6906 (iv).
Annual Drill, Number of Officers, Men, &c. (Ques.) 8699, 9352 (v).
Bahama Islands, Annexation to Canada, Rumours *re* (remarks) 9372 (v).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1341 (i).
——— B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 9337 (v).
——— B. 207 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 8698 (v).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 2431, 3600 (ii).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7480 (iv).
Births and Deaths in Canada, Number &c., on M. (Mr. McCarthy) for Ret., 2680 (ii).
British Columbia Development Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., 5127 (iii).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1682 (i).
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6208 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7564 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827; in Com., 9261, 9297 (v).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3454 (ii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. to ref. to Committee on Marine and Fisheries, 6675 (iv).
Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Cement Merger, Charges of Sir Sanford Fleming (remarks) 9372, 10468 (v).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work (remarks) 7220 (iv).
Chinese Immigration, Encounter of Mr. Jardine and Min. of Inland Revenue (remarks) 2739 (ii).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9832 (v).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).
Cholera Precautions &c. (remarks) 10197 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8716 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Civil Servants and Municipal Office, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2225 (ii).
Civil Servants earning Extra Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1019 (i).
Coal Miners' Strike in the West, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9701 (v).
Cocaine: *See* 'Opium,' 'Poisons.'
Consuls General, Foreign, Status at Official Receptions &c. (M. for Cor. with Imp. Govt.), 949 (i).
Convicts liberated from Penitentiaries, Clothing &c. (remarks) 2069 (ii).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1316 (i).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7813 (iv).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8714 (v).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7016 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act, Orders in Council, Amendments to, in Com. on Res., 1934 (ii).
Drill Halls Generally, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2128 (ii).
Drummond &c. Elections, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir', 473 (i).
Electricity Exportation Act Amt. (B. 101) on M. for 1°, 2260 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3502 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur, Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2379 (ii).
Embargo on British Cattle (remarks) 10344 (v).
Estimates, Discussion of (remarks) 2970 (ii).
——— Order of Discussion *re* Depts. (remarks) 2995 (ii).
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Ref. to Questions, Ques. of Order, 158 (i).
——— Deputy Governor or Administrator, Apptmt. of Mr. Justice Girouard, Tel. to Cardinal Vannutelli *re* Eucharistic Congress (Ques.) 702 (i).
——— Guards of Honour, Authority for (Ques.) 704 (i).
——— Reception to Cardinal Vannutelli, Telegram *re* Govt., Answers *re* (remarks) 6518 (iv).
——— Speaker's Attendance in Official Robes (Ques.) 706 (i).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Eucharistic Congress, Telegram from Mr. Justice Girouard *re* Visit of Cardinal Vannutelli (Ques.) 702 (i).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8453 (v).
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'
Farmers' Bank, Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8215 (v).
—— Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2244 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation &c., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9607 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P.M.G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2270 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8422 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8490 (v).
Flags Flying on Public Buildings (remarks) 3672 (ii).
Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale, on prop. Res. (Mr. Stanfield) 3227 (ii).
Forest Reserves and Parks (B. 85) Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8619, 8655 (v).
Gaspereau Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) Ques. of Order, 10228 (v).
'Globe' Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Morning Sittings, 10095 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M for 2° 9522, 9528 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238 (v).
G. T. P. Branch Lines B. 73 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3021 (ii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306; in Com., 9510 (v).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10102 (v).
High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay. Ry. Co.'s incorp., B. 202 (Mr. W. M. Martin) on M. for 2°, 8642 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. [illegible] (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1423 (i); on M for 3°, 3526 (ii).
House of Commons, Speaker of, Wearing of Official Robes on State Occasions, &c. (Ques.) 705 (i).
See 'Eucharistic.'
—— Sessional Employes, Names. Ages. &c. (M. for ret.*) 980 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
House of Commons, Ventilation (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4479 (iii).
Imperial Steamship Co.'s incorp., B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) on Senate Amts., 6611 (iv).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6938, 6946 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8745 (v).
I. C. R., Branch Lines Lease, (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9590 (v).
I. C. R., Special Excursion Trains &c.. (remarks) 2999 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9091 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations B. 223 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9495 (v).
See 'China.'
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2595 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3182 (ii).
Lighthouse Keepers, Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for ret. (remarks) 773 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System (prop. res.) 1184, neg. (Y. 66; N. 111) 1275 (i).
McClary's Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024 (ii).
Militia Annual Drill, Number called out from 1894 to 1910 (Ques.) 8699 (v).
See 'Annual Drill.'
Ministers. Travelling Expenses, Tips, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7476 (iv).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) on M. for 3°, 7717; in Com., 7720 (iv).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9230; in Com., 9495 (v).
Naval Service of Canada, Total Cost of Cruisers, &c. (Ques.) 791 (i).
Negro Immigration, Restrictions *re* (remarks) 6525 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co.'s Investments in Canada, on prop. Res. for Com. (Mr. Monk) 780, 783 (i).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 8648 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Oliver; Hon. Mr.. Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8329 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill, on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2848 (ii).
Opium, Importation of, Prohibition B. 22 (Mr. King) on M. for 1°, 469 (i).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 2532 (ii).
Ottawa City Sanitary Conditions, Rep. of Dr. Hodgetts (remarks) 5535 (iii).
Ottawa Government Buildings, Parliament Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 7024 (iv).
Oyster Culture, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor. (remarks) 762 (i).
Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Associations, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 7340 (iv).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9920 (v).
Pelagic Sealing, Treaty between G.B. and U.S. *re* Protection (remarks) 3670 (ii).
—— Further information *re* (remarks) 3839 (ii).
—— Ratification of (remarks) 3769 (ii).
See 'Sealing.'
People's Railway Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Nesbitt) on Senate Amts., 6611 (iv).
Pig Iron Imports, used in Steel Rail Mills, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).
Poisons, Sale of, B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 261 (i).
Post Office Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Post Office Dept., Overcrowding in Basement (Ques.) 6667 (iv).
Precedence at Official Receptions (M. for cor.) 949 (i).
Preston, Mr.: *See* 'Netherlands.'
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 846 (i).
Public Works Supply, Objection *re* Full Vote, 9558 (v).
Quebec Boundaries, Cor. with Ont. and Dom. Govts, O.Cs, &c (M. for copies*) 981 (i).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 9343 (v).
Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Use of (remarks) 7109 (iv).
Ques. of Order, *re* Mr. Pugsley's Record in Public Life, 10202 (v).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 701 (i).
Rabies Outbreak, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Race Track Gambling, on M. (Mr. Miller) to print evidence, 10467 (v).
Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Martin) on M. for 2°, 3944, in Com., 3946 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 959 (i).
Railway Accidents, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res, (Mr. Miller) 3939 (ii).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5254 (iii).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
—— on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5066 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3980, 3995 (iii).
—— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8370 (v).
—— Berlin Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5729 (iii).
—— Editorial in Montreal 'Star' (remarks) 4139 (iii).
—— Letter read by Member for Saltcoats, Giving Name of Writer (remarks) 7264 (iv).
—— Oleomargarine, Admission of (remarks) 6504 (iv).
—— Ques. of Order, *re* Interruptions, 4451 (iii).
—— Ques. of Order *re* Obstruction by Minister of Crown (Mr. Paterson) 4124 (iii).
—— on Ques. of Order, *re* referring to previous debate (remarks) 8253 (v).
—— in Com. on Res. (remarks) on handing in Statements, 6954 (iv).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6823 (iv).
—— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7613, 7669 (iv).
—— Letter from 'Globe' Reporter, Reading of, Ques. of Order, 7675 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 9166 (v).
St. Lawrence River, Damming Long Sault, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3230 (ii).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9168 (v).
Scrip to Northwest Settlers, Claims of Pioneers (remarks) 10138 (v).
Seal Fisheries Negotiations (remarks) 9594 (v).
—— Cor. *re* (remarks) 10196 (v).
See 'Pelagic.'

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2597, 2649, 3844 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6610 (iv).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2715 (ii).

Sewage Disposal B. 122 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 4040 (iii).

Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1373 (i).

Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7249 (iv).

South African Parlt., Rep. *re* from P.M.G. (remarks) 1581 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals health) 5955; (dairying) 6238 (iv); (exhibitions) 3781 (ii); (seeds) 6223; (tobacco production) 6262 (iv).

Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6412 (iv)

Canals—Chambly — (macadamizing) 6408; (machinery) 6357 (iv).

Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6358 (iv).

Canals—Miscellaneous (working expenses) 6453 (iv)

Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6396 (iv).

Canals—Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6391 (iv).

Canals—Trent—(lift lock) 6398 (iv).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6398 (iv).

Canals—Williamsburg (machinery) 6426 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 5955 (iv); Justice (salaries) 1019; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1472; Militia (salaries) 1031 (i); Privy Cuncil (clerkships) 8752 (v); Public Works—(salaries) 1033 (i).

Fisheries (Canadian exhibit) 6661; Ont. (inspectors) 6618 (iv).

Indians—Man. Sask. &c. (annuities) 8884 (v); Que. (medical attendance) 6036 (iv).

Labour Dept. (technical education commission) 3803 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6455; (pensions to pilots) 6533; (shipbuilding) 6484; (Thunder Bay) 6500 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8752; (Canada and G.B.) 8774; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784; (Gaspe and Dalhousie) 8786; (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 8786; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8788; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 8788 (v).

Militia (allowance) 8518 (v).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 5828; (schools of navigation) 5824 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (electric power) 3210; (engineers) 3213; (Quarantine stations) 3213 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2096; (Dresden) 2107; (Dundas) 2109; (Essex) 2110; (Fort William) 2111; (Kingston) 2130; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2132; (Listowel) 2141; (Midland) 2144; (Mitchell) 2146; (Peterborough) 2604 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. improvements) 2591; (Montreal barracks) 2569; (Printing Bureau) 2361 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8878 (v); (water supply) 2583 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1686; (Marieville) 1697 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2971 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3215; (salaries) 3214 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Amaguadees Pond) 9500 (v); Ont. (Victoria) 6022 (iv).

Railways—I. C. R. (working expenses) 6338; Miscellaneous (ry. commissioners) 6429 (iv).

Victoria Museum, Defects in Building (remarks) 7350 (iv).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 135) in Com., 6950 (iv).

Winnipeg International Exposition, Govt. Assistance to (Ques.) 708 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 5982 (iv).

Woods Building Lighting Contract, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3195 (ii).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 3°, 5253 (iii).

Coal and Coke, Quantities imported into Canada from U. S. (Ques.) 4674 (iii).

Creighton, Mr. W. O., Farmer Delegate to G. B., Payments to (M. for ret.*) 6505 (iv).

——— (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

'Earl Grey' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c. (Ques.) 1972 (ii).

Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale (prop. res.) 3226 (ii).

See 'Inspection.'

Hickman, W. A., Payments to *re* Immigration Agent to G. B. (M. for ret.*) 6505 (iv).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 3276 (ii).

Inspection and Sale Act (flour and meal) Amt. (B. 117) 1° m., 3453 (ii).

I. C. R., Accidents, Passes, &c., Inquiry for Return, 1571 (i).

——— I. C. R. and P. E. I. Pension Fund, Delegation *re* Amendments (Ques.) 2159 (ii).

——— Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees &c. (Ques.) 2152 (ii).

——— Porters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6339 (iv).

——— Special Excursion Trains *re* Political Meetings (remarks) 2999 (ii).

'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 1724 (i).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Mormon Propaganda, Prevention by Govt. (Ques.) 5135 (iii).
Nash, Fred. J., Emplymt. by Govt. in Inland Revenue, P.E.I. (Ques.) 2668 (ii).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 2435 (ii).
Postoffice Savings Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Names &c. (Ques.) 1568 (i).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3889 (ii).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5066 (iii).
St. Peter's Canal, C.B., Construction &c. (Ques.) 8103 (v).
Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3607 (ii).
'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 1910 (i).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3112 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Fredericton pavement) 1612 (i)
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax post office) 1586; (Lunenburg) 1592; (Parrsboro) 1599 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c., 6027 (iv); (lighting) 3175 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Tignish) 1603 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2971 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 5914; (Campbellton) 5915; (Chatham) 5915; (facilities and accommodation) 5929; (highways protection) 5917; (Moncton car shops) 5926; (Truro) 5930 (iii); (working expenses) 6339 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (working expenses) 6356 (iv).
Truro Political Meeting, Instructions *re* Special Rates over I.C.R. (remarks) 2999 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Expenditures *re*, Space allotted, &c. (Ques.) 1975 (ii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*
Agricultural Implements, Imports since 1908, Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 1350 (i).
—— Imported into Can., Valuations, &c., Complaint *re* Manipulation of Duties, &c. (remarks) 1359 (i).
Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Carman Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii.
Census Enumerators for Man., Recommendations *re* Apptmt (remarks) 8889 (v).
—— Apptmt. of by Liberal Organizers, Cor., &c. (read) on M. for Sup., 9006, (amt.) 9015; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 84) 9068 (v).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*
Crop Statistics, Policy of Collecting, &c. (Ques). 5937 (iv).
Drill Halls, Man., Cost *re* (Ques.) 1975 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8128 (v).
Estimates for Man. Buildings, Objection to Discussing, 2969 (ii).
Farmers' Delegation from the West, and Govt. Ownership of Elevators (remarks) 1504 (i).
Flax exported from Saskatchewan (remarks) 10521 (v).
Fort Osborne Grounds, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9520 (v).
Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8095, 8550, 8921 (v).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver)) in Com., 7848 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. (B. 146) 1° m., 5618 (iii).
Krenzer, Mr. J., Dispute with Mr. Greenway *re* Purchase of Land (M. for cor.*) 2225 (ii).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iv).
Land Patents for S.E. ¼ of Sec. 6, Tp. 7, Issue of, &c. (Ques.) 5834 (iii).
Leech, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5611 (iii).
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6201 (iv).
—— Negotiations with Dom. Govt. (M. for cor*) 980 (i).
—— Speech of Prime Minister at Winnipeg *re* Cor., &c. (Ques.) 709 (i).
Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents, Cor. with Miss Wileman (remarks) 9376 (v).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 2770 (ii).
Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10514 (v).
Pratt's Siding, Establishment of Post Office, Requests *re* (Ques.) 3067 (ii).
Ry. Commission, Vacancy on, Apptmt. of Farmer (Ques.) 1291 (i).
Reciprocity Statistics, Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce (remarks) 6510 (iv).
—— Western Farmers' Interests (remarks) 5543 (iii).
Rosendale Mail Service, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 1291 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Extravagance of (remarks) 10519 (v).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6194 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6251 (iv); (exhibitions) 3794 (ii), 9076 (v); (Quarantine, public health) 5981; (seeds) 6217; (tobacco production) 6263 (iv).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6400 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 5955; Postoffice (contingencies) 6068 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3825 (ii).
Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9547 (v).
Militia (rifle ranges) 6056 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 3019; (Souris) 3019; (Winnipeg) 3018 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 3008 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (repairs) 9553 (v).

Winnipeg World's Fair, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv), 9076 (v).

STRATTON, Mr. J. R., *Peterborough West.*

Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 66) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1313 (i).
Fergus Postoffice Site, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1883 (i).
Postoffice Buildings, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).
Reciprocity, Peterborough Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5750 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (seeds) 6218 (iv).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Drummond &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir', 483 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8749 (v).
Naval Defence, Govt. Policy (remarks) on Address, 127 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot) Ques. of Order, 7973 (v).
Quebec Members, Revolt against extra Session, Newspaper Articles, Denial of, 10096 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., Ques. of Order, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 4066 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order, calling Minister a coward, 10564 (v).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6808 (iv).
——— Vote of member for Labelle &c., 6839 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (public health) 5980; Fisheries (inspectors) 6635 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. G., *Leeds.*

Agriculture Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1944 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry Co., Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 3853 (ii).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2433 (ii).
Beef, Pork, &c. and other Animal Products, Imports, Quantity from Oct. 1, 1910, to Feb. 1911 (Ques.) 6264 (iv).
Bliss, Lt. Col. D. C. Foster, Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 8100 (v).
Butter, Cheese and Meats, Imported, Value, Weight, &c. (Ques.) 4926 (iii).
Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911 (Ques.) 4670 (iii).
Buoys, Stolen at Sorel Shipyards, Investigation *re* (remarks) 7216 (iv).
Cab Fares and Street Ry. Fares. Payments for last year to Govt. Employees, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
See 'Ministers Travelling Expenses.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8835 (v).
Census, Omissions *re* Enumerations (remarks) 9720 (v).
Cheese Cool Curing Room, Brockville, Sale of (Ques.) 8095 (v).
Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909 (Ques.) 1103 (i).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8908 (v).
Coal Strike in the West, Agreement of Two Years past (remarks) 6365 (iv).
——— Suggestions to Minister of Labour (remarks) 9720 (v).
See 'Labour.'
Committees, Sel. Standing, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* (remarks) 5 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8714 (v).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections (personal explanation) *re* Speech of Mr. Miller. M.P., *re* 'disloyalty,' 489 (i).
Dry Docks, Applications for Subsidies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4383 (iii).
Escott Postmaster, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
——— Salary, Date of Increase (Ques.) 7701 (iv).
Escott Postmastership, Date of Apptmt., Complaints *re* late Postmaster (Ques.) 4926 (iii).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Farmers' Bank Failure, Applications *re* Establishment (M. for papers*) 1726 (i).
—— Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5450 (iii).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., appointed by Dom. Govt., Duties, &c.. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6614 (iv).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp., B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8243 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1779 (i).
House of Commons, Number of People Residing in, (Ques.) 3847 (ii).
—— Restaurant and Speaker's Rooms, Number of Employees (Ques.) 1085 (i).
—— Speakers' Chambers, Expenditure *re* Piano Rental (Ques.) 927 (i).
—— Speakers' Chambers, Purchase of Birds (Ques.) 928 (i).
—— Speakers' Chambers. Purchase of Glassware (Ques.) 928 (i).
—— Speakers' Chambers, Purchasing of Gramophone Records (Ques.) 927 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8750 (v).
I.C.R., Bell, G. W., Pass Investigation, (Ques.) 6665 (iv).
—— Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* appropriating Scrap Brass, &c., (Ques.) 6664 (iv).
—— Gaskin, Mr. John, Investigation *re* Charges, &c., (Ques.) 7601 (iv).
—— Hawke, Mr. J. T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds, &c., (Ques.) 6665 (iv).
—— Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept., (Ques.) 6666 (iv).
—— Payments to Dr. C. A. Murray, *re* Tickets, &s. (,Ques.) 7031 (iv).
Kelly, Robt., Emplymt. by Govt. at Vancouver, B.C. (Ques.) 2665 (ii).
Labour Strikes, 'Point of the Bayonet,' Ques of Priv., 9784 (v).
—— Use of Militia, Cor., &c., (remarks) 10345 (v).
See 'Coal.'
Letter Carriers, Free Transportation on Electric Rys. (Ques.) 1104 (i).
Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3266 (ii).
Mahone Bay Customs Collector. Dismissal, &c., (Ques.) 4301 (iii).
—— (M. for cor.*) 4383 (iii).
Marriages, Power of Parlt. to Legalize (Ques.) 8585 (v).
—— Govt.'s Intention *re* (Ques.) 10195 (v).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2060 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Menzies, Wm., Payments to *re* Meteorological Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).
Ministers, Speeches of, Distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).
—— Speeches of Prime Minister, Distribution by Postmasters (remarks) 9071 (v).
—— Travelling Expenses of Ministers, Govt. Employees, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1340 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 3954 (iii).
—— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means. 7432 (iv).
See 'Cab', 'Public Works.'
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9243 (v).
Post Office Buildings, Necessity of, Quotation from President Taft's Speech (read) in Com. of Sup., 1873 (i).
Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 954 (i).
Printing Bureau Investigation, Number of Dismissals, Names, &c. (Ques.) 708 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Aud. Gen.'s Report, 839 (i).
Public Works, Travelling Expenses, Inquiry for Ret., 8356, 9071 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8244 (v).
—— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8358 (v).
—— Admission of Agricultural Products free from Foreign Countries (remarks) 4934 (iii).
—— Letter of Sir Charles Tupper (read) 8277 (v).
—— Negotiations at Washington, Instruction to Mr. Bryce, Cable Dispatch (read) 4140 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices, Ques. of Order, 6835 (iv).
—— accepting as read and printing in Hansard (remarks) 6857 (iv).
Rideau Canal Lockmen, Increased Pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
St. Lawrence, Aids to Navigation, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c. (Ques.) 799 (i).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3777 (ii), 9080 (v); (farm bulletins) 6187; (Patent Record) 6184; Quarantine (public health) 5980 (iv).
Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6411; Chambly (macadamizing) 6409; Cornwall (Robertson's culvert) 6409; Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6412; Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6391; (mooring posts) 6389 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt—Agriculture (contingencies) 5955 (iv); (salaries) 1475; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1464 (i).

Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6614; (overseers) 6159 (iv).

House of Commons (messengers) 6172 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamers) 6546; (Lime Kiln Crossing) 6546; (maritime road) 6545 (iv).

Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6556 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax post office) 1587; (Parrsboro) 1598; (Wolfville) 1599 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting contracts) 3174, 3191 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Napierville) 1865 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 5994 (iv).

Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 6187 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (freight cars) 5989 (iv).

Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6558; (meteorological service) 6561, 6566 (iv).

Senate (address to His Ex.) 6167 (iv).

Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 6572 (iv).

Technical Education, Progress re, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1721 (i).

Truro Freight Shed Fire (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

Whip, Chief, Retirement of, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Sel. Com. (remarks) 6 (i).

Winnipeg, St. Charles Rifle Range, Sale of, Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 7343 (iv).

Woods Building, Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3194 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D., *New Westminster.*

Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of (Ques.) 3463 (ii).

Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application *re* Homestead, &c., (Ques.) 3221 (ii).

Bidwell Bay, B.C., Govt. Land Reserves, Disposition of (Ques.) 1284 (i).

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 17) 1°*, 376; in Com., 1682 (i).

Burrard, Westminster Boundary Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1487 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7870 (iv).

Chinese Investigation Commission. Censure to Govt. (Amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10383, Neg. (Y. 54; N. 90) 10454 (v).

——— Rep. of Mr. Justice Murphy, Inquiry for, 9594 (v).

——— (evidence read, &c.) 9786 (v).

——— Accusation *re* Obstruction (Mr. Fielding) 9888 (v).

——— Discussion *re* Rep., 9926 (v).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Conciliation Board of Labour Dept., Principle of Action (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4242 (iii).

Dog Fish Industry (remarks) 8049 (v).

Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of (M. for cor.) 2188 (ii).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9630 (v).

Fisheries Act (B.C. licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8044; in Com., 8419 (v).

See 'Supply Fisheries'.

Fisheries Treaty. 1908, Non-fulfilment by U. S. (remarks) 6528 (iv).

——— Proclamation *re* (remarks) 5035 (iii).

Fisheries Treaty, Further Information *re* (remarks) 8479 (v).

——— Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup., 8479 (v).

Fishery Regulations *re* International Commission, Date of Operation *re* (Ques.) 3465 (ii).

——— Regulations, Mess. from Wash. (remarks) 6504 (iv).

Fraser Mills, Postmaster, Defalcation of Funds, Bonds *re* (Ques.) 1566 (i).

Fraser River Mail Service, Applications *re* (Ques.) 3463 (ii).

Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions &c., (Ques.) 1285 (i).

Fruit Growers Association, B.C., Protest *re* Duty. &c. (read) 3373 (ii).

G. T. P. Labourers at Lafond, in Alberta, Amounts owing for work, &c., (Ques.) 3669 (ii).

Hall's Prairie P.O., Pet. *re* Location, Postmaster, &c., (Ques.) 3468 (ii).

Hall's Prairie Timber Limits, Requests *re* Removal of Timber, &c. (Ques.) 3282 (ii).

Homestead Applicants in New Westminster District, Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).

See 'New Westminster.'

Homestead Regulations in B.C., Application, &c., Ry. Belt, &c., (M. for ret.) 2855 (ii).

Hope Townsite, Date of Payment by Mr. Wardle, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 3068 (ii).

——— Payments by T. D. Shorts, Approval by Govt. (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1447 (i); on M. for 3°, 2864 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works, Printing of Proceedings of Com. (Ques.) 3280 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Japanese Immigration, Application *re* Special Purposes (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s (B. 18) 1°*, 376 (i).
Letter Carriers in New Westminster, Free Transportation on Tramways (M. for cor.) 2194 (ii).
Miner. Bill, Capture of, Return to Canada (remarks) 4384 (iii).
New Westminster District, Govt. Lands, Grant issued, &c. (Ques.) 1291 (i).
See 'Homestead,' 'Timber,' &c.
New Westminster Penitentiary, Increase of Pay to Employees (M. for cor.) 2183 (ii).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8343 (v).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7785 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res. 9673 (v).
——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 2988 (ii).
——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5948 (iv).
——- Tels. read from B.C. Agricultural Associations, 3955 (iii).
See 'Fruit.'
Ruddock, R. F., Application *re* Homestead in B.C., &c. (Ques.) 3279 (ii).
Springhill Strike, Action of Conciliation Board (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4241 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6238 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3825 (ii).
Labour Dept (conciliation board) 4244; (Labour Gazette) 4235 (iii); Ques. of Order, 3451 (ii).
Post Office (clerks) 4288; (postmasters' salaries) 4290; (stamps) 4280 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Chilliwack) 3012; (Cranbrook) 3014; Generally (experimental farms) 3159 (ii).
Timber Licenses in New Westminster District, Pets. against Renewals, &c. (Ques.) 3222 (ii).
See 'New Westminster.'

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W. (Minister of Inland Revenue, *Comox-Atlin.*
Astronomers Rep. (presented) 9690 (v).
Barlow, John R., Emplymt by Govt. (Ans.) 8583 (v).
Canning, J. H., Inland Revenue Inspector, Retirement of (Ans.) 1350 (i).
Chinese Immigration, Encounter with Mr. Jardine (remarks) 2740 (ii).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10392, 10422 (v).
——— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9805 (v).
Elections Deferred (remarks) 10381 (v).
Elliott, George E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1497 (i).
Explosives Regulations (B. 79) M. for Com. on Res., 989; in Com. on prop. Res., 1577 (i); in Com., 8451 (v).
Explosives, Number of Factories, Employees, &c. (Ans.) 2374 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B.C. licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8426 (v).
Gas Meters in Toronto, Excessive Measurements (Ans.) 3280 (ii).
Geological Survey Rep. (presented) 9690 (v).
Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt., Fined for Electoral Corruption (Ans.) 2673 (ii).
Holland Peat Bog (Ans.) 4303 (iii).
Inland Revenue Act (French version), Correction of Clerical Error (B. 132) 1°*, 4566 (iii); in Com., 8088 (v).
Inland Revenue Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Maple Sugar, Adulteration, Pet. *re* Amt. to Foods Act (Ans.) 5131 (iii).
Mineral Notices, Circular of Mr. F. H. Fourchet, &c. (Ans.) 4306 (iii).
Nash, Fred. J., Emplymt by Govt in Inland Revenue, P.E.I. (Ans.) 2668 (ii).
Niagara Falls Water Power, Quantity developed, &c. (Ans.) 5132 (iii).
Peat Gas, Generating Electric Power, Process, &c. (Ans.) 708, 986 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4811 (iii).
Statutes, French Translations, Corrections (remarks) 8089 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Inland Revenue (contingencies) 1048; Inland Revenue (salaries) 1047; Mines (salaries) 1475 (i).
Geological Survey (explorations, &c.) 9551 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3216 (ii).

THOBURN, Mr. W., *Lanark, North.*
Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders from P.W Dept (remarks) 2648 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 2880 (ii).
James Bay, Fishing Lease to A. McNee, Duration of, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1206 (1).
Mississippi Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9252 (v).

THOBURN, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Negro Immigration, Restrictions *re* (remarks) 6523 (iv).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 9764, 9879 (v).

SUPPLY—

House of Commons (charwomen) 6174 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1893 (i).

Telegraph and Cable Services, Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9644 (v).

THORNTON, Mr. C. J., *Durham.*

Brown, George Addison, Relief (B. 139) 1°*, 5525 (iii).

Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6211 (iv).

Farmers' Bank, Failure, Assets, &c., Keely Mine, Value &c. (Ques.) 2152 (ii).

——— Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5315, 5440 (iii).

Forest Reserves B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8085 (v).

Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8080 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7040 (v).

——— Canadian Coasting Laws, affecting Grain and Hogs (Ques.) 5133 (iii).

——— Prime Minister's Visit to Imp. Conference, Editorials in 'Christian Guardian' (read &c.) 9072 (v).

SUPPLY—

Art, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6248 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3158 (ii).

Sussex Street, Govt. Properties, Names of Owners (Ques.) 6666 (iv).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Denial by Mr. Begin *re* words quoted by Mr. Monk *re* Naval Defence, 134 (i).

TODD, Mr. W. F., *Charlotte.*

Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8447 (v).

TOLMIE, Mr. J., *Bruce North.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1487 (i); in Com., 3392, 3459 (ii).

Bell, Hugh Samuel Relief (B. 191) 1°*, 8187 (v).

Johnston, Mary Hamilton Relief (B. 140) 1°*, 5619 (iii).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 159) 1°*, 6439 (iv).

Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 76) 1°*, 1488 (i).

TOLMIE, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 83) 1°*, 1640 (i).

Stapleton, Dalton Mabel Relief (B. 141) 1°*, 5619 (iii).

Sutherland, George Mackay Relief (B. 218) 1°*, 9089 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2609 (ii).

Western Canal Co.'s incorp. (B. 195) 1°*, 8308 (v).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A., *Nicolet.*

Naval Policy and Arthabaska Election (remarks) on Address, 494 (i).

TURCOTTE, Mr. J. P., *Quebec County.*

Address, The, 190 (i).

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6320 (iv).

Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4579 (iii).

Drummond and Arthabaska Election (remarks) on Address, 190 (i).

Indian River Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 1710 (i).

I.C.R., St. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 2436 (ii).

Privileges and Elections Com., Ques. of Order, 8000 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7506 (iv).

——— Convention at Washington, Cor. with G. B. and Can. *re* Negotiations &c. (M. for copy*) 3948 (ii).

Revillon Freres Trading Co., Limited, incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

I.C.R., Branch Lines Lease (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9590 (v).

——— Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1166 (i).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia.*

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5082, 5575; on M. for 3°, 5252 (iii).

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3028 (ii).

Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1°*, 1453 (i).

Bradley, Mr. John, Irregularity *re* Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5586 (iii).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 70) 1°*, 1488 (i); in Com., 3062 (ii).

Coal Miners' Strike in West, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9705 (v).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2421 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9620 (v).
Flax Exports from Saskatchewan, &c., (remarks) 10521 (v).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8620 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp., B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238, 8559 (v).
G. T. P. Branch Lines (B. 73) 1°*, 1488 (i); in Com., 3021 (ii).
Homestead Irregularities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5592 (iii).
I. C. R. Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie), 1124 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3265 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6145 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 8148 (v).
——— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10023 (v).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7679 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5559 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—Sask., (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).
Telegraph and Cable Services Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9645 (v).
Waterways Treaty Bill, Govt. Intention, (remarks) 8895 (v).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1333 (i).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, (B. 3) 1°*, 148; 2° m., 1407, in Com., 1408, 1527, 1728-9 (i); 3° m., 2864, 3276, 3526 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause, &c. (Ques.) 5835 (iii).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G., *York Centre (O.)*
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res., (Mr. Beattie) 4360 (iii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, Arrangement *re* re-instatement (Ques.) 654 (i).
Humber River Bridge, Obstruction to Navigation (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. and Cor. of Mr. Walsh (read) 10474, (amt.) 10489, Neg., Y. 45; N. 79) 10533 (v).
——— Cor. with Mr. E. J. Walsh and Dept. (M. for copies*) 5136 (iii).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G.—*Con.*
——— Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 7556 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 7556 (iv).
Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5830 (iii).
Porcupine Fire Sufferers, Request for Tents, Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 9983 (v).
Reciprocity Vote, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Ques. of Priv., 3461 (ii).
Sections 11, 12, 14, 22, &c., in Tp. 10, Range 22, Applications *re* (M. for copies*) 980 (i).
Shafting imported, Quantities and Values, since April, 1910 (Ques.) 7593 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Post Office (free delivery) 4295 (iii).

WARBURTON, Mr. A. B., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Oyster Industry, Memorials, Surveys, &c. (M. for cor.) 714 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Communication, Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 3863, 3917 (ii).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorial, &c., on M. (Mr. Richards) for Copies, 2179 (ii).
Public Accounts Com. (M.) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. to Committee, 527, 818 (i).
——— on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 836 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3709 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Marine ('Earl Grey') 6477 (iv).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *Renfrew, North.*
American Bank Note Co.'s Contract *re* Bank Notes, Acceptance of Designs for Postage Stamps (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
See 'Stamps.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8823; in Com., 9304 (v).
Eggs imported into Canada from Foreign Countries (Ques.) 4467 (iii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4348 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 5148 (iii).
——— Estimates *re* &c. (remarks) 2004 (ii).
Ontario and Abitibi Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 3° m., 8962 (v).
Pensions to Veterans (remarks) 6915 (iv).
Petewawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Forces in Training (Ques.) 4465 (iii).
——— Extent of Damage by Fire (remarks) 9090 (v).
Petawawa Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).
Postage Stamps, Canadian Design, (remarks) 7106 (iv).
——— New Issue, Condemnation *re* (Ques.) 9990 (v).

WHITE, Mr. G. V.—*Con.*

Postage Stamps, Prizes *re* Best Design, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 5402 (iii).
See 'American.'

Quebec Bridge, Caisson, Damage to, Claims *re* (Ques.) 4045 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (farm bulletins) 6185 (iv); Civil Govt.—Militia (salaries) 1032 (i).

Tariff Resolutions, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 2641 (ii).

WHITE, Mr. W. H., *Victoria, Alta.*

Elevators, Terminal, &c. on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3509 (ii).

Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1274 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Vegreville) 3011 (ii).

WILCOX Mr O. J., *Essex, North.*

Animals transported between Can. and U.S., Disregard of Rules, &c. (remarks) 310 (i).

Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiations with U.S. *re* (remarks) 1575 (i).

Canning, J. H., Inspector of Inland Revenue, Retirement of, &c. (Ques.) 1350 (i).

Farm Products entered at Windsor, from 1906-1910 (Ques.) 7596 (iv).

Farm Products exported through Windsor, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 8701 (v.)

Fisheries on the Great Lakes, Regulations *re* Commission (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5217 (iii).

Fisheries Regulations, Modification of (remarks) 1803 (i)

G.T.Trainmen's Strike, Inaction of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5809 (iii).

Leamington Post Office, Cost in Detail, &c. (Ques.) 9782 (y).

Negro Immigrants, Treatment of, Prohibition of into Canada (remarks) 5941 (iv).

Post Office Revenue at Tlbury, Essex, &c., for the years 1904-10 (Ques.) 807 (i).
See 'Walkervlle.'

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Hartland) 1617; Que. (Maisonneuve) 1685 (i).

Walkerville Post Office Building, and Mail Distribution (remarks) *re* Post Office Staff 2559 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).
See 'Post Office.'

Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of (Ques.) 6272 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. C. A., *Laval.*

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6316 (iv).

Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3603 (ii).

Canadian Commissioner at Paris, Contradiction of Question asked in Senate, 9545 (v).

Jesus River Improvements, Completion, Suspension, &c. (Ques.) 804 (i).

Montreal Customs House, Employees leaving since 1st July, 1896 (M. for ret.*) 1340 (i).

National Weekly Indemnity Co., Change of Name (B. 77) 1°*, 1488 (i).

Racial and Religious Prejudices in Liberal Pamphlets (remarks) on Address, 542 (i).

Riviere des Prairies Dredging, Rep. *re* (M. for copy) 2162 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1685; (Marieville) 1698 (i); (Montreal barracks) 3149 (ii).

WILSON, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Cameron, Miss, Immigration Agent in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5191 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827 (v).

Immigration Agents in G.B. and Europe, List, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 981 (i).

Immigration Expenditure in U.S. and G.B. for 1910 (Ques.) 4300 (iii).

Immigration, Number since 31st March last to present, &c. (M. for ret.) 1498 (i).

Immigration Statistics, Publication of (remarks) 2366, 2556 (ii).

Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8745 (v).

Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 1104 (i).

Napanee River Dredging, Instructions, &c. (M. for cor.*) 981 (i).

—— Cor. *re* (remarks) 1903 (i), 2065 (ii), 4049 (iii).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 9727 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture — Quarantine (public health) 5981 (iv).

Canals—Miscellaneous (lock keepers) 6453; Welland (Port Colborne) 6398 (iv).

Dom. Lands—(Forestry convention) 6052 (iv).

Immigration (agents) 5166, Reply to Minister, 5177 (iii).

Interior (immigration agents) 4729 (iii).

Justice—Miscellaneous (Hague arbitration) 6164 (iv).

Labour Dept—(Labour Gazette) 6057 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses) 6460, 6496 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine (supplies) 6473 (iv).

Miscellaneous (coronation decorations) 9565 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2089; (Peterborough) 2603 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 1677; (Montreal barracks) 1864; (Napierville) 1866 (i).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen's cars) 6446 (iv).

WRIGHT, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*

Bracebridge Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).

Reciprocity with U.S. in Com. on Res., 7461 7481 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (Agents) 5166 (iii); Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Victoria) 6023 (iv).

Technical Education Commission, Completion of Work (remarks) 1662 (i).

INDEX—SUBJECTS

Absence of Ministers during Discussion *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8358 (v).

Accidents on Rys: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

——— *See* 'Railways.'

Accounts Outstanding, Total Amounts *re* Financial Statement: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5403 (iii).

———*See* 'Finance.'

Acton Vale, Upton and St. Pie Post-office Revenues: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 980 (i).

Address, The, M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Precedence, 5 (i).

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech: Moved (Mr. McGiverin) 10; Seconded (Mr. Lapointe) 16 (i).

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 22; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 44; (Mr. Foster) 60; (Mr. Guthrie) 77; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 98; (Mr. Monk) 111; (amt.) 133, Neg. (Y. 67; N. 120) 651; (Mr. Brodeur) 135, 152; (Mr. Blondin) 169; (Mr. Beland) 172; (Mr. Nantel) 179; (Mr. Jos. Turcotte) 190; (Mr. Paquet) 197; (Mr. Rivet) 208; (Mr. R. L. Borden) Amt. to Amt., 228, Neg. (Y. 70; N. 126) 649; (Mr. Miller) 229; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 246; (Mr. Fowke) 254, 271; (Mr. M. Clark) 297; (Mr. Burrell) 303, 311; (Mr. Neely) 325; (Mr. Sproule) 334; (Mr. Paterson) 346; (Mr. Blain) 355; (Mr. Kyte) 369; (Mr. Northrup) 378; (Mr. Ralph Smith) 402; (Mr. Middlebro) 423; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Borden) 441; (Mr. Crothers) 491; (Mr. G. A. Turcotte) 494; (Mr. Proulx) 497; (Mr. Carvell) 512; (Mr. Foster) 531; (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 567; (Mr. Monk) on Amt. (Mr. Borden) 595;(Mr. Lafortune) 615; (Mr. Gilbert) 624; (Mr. Fisher) 626; (Mr. Campbell) 640; (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 664 (i).

Address in Ans. to His Ex's Speech: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 694 (i).

Address, the, Reply from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1487 (i).

Address to His Ex., Casket for: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).

Adjournment for Coronation, Definite Date: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9090 (v).

———Extension of Time: Remarks (Mr. Miller) 9566 (v).

——— M. (Mr. Fielding) 9580 (v).

See 'Coronation', 'Business.'

Adjournment of House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 866 (i).

Administration of Oaths: *See* 'B. No. 1.'

Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change: M. for Cor. (Mr. McKenzie) 2166 (ii).

Administrator of the Govt. during His Ex.'s Absence, Emoluments for: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1089 (i).

Adulteration of Foods: *See* 'B. No. 35.'

Advertising Govt. Works, Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).

See 'Public Works.'

Agricultural and Farmers Associations, Res. approving Reciprocity; Read (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5546 (iii).

Agricultural Implements: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5745 (iii).

See 'Agriculture, Implements.'

Agricultural and Manufactured Products of the U. S. *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Stmnt. made by Mr. M. Clark, 4196 (iii).

———*See* 'Reciprocity.'

AGRICULTURE:

Agriculture, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup. 1474 (i), 5955 (iv), 9076 (v).

——— Deptl. Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to: Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).

——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Gilbert) 5938 (iv).

Agricultural Imports into Canada, Quantity, Average Price, &c: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5401 (iii).

Agricultural Products, imported into B. C. from U. S., Australia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7344 (iv).

Agricultural Products and Dairy Produce imported from U. S., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9991 (v).

Agriculture, Total Expenditure from Confederation: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 4302 (iii).

Agricultural Products of Canada, Total Quantity: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6756 (iv).

Animals Health, Quarantine, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Animal Industry in Canada, Reps. Data, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Magrath) 4677 (iii).

Animals transported between Can. and U.S., Disregard of Rules: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 310 (i).

Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 10350 (v).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Beef, Pork, &c., and other Animal Productions, Imports, Quantity, &c. from Oct. 1910 to Feb. 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6264 (iv).

Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Govt., Remedy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 655 (i).

Butter, Cheese and Meats imported, Value, Weight, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).

Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4670 (iii).

——— Suppl. Answer laid on Table (Mr. Paterson) 6188 (iv).

Cattle exports to the U.S., Bonded to G.B.: Remarks (Mr Blain) 7426 (iv).

——— Reshipped to G.B.: Remarks *re* Return (Mr. Blain) 7558 (iv).

Cattle Inspection on Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

Cattle Quarantine Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).

Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).

Cheese Cool Curing Room, Brockville, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8095 (v).

Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5406 (iii).

Cholera Precautions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10197 (v).

Cold Storage in Can., Govt. Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1455 (i).

Cold Storage Depots, Total Amounts paid from 1907-10: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii).

Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).

Crop Statistics, Policy of Collecting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5937 (iv).

Dairy Industry, Memorials *re*: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2671 (ii).

Dairy and Fruit Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6234 (iv).

Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 662 (i).

Eggs imported into Canada from Foreign Countries: Ques.(Mr. G. V. White) 4467 (iii).

Embargo on British Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10344 (v).

Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 3776 (ii), 9076 (v).

Exhibition Grants, Subsidies paid to: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii).

——— See 'Winnipeg.'

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Expenditures on Militia and Agriculture from 1867 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9371, 9432 (v).

Expenditures in Ontario for 1910; Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6668 (iv).

Experimental Farm Bulletins: in Com. of Sup., 6185 (iv).

Experimental Farms Reps.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).

Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Milk Average, Eggs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 662, 1285 (i).

Experimental Farms, Stock *re*: Remarks (Mr. Best), in Com. of Sup., 3795 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Number established for past year: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 656 (i).

——— Number operated in Dom., Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1102 (i).

Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) on M. for Sup., 8995 (v).

Farm Products, Dutiable Exports by Provs. into U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 7026 (iv).

Farm Products entered at Windsor from 1906 1910: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 7596 (iv).

Farm Products exported through Windsor, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 8701 (v).

Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets, 1910-11: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 8096 (v).

Farm Stock and Products, Value of Customs Imports from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1496 (i).

Farm and Dairy Products, Quantity and Value of Importation from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9361 (v).

Farm Products imported from U.S. into Kingson Port, Quantities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3668 (ii).

Farm and Garden Products imported from Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7034 (iv).

Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Apptmt. Qualifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 8701 (v).

Hay Claims, Delay in repayment to Canadian Exporters: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5403 (iii).

Hay and Grain Imports into Canada from U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8984 (v).

Horses admitted into Canada from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).

Horses Diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 7427 (iv).

Implements, Reduction of Duties: Prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1915 (i).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

——— Resuming adjd. Debate: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 2253 (ii), 4383 (iii).

Implements, Imports into Can. since 1908, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1350 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1358 (i).

Imports into Canada, Quantity, Average Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5401 (iii).

King, Dr., Residence at Experimental Farm, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 804, 1349 (i).

Live Stock Industry and Cold Storage Systems: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1184; Neg. (Y. 66; N. 111) 1275 (i).

Maple Sugar, Adulteration, Pet. *re* Amt. to Foods Act: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5131 (iii).

Milk and Cream shipped from Western Ont., Accommodation *re* Handling: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).

Milk and Cream exported, Quantity for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6269 (iv).

Milk and Cream exported to U.S. for 1910-11, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7038 (iv).

——— Exports to U.S. for March and April, 1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8790 (v).

Pork Packing Industry, Delegation *re*: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Blain) 3530 (ii).

Potatoes exported, Quantity, Value from 1901 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6271 (iv).

Quarantine Stations, Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3213 (ii).

Quebec Experimental Farm, Purchase by Govt.: Ques., (Mr. Monk) 8992 (v).

Rabies, Outbreak of, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9995, 10095 (v).

Seeds and Farm Weeds: in Com. of Sup., 6213 (iv).

Sheep and Lambs imported into Canada from U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).

Soil Fertility, Memorandum from Experimental Farm: Read (Mr. Armstrong) 5965 (iv).

Tobacco Curing Experimental Stations: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

Tobacco Duties, Imports and Exports from and to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).

Tobacco Leaf, Total Imports, &c. into Canada for last three years: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5405 (iii).

Tobacco Production, Encouragement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6262 (iv).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Wheat Prices in West and Canada and Liverpool Market: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 6267 (iv).

Winnipeg World's Fair, Grant to: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9076 (v).

Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 6455 (iv).

Aids to Navigation on St. Lawrence, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 799 (i).

See '*Marine*'.

Air Brakes for Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Air Brakes, Triple Valve, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5913 (iii).

Alaskan Boundary Commission's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3952 (iii).

Alberta Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 92'.

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 93'.

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51'.

Alberta Rangers, Macleod Squadron, Organisation of, Capt. D. J. Campbell's Connection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7340 (iv).

Alberta-Saskatchewan Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 133'.

Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 220'.

Alcoholism International Congress, Delegates to: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5632 (iii).

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 62'.

Algoma Timber Permits, Amounts paid *re* Dues: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4673 (iii).

Alien Labour Law, Administration at Sault Ste. Marie: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).

——— Employment of Foreigners on Public Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 10367 (v).

Aliens Naturalization, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2666 (ii).

See 'Labour'.

Aliens, Outside of Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 7554 (iv).

All Red Steamship Co.: *See* 'B. No. 105.'

See 'Atlantic'.

Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* , B. No. 162.'

'Alva' Str., Expenditure *re* to Philip & Son.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2438 (ii).

——— Purchase of, Dimensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1909 (i).

Amaguadees Pond, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9500 (v).

American Bank Note Co.'s Contract, Expiration of: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 7247 (iv).

See 'Post Office'.

American Boats through Can. Canals, Reciprocity for: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).
American Silver Coin, Amount exported from Canada: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).
—— *See* 'Coin.'
American War Vessels passing through Canadian Canals, Permission from Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10334 (v).
—— *See* 'U.S.'
Ancona Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Anglo-American Treaty, Arbitration, Communications *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5619 (iii).
Anglo-Japanese Commercial Treaty, Signing of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6673 (iv).
—— Cor. *re* Favoured Nation Clause: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6758, 6906 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Copy (Mr. Burrell) 7255 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 2271 (ii).
—— Termination of, Cor. *re* Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 2003 (ii).
—— *See* 'Japan.'
Animals Health, Quarantine, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).
Animal Industry in Canada, Reps. Data, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Magrath) 4677 (iii).
Animals transported between Can. and U.S., Disregard of Rules: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 310 (i).
Annapolis and London Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8752 (v).
Annual Drill, Number of Officers, Men, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 9352 (v).
See 'Militia.'
Annuities for Indians, Man., Sask., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8884 (v).
Answers of Ministers to Questions *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4137 (iii).
Arbitrations, &c. and Awards, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 6427 (iv).
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
Archives, Historical Researches, Names of Staff: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2155 (ii).
'Arctic,' Rep. of Capt. Bernier: Inquiry for (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
—— Provisions: in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).
Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 10350 (v).
Argyle Sound, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).
Armouries, &c. in Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Edwards) 1460 (i).
See 'Militia,' 'Public Works,' &c.
Arrow Lake Postal Clerk: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
Arthabaska Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
Arthabaska Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 1474 (i), 5955 (iv), 9076 (v).
Ash Wednesday Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4115 (iii).
Assiniboine River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii), 6006 (iv).
Associated Boards of Trade of Ont. and Reciprocity: Res. Read (Mr. Middlebro) 4121 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity.'
Astronomers Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 9690 (v).
Athens Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2088 (ii).
Athol Mail Route, Establishment of, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Rhodes) 2161 (ii).
Atlantic Fast Service and All Red Route, Establishment of: M. for Cor. (Mr. Armstrong) 1726 (i).
Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).
See 'Post Office.'
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3853 (ii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Quebec Oriental Ry. Co., and New Canadian Co., Date of Incorporation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2161 (ii).
—— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 4048 (iii).
See 'Charing Cross.'
Aud. Gen., Cor. *re* Overpayments by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Best) 1010 (i).
Aud. Gen's Report: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1485 (i).
Austin Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).
Australia and Can., Reciprocal Negotiations since 1900: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).
Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Aylmer Post Office Revenue for 1908-9, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 984 (i).
Aylmer, Que., Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1672 (i).
Aylwin Irrigation Grant: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 6445 (iv), 8192, 9076 (v).
—— *See* 'Interior.'
Babcock, Mr., Payments *re* Extra Work: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6108 (iv).
Baby Farm, Toronto Sale of, Competition *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2155 (ii).
——*See* 'Militia'

Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8763 (v).
Baggage Smashing: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
Bahamas and Canada, Negotiations *re* Annexation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8955 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9372 (v).
Bait Freezer at Barrington Passage, Assistance *re* Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Jameson) 3947 (ii).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) 8889 (v).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5039, 5293 (iii), 8791 (v).
Bait Freezers Construction in Louisburg, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 6505 (iv).
Banff Park Water Works: in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).
Bank Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 5, 14, 50, 213, 219.'
Bank Act, Consideration of by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6674 (iv).
Bank Act, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6441, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).
Bank Act, Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govt. Action: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5632 (iii).
———*See* 'Finance.'
Bank Charters, Extension: *See* 'B. Nos. 213, 219 and 221.
Bank Curators' Reports: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 3142 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4569 (iii), 7556 (iv).
——— Explanation (Mr. Foster) 5038 (iii).
Bankers Association, Agreement *re* Competition: Ques. (Mr. Low) 3466 (ii).
——— Bylaws, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4116 (iii).
Bank Failures, Rep. of Curators to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2670 (ii).
——— Stmnt. of Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2670 (ii).
———*See* 'Finance.'
Banking and Commerce Com.: M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 2364, 2429, 3599 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Miller) to sit during Sessions of House, 8355 (v).
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt. ref. to Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 926, 1091 (i).
Bank Officers and Creditors: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Baptist Convention of Ont. and Que.: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
See 'Can. Baptist.'
Bark Lake Post Office, Closing and Opening: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).
Barlow, John R., Emplymt. by Geological Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8533 (v).
Barrett, Mr., Payments to *re* Lifting Buoys: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).
Barrington Bait Freezer: *See* Bait 'Freezer.'
Bathurst Dredging Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 803, 1285 (i).
——— *See* 'Gaspereaux.'
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2970 (ii).
——— Cor. Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3005 (ii).
——— Further Cor.: Read (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 3029 (ii).
Bay of Fundy Buoy Lights: in Com. of Sup., 6458 (iv).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).
——— *See* 'Hague Arbitration.'
Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 88.'
Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Bear River Indian Reserves, Medical Officer, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3223 (ii).
Bear River Rifle Range, Pets *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3606 (ii).
Bear River Rifle Range: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii), 6057 (iv).
Beatty, Mary Jane, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Beauharnois Canal, Alienation of, Reps. *re*: M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2214 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).
——— Grantees, Improvements, Valuation of Franchise, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1711 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 2194 (ii).
——— Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2677 (ii).
——— Privileges, Advertisement for Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1712 (i).
——— Total Cost, Revenue from Grantees, Arrears, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).
See 'Canals.'
Beausoleil Indian Agent at Christian Island, Place of Residence: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5288 (iii).
Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits *re* cutting Timber, Agent's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4304-5 (iii).
See Indians.'
Beddington, Mr., Pension *re* Pilotage: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Beef, Pork, &c., and other Animal Productions, Imports, Quantity, &c. from Oct., 1910 to Feb., 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6264 (iv).
See 'Butter.'
Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application re Homestead, Date of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3221 (ii).
Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).

Bell, G. W., Pass Investigation *re* I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

Bell, Hugh Samuel, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 191.'

Belleville Docking Facilities: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. of Sup., 6011 (iv).

Belleville Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Belleville Govt. Buildings, Draping for King's Death: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

Bellevue Mining Disaster, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 1079 (i).

Berlin Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) 5726 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity.'

Bermuda, Information *re* Annexation: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 5216 (iii).

Bidwell Bay, B.C., Govt. Land Reserves, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1284 (i).

Big Bay Point Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).

Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6574 (iv) 9536 (v).

Bills, Royal Assent, 9591 (v).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).
1°*, 2 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 8; 2°, 956, 1407, 1797 (i).

Bill (No. 3) Respecting the Hours of Labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville).
1°*, 148; 2°, 1407; in Com., 1408, 1527, 1728 (i); 3° m., 3276, 3526 (ii).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Martin, St. Mary's).
1°*, 148 (i); 2°, 3943; M. for Com., 3945; in Com., 3946 (ii); 3°*, 4583 (iii).

Bill (No. 5) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Demers).
1°, 148 (i).

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Miller).
1°, 149; 2°, 968; in Com., 976, 1294, 1510; 3°*, 1728 (i).

Bill (No. 7) To amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 149; 2°, 1296 (i); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 8789 (v).

Bill (No. 8) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 149; 2°, 1298 (i).

Bill (No. 9) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°, 150; 2°, 1300; in Com., 1301, 1526; 3°*, 1527 (i); Sen. Amts., 3460, 3845 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 10) To prohibit the Manufacture and Importation of Matches made with White Phosporus.—(Mr. King).
1°, 194; 2°, 1576 (i).

Bill (No. 11) Respecting Co-operative Credit Societies.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 194; 2°, 1302; in Com., 1302 (i).

Bill (No. 12) To amend the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908.—(Mr. Beauparlant).
1°, 195 (i); Order dschgd., 4464 (iii).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the Sale of Poisons. (Mr. Lewis).
1°, 259 (i).

Bill (No. 14) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 261 (i).

Bill (No. 15) To amend the Canada Medical Act.—(Mr. Black).
1°, 309 (i); 2°, 2253 (ii); in Com., 6067; 3°*, 6068 (iv).

Bill (No. 16) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 377 (i).

Bill (No. 17) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).
1°*, 376; 2°*, 700; in Com., 1682; 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 18) Respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).
1°*, 376; 2°*,700; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 19) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 376; 2°*, 700 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2100 (ii).

Bill (No. 20) Respecting the Mather Bridge and Power Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 377; 2°*, 700 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 377; 2°*, 700 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2100 (ii).

Bill (No. 22) To prohibit the Importation, Manufacture, Sale and Use of Opium for other than Scientific or Medicinal Purposes.—(Mr. King).
1°, 468 (i).

Bill (No. 23) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Meighen).
1°, 529 (i).

Bill (No. 24) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Edwards).
1°, 530 (i).

Bill (No. 25) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Barnard).
1°, 663 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the Saving of Daylight.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°*, 663 (i).

Bill (No. 27) Respecting Licenses to Fishing Vessels.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°, 698 (i).

Bill (No. 28) To amend the Elections Act.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°, 699 (i).

Bill (No. 29) Respecting Co-operation.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°, 699 (i).

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Inspection of Railway Locomotive Steam Boilers.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°, 699 (i).

Bill (No. 31) Respecting the Guelph and Goderich Railway Company.—(Mr. Rankin).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1080; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 32) To incorporate the Sterling Trusts Corporation.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1032 (i); in Com., 2596, 2648, 3021, 3180, 3453, 3841 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4664 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6609 (iv).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1032; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—(Mr. Donnelly).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1032; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 35) Respecting Pure Foods.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).
1°, 865 (i).

Bill (No. 36) Relating to the establishment and expenses of the International Joint Commission under the Waterways Treaty of January the eleventh, nineteen hundred and nine.—(Mr. Pugsley).
Prop. Res., 695; in Com. on Res., 867; 1°* of B., 923 (i); 2° m., 9091; in Com., 9156, 9172; 3°*, 9220 (v).

Bill (No. 37) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 924 (i).

Bill (No. 38) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°, 924 (i).

Bill (No. 39) To amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°, 924 (i).

Bill (No. 40) To amend the Criminal Code, respecting Homicide while Hunting.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 987 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 41) Respecting Wireless Telegraphy on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 988 (i).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Collingwood Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 43) Respecting a Patent of Conduits Company, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); 3°*, 4241 (iii).

Bill (No. 44) Respecting the Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 2594, 3021 (ii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Ecrement).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3180, 3389, 3454 (ii), 3993 (iii); 3°, 7560, 7717; in Com., 7718 (iv); 3°*, 8069 (v).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company. —(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2601 (ii).

Bill (No. 47) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°, 1069 (i); 2° and in Com., 2005; 3°*, 2740 (ii).

Bill (No. 48),to amend the Montreal Harbour Commissioners Act, 1894.— (Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 1069 (i); 2° and in Com., 8451; 3°*, 8451; Sen. Amt., 9534 (v).

Bill (No. 49) Respecting Water Powers.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 1277 (i).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting Banks and Banking.—Mr. Fielding).
1°, 1340 (i).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—(Mr Magrath).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3024, 3181 3391; 3°*, 3392 (ii).

Bill (No. 52) To incorporate the Commercial Travellers Accident Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Rankin).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Pickup).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684; in Com., and 3°*, 2601 (ii).

Bill (No. 54) Respecting the E. B. Eddy Company.—(Mr. Devlin).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3028 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 55) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 56) To incorporate the Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation. (Mr. Knowles).

1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3994; 3°*, 3995 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6952 (iv).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting the London & Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Beattie).

1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) To amend the Fisheries Act. —(Mr. Barnard).

1°, 1343 (i).

Bill (No. 59) Respecting the Athabasca Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 1453; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 60) Respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).

1°*, 1453; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3060, 3182; 3°*, 3183 (ii).

Bill (No. 61) Respecting the Pontiac Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 1453; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3064 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 3392, 3459; 3°*, 3460 (ii).

Bill (No. 63) To incorporate the British Columbia and Dawson Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3064 (ii).

Bill (No. 64) To incorporate the British Columbia and White River Railway Company.—(Mr. Congdon).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6951 (iv).

Bill (No. 65) Respecting the British Crown Assurance Company, Limited.—(Mr. McColl).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1848 (i).

Bill (No. 66) Respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Stratton).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2601 (ii).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Burrard. Westminster Boundary Railway and Navigation Company. — (Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Fowke).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°* 3808 (ii).

Bill (No. 69) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 3183, 3454; 3°*, 3459 (ii).

Bill (No. 70) Respecting the Canadian Western Railw y Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3062; 3°*, 3064 (ii).

Bill (No. 71) To incorporate the Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

Bill (No. 72) Respecting the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 73) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3021; 3°*, 3024 (ii).

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the International Railway Company and International Traction Railway.—(Mr. German).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3808 (ii).

Bill (No. 75) Respecting the McClary Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Beattie).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 3024, 3181, 3389; 3°*, 3391 (ii).

Bill (No. 76) Respecting the Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3392 (ii).

Bill (No. 77) Respecting the National Weekly Indemnity Company, and to change its name to the National Guarantee and Accident Company.—(Mr. Wilson, Laval).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3993 (iii).

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Macdonnell).

1°, 1551 (i); order dschgd, 4464 (iii).

Bill (No. 79) To regulate the Manufacture, Storage and Importation of Explosives.—(Mr. Templeman).

Res. prop., 989; in Com. on Res., 1577; 1°* of B., 1580 (i); 2° and in Com., 8451 (v).

Bill (No. 80) Respecting the Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. Lancaster).

1°*, 1640 (i); 2°*, 2100, in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 81) To incorporate the Canadian Northern Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Cash).

1°*, 1640; 2°*, 1848 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii); Sen. Amts., 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company, and to change its name to the Kettle Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).

1°*, 1640; 2°*, 1848 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

Bill (No. 83) To incorporate the Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 1640 (i); 2°*, 2100; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 84) Respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Conmee).

1°*, 1640; 2°*, 1848 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3808 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) Respecting Forest Reserves and Parks.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 1640 (i); 2° and in Com., 8084, 8606, 8650, 9345; 3°*, 9348 (v).

Bill (No. 86) To amend the Criminal Code respecting Offensive Weapons.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 1642 (i).

Bill (No. 87) To prevent giving and taking Secret Commissions.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 1646 (i).

Bill (No. 88) Respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie, Prince Edward).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 89) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Lafortune).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 90) Respecting the Indian River Railway Company.—(Mr. Turcotte, (Quebec).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 91) To incorporate the Pacific and Peace Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 3993 (iii).

Bill (No. 92) Respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company .—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 1969; 2°*, 2295; in Com., and 3°*, 3809 (ii); Sen, Amts., 6469 (iv).

Bill (No. 93) To incorporate the Alberta Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy).

1°*, 1969; 2°*, 2295 (ii); in Com., 5079, 5252, 5568, 5630; 3°*, 5631 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 94) Respecting the Western Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 1969; 2°*, 2295 (ii), in Com., and 3°*, 6066 (iv).

Bill (No. 95) To amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).

1°, 1969 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) To prohibit the Manufacture and Importation of Matches made with White Phosphorus.—(Mr. King).

Res. prop., 1802 (i); in Com. on Res., 2021; 1°* of B., 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) To prohibit the Importation, Manufacture, Sale and Use of Opium for other than Scientific or Medicinal purposes.—(Mr. King).

Res. prop., 1803 (i); in Com. on Res., 2062; 1°* of B., 2063; 2°, 2518; in Com., 2532; 3°, 2740 (ii); Sen. Amts., 8090 (v).

Bill (No. 98) Respecting Load Lines on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 2063 (ii).

Bill (No. 99) To incorporate the Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. German).

1°*, 2254; 2°*, 2602; in Com., and 3°*, 3809 (ii).

Bill (No. 100) Respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Hunt).

1°*, 2254; 2°*, 2602; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 101) Respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Sealey).

1°*, 2434; 2°*, 2665 (iii), in Com., and 3°* 4606 (iii).

Bill (No. 102) To incorporate the Imperial Traction Company.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 2434; 2°*, 2665 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5128 (iii).

Bill (No. 103) Relating to Steamship Subsidies.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Res. prop., 1802 (i); in Com. on Res., 2503; 1°* of B., 2518 (ii); 2° and in Com., 8675; 3°*, 8678 (v).

Bill (No. 104) To amend paragraph (*l*) of Section 2, and paragraphs (*n*) and (*o*) of Section 9 of the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1° m., 2736 (ii); 2°, 8065; in Com., 8070; 3°*, 8077 (v).

Bill (No. 105) To incorporate the All Red Steamship Company (title changed to Imperial Steamship Company).—(Mr. McKenzie).

1°*, 2827; 2°*, 3064 (ii); in Com., 4239; 3°*, 4428 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6610 (iv).

Bill (No. 106) To incorporate the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Harris).

1°*, 2828; 2°*, 3064 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4606 (iii).

Bill (No. 107) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 2851 (ii); wthdwn., 8088 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 108) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. — (Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 2983; 2°*, 3183 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5631 (iii).

Bill (No. 109) Respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Conmee).

1°*, 2983; 2° m., 3184; 2°*, 3393 (ii); in Com., 6121; 3°*, 6156 (iv).

Bill (No. 110) Respecting the People's Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).

1°*, 2983; 2°*, 3393 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5128 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6611 (iv).

Bill (No. 111) To incorporate the Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Carvell).

1°*, 2983; 2°, 3184 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 112) Respecting the Storage of Food.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 2983 (ii).

Bill (No. 113) To incorporate the Dominion Development Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°, 3184; 2°*, 3393 (ii); in Com., 5127, 5253 3°*, 5254 (iii).

Bill (No. 114) For the Protection of Railway Employees.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°, 3218 (ii).

Bill (No. 115, from the Senate), To incorporate the Guardian Accident and Guarantee Company.—(Mr. Doherty).

1°*, 3453, 2°*, 3563 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 3993 (iii).

Bill (No. 116) To amend the Telegraphs Act. —(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 3453 (ii).

Bill (No. 117) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Stanfield).

1°, 3453 (ii).

Bill (No. 118) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. McLean, Queens).

1°, 3664 (ii).

Bill (No. 119, from the Senate), Respecting the Ontario Northern and Timagimi Railway Company.—(Mr. Proulx).

1°*, 4109; 2°*, 4241; in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 120, from the Senate), Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Carvell).

1°, 4110; 2°*, 4241 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6066 (iv).

Bill (No. 121, from the Senate), Respecting the Globe Printing Company.—(Mr. Harris).

1°, 4040; 2°*, 4300; in Com., 5127; 3°*, 5128 (iii).

Bill (No. 122) Respecting Sewage.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 4039 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 123) To incorporate La Banque Internationale du Canada.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 4109; 2°*, 4241; in Com., 5631, 5716 (iii), 6120; 3°*, 6121 (iv).

Bill (No. 124) Relating to the Water in the Railway Belt and Peace River Block of Land.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 4110 (iii).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate), Respecting the Pacific, Northern and Omenica Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

2°*, 4300; in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Fortier).

1°*, 4384; 2°*, 4606; in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate), To Incorporate the Universal Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Low).

2°*, 4300; in Com., and 3°*, 4664 (iii).

Bill (No. 128) For granting to His Majesty certain sums for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1911.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4210 (iii).

Bill (No. 129) Respecting Baggage Smashing. —(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 4198 (iii).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate), For the Relief of Matilda Emo.—(Mr. Hodgins).

1°*, 4298; 2°*, 4428; in Com., and 3°*, 5128 (iii).

Bill (No. 131) Respecting Drinking Water.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 4564 (iii).

Bill (No. 132) To correct certain Clerical Errors in the French Version of the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Templeman).

1°*, 4566; 2° and in Com., 8088; 3°*, 8090 (v).

Bill (No. 133 from the Senate), To incorporate the Alberta-Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Rutan.)

1°*, 4740; 2°*, 5129; in Com., and 3°*, 5631 (iii).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate), To incorporate the Canadian Inter-Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve.)

1°*, 4740; 2°*, 5129; in Com., and 3°*, 5631 (iii).

Bill (No. 135, from the Senate), Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company. —(Mr. Douglas.)

1°*, 4740; 2°*, 5129 (iii); in Com., 6950; 3°*, 6951 (iv).

Bill (No. 136, from the Senate), To correct a Clerical Error in the Title of the French Version of Chapter 142 of the Statutes of 1910.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°*, 4740 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate), For the relief of Maggie Florence Sadler.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).

2°*, 6224; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate), For the relief of Gertrude Maud Grant.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 5619; 2°*, 5776 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate), For the relief of George Addison Brown.—(Mr. Thornton).

1°*, 5525; 2°*, 5631 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 140, from the Senate), For the relief of Mary Hamilton Johnston.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 5619; 2°*, 5776 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate), For the relief of Dalton Mabel Stapleton.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 5619; 2°*, 5776 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 142, from the Senate), For the relief of Lorne Forbes Robertson.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6066; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 143, from the Senate), For the relief of Cecil Ernest Freeman.—(Mr. Blain).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6066; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 144, from the Senate), For the relief of Ethel May Hornell.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6066; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 145, from the Senate) For the relief of Paulina Verena Meyer.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 5933; 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 146) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Staples).

1°, 5618 (iii).

Bill (No. 147, from the Senate), To amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2° and in Com., 7869 (iv).

Bill (No. 148, from the Senate), Respecting the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Molloy).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 149, from the Senate), Respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Harris).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 150) To authorize the Government of Canada to acquire, by lease, a certain line of railway in the Province of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 4200; in Com. on Res., 5640; 1°* of B., 5726 (iii); 2°, 8410; in Com., 8411; 3°*, 8419 (v).

Bill (No. 151, from the Senate) To incorporate The Canadian Surety Company.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 5933; 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 7024 (iv).

Bill (No. 152, from the Senate) Respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Fowke).

1°*, 6439; 2°*, 6504; in Com., and 3°*, 7470 (iv).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act, as regards the Weight of a bushel and a bag of certain articles.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°*, 6035 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8078, 8743 (v).

Bill (No. 154) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 6034 (iv).

Bill (No. 155) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 6112; 2° and ref. to Marine Com., 6675 (iv).

Bill (No. 156) To amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 6188 (iv); 2°, 8409; in Com., 8409; 3°*, 8410 (v).

Bill (No. 157) Respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.—(Mr. Fisher).

In Com. on Res., 6188; 1°*, 2°* of B., 6196 (iv); in Com. on B., 8077; 3°*, 8078 (v).

Bill (No. 158, from the Senate) To incorporate Revillon Frères Trading Company, Limited.—(Mr. Devlin).

1°, 6439; 2°, 7147, 7590 (iv); in Com., 8577, 8966, 9165, 9575; 3°*, 9576 (v).

Bill (No. 159, from the Senate) To change the name of the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 6439; 2°*, 6504; in Com., and 3°*, 6951 (iv).

Bill (No. 160) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively the thirty-first March, 1911, and the thirty-first March, 1912.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 6440; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°, 6441 (iv).

Bill (No. 161, from the Senate) To incorporate the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board.—(Mr. Fowke).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 6951; in Com., 7470, 7560; 3°*, 7589 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 162, from the Senate) Respecting the Alsek and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 6952 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8069 (v).

Bill (No. 163, from the Senate) For the relief of Mary Jane Beatty.—(Mr. Congdon).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 6952; in Com., and 3°*, 7590 (iv).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) For the relief of Walter Harvey Kirkland.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 165, from the Senate) Respecting a Patent of the Goldschmidt Thermit Company.—(Mr. Rivet).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024; in Com., and 3°*, 7590 (iv).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) To incorporate the Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Rutan).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) To incorporate the Pacific and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8070 (v).

Bill (No. 168, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ontario-Michigan Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8070 (v).

Bill (No. 169, from the Senate) To incorporate the Canada West Loan Corporation.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., 8563; 3°*, 8566 (v).

Bill (No. 170, from the Senate) To incorporate the New Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Nipissing).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., 8094, 8233, 8519, 8535, 8642, 8916, 8956; 3° m., 8962 (v).

Bill (No. 171, from the Senate) To incorporate the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.—(Mr. Rutan).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., 8095, 8236, 8536, 8916; 3°*, 8923 (v).

Bill (No. 172 from the Senate) Respecting the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—(Mr. Barker).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8069 (v).

Bill (No. 173, from the Senate) For the relief of Robert William Logan.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7025; in Com., and 3°*, 7590 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) To incorporate the Casualty Company of Canada.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7025; in Com., 8566; 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 175, from the Senate), To amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Harbour of Toronto.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., 8234, 8535; 3°*, 8536 (v).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate), to incorporate the Restigouche Riparian Association.—(Mr. Geoffrion).

1°*, 7019; 2°*, 7148; in Com., 7589; 3°*, 7590 (iv).

Bill (No. 177), To amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 7019; 2°, 7825; in Com., 7846 (iv); 3°m., 8104, 8193, 8403 (v).

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate), Respecting the Pollution of Navigable Waters.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).

1°*, 7339 (iv).

Bill (No. 179), Respecting the Songhees Indian Reserve.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 7248; in Com. on Res., 7248; 1°* of B., 7252; 2° and in Com., 7824; 3°*, 7825 (iv).

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate), For the relief of Mary Kathleen Crittenden.—(Mr. Rhodes).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 181, from the Senate), For the relief of Pauline Winslow Saunderson.—(Mr. Todd).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate), For the relief of Nellie Bridgland Morrison.—(Mr. Harris).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577(v).

Bill (No. 183, from the Senate), For the relief of Frances Whittington Truesdell.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 184), Respecting Copyrights.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 7807; in Com. on Res., 7817; 1°* of B., 7824 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8895 (v).

Bill (No. 185), To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

Res. prop., 4201 (iii); in Com. on Res., 8042; 1°* of B., 8065; in Com., 8419; 3°*, 8451 (v).

Bill (No. 186, from the Senate), Respecting The Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Dubeau).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 187, from the Senate), Respecting a Patent of the Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Company, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8969; 3°*, 8970 (v).

Bill (No. 188, from the Senate), To confer on the Commission of Patents certain Powers for the relief of Trussed Concrete Steel Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 8308; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8970; 3°*, 8970 (v).

Bill (No. 189, from the Senate), To amend The Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908.—(Sir Allen Aylesworth).

1°*, 8187 (v).

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate), For the relief of Violet Jane Dakin.—(Mr. McCarthy).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 191, from the Senate), For the relief of Hugh Samuel Bell.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 192, from the Senate), To provide for increasing the Capital Stock of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8969; 3°*, 8969 (v).

Bill (No. 193, from the Senate), Respecting La Sauvegarde Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion)

1°*, 8308; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 ,v).

Bill (No. 194), To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 8187 (v).

Bill (No. 195, from the Senate), To incorporate the Western Canal Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 8308; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 196, from the Senate), To incorporate The Continental Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Molloy).

1°*, 8403; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8968; 3°*, 8969 (v).

Bill (No. 197), To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 8399; 2° and in Com., 9312, 9377; 3°*, 9430 (v).

Bill (No. 198, from the Senate), To incorporate the Quebec and Great North Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Hodgins).

1°*, 8476; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 9936 (v).

Bill (No. 199, from the Senate), For the relief of Fanny Mary Healey.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 8476; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 200, from the Senate), For the relief of Gertrude Mary Grantham.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 8477; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8971; 3°*, 8981 (v).

Bill (No. 201, from the Senate), Respecting the Canada National Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 8476; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8981; 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 202, from the Senate), To incorporate the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 8582; 2°, 8642; in Com., and 3°*, 9576 (v).

Bill (No. 203, from the Senate), Respecting certain Patents of Munderloh and Company, Limited.—(Mr. Gordon, Kent).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8641; in Com., 8970; 3°*, 8970 (v).

Bill (No. 204, from the Senate), Respecting the Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8641; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 205, from the Senate), Respecting the Canada Cement Company, Limited. (Mr. Northrup).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8642 (v).

Bill (No. 206, from the Senate), Respecting the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Kent).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8642; in Com., 8970; 3°*, 8971 (v).

Bill (No. 207), Respecting Bank Officers and Creditors.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 8695 (v).

Bill (No. 208, To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Paterson).

Res. prop., 8477; in Com. on Res., 8716; 1°* of B., 8743 (v).

Bill (No. 209, from the Senate), Respecting Grain.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 8887; 2°, 9512 (v).

Bill (No. 210, from the Senate), To amend the Water Carriage of Goods Act as regards the delivery of wood.—(Mr. Sinclair), 1°*, 8887 (v).

Bill (No. 211) Respecting aid towards the construction of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 8704; M. for Com. on Res., 8801; in Com. on Res., 8825; 1°* of B., 8872; 2° and in Com., 9222, 9255; 3°m., 9294 (v).

Bill (No. 212) To amend the Water Carriage of Goods Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°*, 8887; 2° and in Com., 9348; 3°*, 9349 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 213) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 8887; 2°, 9221; in Com., 9222; 3°, 9334 (v).

Bill (No. 214, from the Senate) Respecting the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 8955; 2°*, 8983; in Com., 9167 (v).

Bill (No. 215, from the Senate) For the relief of William Francis Currie.—(Mr. Pardee).

1°*, 8955; 2°*, 9172 (v).

Bill (No. 216) To amend the Post Office Act, —(Mr. Lemieux).

Res. prop., 8585; in Com. on Res., 8906, 8924; 1°* of B., 8954; 2°, 9567; in Com., 9568, 9576; 3°*, 9580 (v).

Bill (No. 217) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

Res. prop., 8586; in Com., on Res, 8954; 1°* of B., 8955 (v).

Bill (No. 218, from the Senate) For the relief of George Mackay Sutherland.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 9089; 2°*, 9576 (v).

Bill (No. 219) To amend the Quebec Savings Banks Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 9089; 2°, 9343; in Com., and 3°, 9343 (v).

Bill (No. 220 from the Senate) To incorporate the Albert and Moncton Railway Company.—(Mr. Emmerson).

2°, 9224; M. for Com., 9350; in Com., 9351; in Com., and 3°*, 9377 (v).

Bill (No. 221) To amend the Penny Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 8104; M. for Com. on Res., 9220; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°* of B., 9221 (v).

Bill (No. 222) Respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°, 9228; 2°, in Com., 9495; 3°*, 9499 (v).

Bill (No. 223) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

M. for 1°, 9305; 1°*, 2°*, and ref. to Ry. Com., 9308; in Com. of the Whole, 9509, 3°*, 9511 (v).

Bill (No. 224) Respecting Duties of Customs on Importations from Japan.—(Mr. Fielding).

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9432; in Com., 9445; 1°*, 2°* and in Com. on B., 9494; 3°, 9533 (v).

Bill (No. 225) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively 31st March, 1911, and 31st. March, 1912.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 9580; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 9589 (v).

Birch Grove Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) 6073 (iv).

Birthday Congratulations to Prime Minister (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8 (i).

Births and Deaths in Canada, Number, &c.; M. for Ret. (Mr. McCarthy) 2679 (ii).

Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Govt., Remedy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 655 (i).

B'iss, Lt.-Col. D. C., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8100 (v).

Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co., Ltd., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 187.'

Boiler Inspection on Vessels: *See* 'B. No. 155.'

Bonaventure River, Quebec, and N. B. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8764 (v).

Bonded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 4464 (iii).

Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiation with U. S. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1575 (i).

Bookkeeping: *See* 'Falconer.'

Boot and Shoe Lasts, Names of Manufacturers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Hughes) 1340 (i).

Boot Contract: *See* 'Naval Service,' &c.

Boston Speech of Min. of Militia, *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 5751 (iii).

Boundary Surveys and Demarcation: in Com. of Sup., 9546 (v).

Bracebridge Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).

Bradford Channel, Newmarket: in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).

Brantford Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 2098 (ii).

Bricks, Tiles, &c., Amount Imported from G. B. and U. S., 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2369 (ii).

Bridge Strengthening on I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5913 (iii).

Brier Island Light, Application *re* new house: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).

—— Lightkeeper's Salary: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).

Brighton Wharf, Vote *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 1655 (i).

Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4825 (iii).

Britain's Demand for Tariff Concession *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6574 (iv).

British Ambassador's Warning to Can. Ministers *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6200 (iv).

—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

B. C. and Central Can. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 113.'

B. C. Coal Strike, Agreement of Two Years ago: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6365 (iv).

B. C. Coal Strike: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6363 (iv).
——— *See* 'Coal,' 'Militia.'
British Columbia and Dawson Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
B. C. Fisheries Regulations: *See* 'B. No. 185.' *See* 'Fisheries.'
B. C. Militia, Complaints *re* Treatment, Par. in B. C. Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) 9248 (v).
B. C. Ry. Belt, Water: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 17.'
British Columbia and White River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
British Crown Assurance Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
British Patriotic Songs in Western Schools and American Pupils: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 656 (i).
——— Remarks of Mr. Armstrong: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4931 (iii).
British Preference Trade Policy: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5619 (iii).
British Preference, Increase of, Readjustment of Tariff, Reciprocity, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7210 (iv).
British Tariff Commission, Rep. *re* Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6268 (iv).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3859 (ii).
Bronte Harbour Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iv).
Brown, George Addison, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247 (iv).
Budget, The, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 6577 (iv).
——— Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6439 (iv). *See* 'Address,' 'Finance,' 'Reciprocity.'
Buffalo Herds in National Parks: in Com. of Sup., 6049 (iv).
Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 80.'
Builders Woodworking Co., Expropriation of Land for Moncton Extension: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Crocket) 6158 (iv).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Buildings, Public Works, Plans approved by Depts. previous to Aug 5th, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 698 (i).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sealey) 7341 (iv).
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c.: Remarks on Question (Mr. Sealey) 7348 (iv).
Burrard, Westminster Boundary Ry. and Nav. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Business of the House, Adjournment for Coronation: Stmnt. (Mr. Fielding) 9309 (v).
——— *See* 'Adjournment.'
Business of the House, Morning Sittings: M. (Mr. Fielding) 8887, 10095 (v).
Business of Hse. for Thursdays, Procedure *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1550 (i).
——— Public Bills for Thursdays: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 2064 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'
Butter, Cheese and Meats imported, Value, Weight, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).
Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada, Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4670 (iii).
——— Suppl. Answer laid on Table (Mr. Paterson) 6188 (iv).
Butter and Eggs, Prices in London, Statistics *re* Reciprocity: Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce *re* Return (Mr. Perley) 6508 (iv).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Cab Fares and Street Ry. Fares, Payments for last year to Govt. Employees: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1339 (i).
——— *See* 'Public Works. &c.'
Calgary Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).
Callender Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 6497 (iv).
Cameron, Miss, Emplymt. by Govt. as Immigration Agent: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 5191 (iii).
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 68.'
Campbellton Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5914 (iii), 5983 (iv).
Campbellton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).
Canada and Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8764 (v).
Canada Cement Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Canada Cement Co., Charges by Sir Sandford Fleming: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9372 (v).
——— *See* 'Cement.'
Canada and Cuba Mail Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv), 8775 (v).
'Canada's Farthest South,' Cost of Printing and Preparing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2885 (ii).
Canada and G.B. SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8773 (v).
——— *See* 'Atlantic,' 'Post Office,' &c.

Canada and Japan Mail Subsidy: Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1802 (i), 2503 (ii).
——— *See* 'Bill No. 103.'
Canada-Japan Trade Treaty, Expiration of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5638 (iii).
——— *See* 'Japan.'
Can. Medical Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 15.'
Canada and Mexico SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8781 (v).
Can. National Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 201.'
Canada and Newfoundland SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8783 (v).
Can. Shipping Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 24, 118, 155.'
Canada and S. Africa SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 8784 (v).
Canada and S. America SS. Service, Subsidies to: Ques. (Mr. Daniel), 5290 (iii).
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid *re*, Complaints of Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 661 (i).
Canada and West Indies SS. Subsidy Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5936 (iv).
Canada and W. Indies Trade Relations, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).
Can. West Loan Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
See 'Baptist.'
Canadian Coasting Laws, Reciprocity affecting Grain and Hogs: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 5133 (iii).
Canadian Commissioner for France, Vacancy, Apptmt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1971 (ii), 8103 (v).
——— Contradiction of Question asked in Senate (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 9545 (v).
Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities, Dredges, Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1905 (i).
Canadian Fisheries Exhibition: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).
Canadian Fisheries, Extent in Marine Miles, Amounts realized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1289 (i).
——— Control by Federal Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 983 (i).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Canadian Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnson before Com. on Ag.: Remarks (Mr. Schell) 2992 (ii).
———*See* 'Reciprocity.'
Canadian General Development Co., Total Amounts paid by, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 655 (i).
Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency, Charge *re* Frauds: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1716 (i).
Can. Inter-Mountain Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
Canadian Light and Power Co., Lease between Govt., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lortie) 1501 (i).
——— Plans, &c., Date of Approval: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7591, 7805 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7261 (iv).
Canadian Loans and Investments in U. S., Amount, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rutan) 6505 (iv).
——— *See* 'Finance.'
Canadian National Parks: in Com. of Sup., 6049 (iv).
Canadian Naval Service, Applications from Canadians and British Navy: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1339 (i).
——— 'Bristol' Type, Specifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1279 (i).
——— Date and Port of Sailing of 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow': Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1091 (i).
——— Home Rule: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 1461 (i).
——— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow', Loan by Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 983 (i).
——— Number of Battleships withdrawn from Can. by G. B. during the past five years: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1093 (i).
——— 'Rainbow' Type, Guns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1490 (i).
——— 'Rainbow' listed as ineffective: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1070 (i).
——— Total Expenditure since 31st Oct. 1910: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5638 (iii).
See 'Naval Service,' &c.
Can. Northern Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 69 and 211.'
Can. Northern Quebec Ry Co.: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re*: Personal Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 8187 (v).
C. P. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
C. P. R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 766 i).
——— Land Tax, Information *re* Privy Council's Decision (Mr. Bradbury) 2992 (ii).
——— Reduction of Rates &c.: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1806 (i); Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1573 (i).
——— *See* 'Railways.'
Canadian Railways, Accidents *re*, Investigation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3922 (ii).
Can. Surety Co.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U. S. Citizens: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4672 (iii).
Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3608 (ii).

Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c.: *See* 'Militia.'

Can. Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'

CANALS—

Arbitrations, &c. and Awards, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 6427 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal, Alienation, Rep. *re* Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2214 (ii).

——— Grantees, Improvements, Valuation of Franchise &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1711 (i).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 2194 (ii).

——— Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2677 (ii).

——— Privileges, Advertisement for Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1712 (i).

——— Total Cost, Revenue from Grantees, Arrears, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).

Canal Statistics: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7019 (iv).

——— Working Expenses, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 8453 (v).

Cardinal Canal Bridge: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

——— Dock Rebuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).

Carillon Water Power Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8700 (v).

——— Names of Lessee, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2668 (ii).

Chambly Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (iv).

——— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).

——— Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup. 6408 (iv).

Clarry, Mr. L. F., Payments to by Govt. for Professional Services: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 813 (i).

——— Charges against: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).

Cornwall Canal, Enlargement of Office: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

——— Lock, 17: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

——— Lock. 19: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

——— Removing High Spots from Prism: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

——— Robertson's Culvert, Reinforcing Bank: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

Farran's Point, Lower Entrance Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

Galops Canal—Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Use by Americans: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7804 (iv).

——— *See* main heading.

Lachine Canal, Concrete Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6358, 6410 (iv).

CANALS—*Con.*

Lachine Canal: New Tug: in Com. of Sup., 6359 (iv).

——— Tugs: in Com. of Sup., 6388 (iv

——— Wharfs and Basins: in Com. of Sup., 6359 (iv).

Lake St. Francis Protection Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iv).

Lockmen, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6413, 6453 (iv).

Murray Canal Dredging: in Com. of Su 6410 (iv).

——— New Scow: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).

Newmarket Canal, Expenditure for 1910, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5830 (iii).

——— Cor. with Mr. E. J. Walsh and Dept. M. for Copies* (Mr. Wallace) 5136 (iii).

——— Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10474; Neg. (Y. 45; N. 79) 10532 (v).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Wallace) 7556 (iv).

Newmarket Canal: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).

——— Bradford Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).

Quebec, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).

Rapide Plat Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

Rideau Canal, Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

——— Lockmen, Increase of Pay: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

——— Removal of Stumps: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).

St. Ours Locks, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).

St. Peter's Canal, C. B., Construction, &c., Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 8103 (v).

——— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8355 (v).

——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie, Lock Gates, Tugs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).

——— Concrete Walls: Remarks (Mr Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).

——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup , 6397 (iv).

——— Upper Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).

Soulanges Canal, Claim for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).

——— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).

CANALS—*Con.*

Soulanges Canal, Leaks and Trimming Slopes: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).

——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).

——— Protection Works, Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer *re* administration of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6273 (iv).

Trent Canal, Damages by Floods: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).

——— Fenelon Falls Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

——— Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).

——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).

——— Lift Lock: in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).

——— Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).

——— Scugog River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv). *See* 'Newmarket.'

Welland Canal, Enlargement, Change of Route, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).

——— Enlargement, Memorial, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Hodgins) 1500 (i).

——— Jane St. Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).

——— Port Colborne Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).

——— Selkirk Route, Welland Canal: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).

——— Stone Protection to Banks: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).

——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).

Williamsburg Canal, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6396 (iv).

——— Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).

——— Lockmaster's House: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).

——— Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).

——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).

Canned Goods: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Canned Pease, Impure, Importation of into Canada, Number of Cases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3279 (ii).

——— Quantity imported into Can.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3221 (ii).

Canning, J. H., Inspector of Inland Revenue, Retirement of: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1350 (i).

Canso and Guysborough Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8994 (v).

Capital Life Assurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'

Cardinal Canal Bridge: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

Cardinal Dock Rebuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).

Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'

Carillon Water Power, Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c.: (Mr. Monk) 8700 (v).

——— Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2668 (ii).

Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).

Carrier-Laine Works, Purchase by Govt., Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8992

Casualty Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 174.'

Cattle Exports to the U. S., Bonded to G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7426 (iv).

——— Remarks *re* Return (Mr. Blain) 7558 (v).

Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).

Cattle Inspection on Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

Cattle Quarantine Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).

Cement Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 205.'

Cement Merger, Charges of Sir Sandford Fleming: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9372, 10468 (v).

Cement Production, Total Production annually since 1900: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 10196 (v).

CENSUS—

Appointments for East Elgin, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 4302 (iii).

Census Commissioner, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2155 (ii).

Census Methods: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6669, 7556 (iv).

Census of North and South Ontario, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9431 (v).

Census, Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden) 9594 (v).

Census Returns: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 8193 (v).

Census, Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 9694 (v).

Census, System of Taking: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4337 (iii).

Commissioner for York County, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8704 (v).

Enumerators, Apptmt. of Enumerators: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9994 (v).

——— Apptmt. of by Liberal Associations: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7021 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) 2887 (ii), 4933 (iii).

CENSUS—*Con.*

Enumerators, Circulating Pets. *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Best) 6507 (iv).

—— Completion of Work: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7218 (iv).

—— Inaccuracies in Quebec: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 7217 (iv).

Enumerators in Man., Apptmt. of by Liberal Organizers, Cor. &c., Read: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Staples) 9006, 9015 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. Staples) 8889 (v).

Enumerators, Names, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4465 (iii).

Enumerators in Peel County, Number, Apptmt., &c: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10335 (v).

Hochelaga Census Enumerators, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9432 (v).

Jacques Cartier Census Enumerators, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9431 (v).

Omissions *re* Enumerations: Further Information re (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9897 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9711 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 10099 (v).

Questions, Preparation of Lists, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 659 (i).

Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7556 (iv).

Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8983 (v).

Certificates to Masters, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'

Chacastapasin Indian Reserve, Owner, &c.: (Mr. Schaffner) 4301 (iii).

Chambly Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (v).

—— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).

—— Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).

Charing Cross Bank and Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. with Govt. (Mr. Ames) 1726 (i).

—— *See* 'Atlantic, Quebec & Western.'

Charwomen, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).

Chatham, Diversion of I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Chatham, N. B., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1610 (i).

—— Purchase of Site, Name of Owners: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (iii).

Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 206.'

Cheese Cool Curing Room, Brockville, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8095 (v).

Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5406 (iii).

Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Protection *re* Marketing: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).

See 'Butter'.

Chemin Gouin Postmaster, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7038 (iv).

—— A. C. Miquelon, Pension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7210 (iv).

Chesley Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 2103 (ii).

Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).

China, Japan and Can. SS. Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 103.'

China-Japan SS. Subsidy: M. for Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 147.'

See 'Immigration.'

Chinese Immigration Act, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv).

Chinese Investigation Commission, Censure of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10383, Neg. (Y. 54; N. 90) 10454 (v).

—— Discussion *re* Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9926 (v).

—— Evidence read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9786 (v).

—— Rep. of Mr. Justice Murphy: Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9594 (v).

—— Rep. of Judge Murphy: Laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9897 (v).

—— Stmnt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion with Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Ralph Smith) 2738 (ii).

Chinese Immigration, Total Number, Capita Tax, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 788 (i).

Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1103 (i).

Cholera Precautions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10197 (v).

Christian Island Indian Reserve, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4567 (iii).

—— *See* 'Beausoleil.'

Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1453 (i).

Chrysler, Mr. F. H., Amounts paid by Govt. *re* Legal Services from 1896 to 1910 (M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 1727 (i).

Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4571 (iii).

Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*: M. for O. Cs., &c. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2218 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7553 (iv).

—— Notice (Mr. R. L. Borden) of Discussion, 1912 (i).

Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*: *See* 'Govt. Officials.'
Civil Service Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 12, 208 & 217.'
Civil Service, Apptmt. of Coloured Persons: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4930, 5038 (iii).
Civil Service Apptmts. from South Grey: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 2555 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Apptmts.'
Clarry, Mr. L. F., Payments to by Govt. for Professional Services: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 813 (i).
——— Charges against: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Clayoquot Life Saving Station, Investigation *re* Irregularities: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Barnard) 785 (i).
Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of: Remarks (Mr. Russell) 9996 (v).
Coal Barges and Pilotage Fees: *See* 'B. No. 118..
Coal and Coke, Quantities imported into Canada from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4674 (iii).
Coal Consumption by Govt. Cruisers, Quantity per Day: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv).
Coal imported from U. S. for 1910 for Ont., Total Amounts of Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. D. Gordon) 4041 (iii).
Coal Mining Rights in School Lands, Leases issued: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).
Coal Miners Strike, Remarks of Mr. Geo. Taylor, 9720 (v).
——— *See* 'Militia.'
Coal Strike in Alberta and B. C., Conciliation by Labour Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6197 (iv).
Coal Strikes in the West, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6363, 6908, 7105 (iv).
Coasting Trade Act, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4675 (iii).
Cobalt Mail Service, Delays and inefficient Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1649, 1663, 1804 (i).
Cocaine, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Coeli, Mr. Treau de, Payments to *re* Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8308 (v).
Coins, Foreign and Uncurrent, Removal of: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Cold Storage in Can., Govt. Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1455 (i).
Cold Storage Depots, Total Amounts paid from 1907-10: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii). *See* 'Agriculture.'
Cold Storage Warehouses: *See* 'B. Nos. 36 & 112.'
Collingwood Corner Postmaster, Name, Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Capital Cost, Dimensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middleboro) 10337 (v).
Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Colonial Conference, 1911, Canada's Proposals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1280 (i).
——— *See* 'Imperial Conference.'
Coloured Aliens as Immigrants from U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4470 (iii).
——— *See* 'Civil Service,' 'Negroes,' &c.
Combines Investigation Act: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).
Combines Investigation Act, Charges re: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro), 663 (i).
Combines Investigation Act, Rep of: Inquiry for (Mr. Maddin) 1987 (ii).
Combines Investigation in United Shoe Machinery Co., Restraint, &c.: Remarks (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5953 (iv).
Commercial Agent for Canada at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 9511 (v).
Commercial Agencies: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Commercial Relations Documents, Translation of: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 3462 (ii).
Commercial Travellers Accident Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Commission to Immigration Agents, Total Amount paid: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2436 (ii).
Commissions, Taking of: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).
——— Lists: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 262 (i).
——— M. to add Names (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 377 (i).
Committees, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).
Commutation Ry. Tickets: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Companies Act Amt.: *See* 'B No. 7.'
Compensation to Workmen for Injuries: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Conciliation Board, Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 3378, 3399 (ii), 4244 (iii).
Conciliation Board, Principle of Action: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4242 (iii).
——— *See* 'Industrial.'
Conduits Co.'s Ltd., Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 43.'
Conservation Commission, Annual Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 698 (i).
Conservation of Natural Resources, Number of Copies printed: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 660 (i).
Consolidated Boards of Trade, Saskatchewan, Despatch from W. A. Shepherd: Read (Mr. Schaffner) 5752 (iii).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Constantineau, Judge, Number of Motions heard ,Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 982 (i).

Consuls General, Foreign, Status at Official Receptions, &c.: M. for Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Mr. Sproule) 949 (i).
Continental Fire Insurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 196.'
Convicts liberated from Penitentiary at Kingston without Clothing or Means: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) 1913 (i), 2065 (ii).
——— Stmnt. (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 1986 (ii).
Co-operation: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 & 29.'
Copyright Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Copyright Act Amt., Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7557 (iv), 9594 (v).
Copyright Law and Imperial Copyright Conference, Canada's Action *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5134 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Enlargement of Office: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Lock 17: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Lock 19: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Removing High Spots from Prism: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Robertson's Culvert, Reinforcing Bank: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
Coronation of King George V, Invitation to Members of Parlt: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1580 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8709 (v).
——— *See* 'Adjournment.'
Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4659 (iii)
——— Apptmt. of Col. Landry: Personal Explanation (Mr. Lemieux) 8093 (iv)
——— Indian Contingent, Par. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6506 (iv).
——— Regulations *re* Apptmt., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3220, 3277 (ii).
——— Regulations *re* Selecting Corps: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4464 (iii).
——— Names of Officers, &c., Cadets, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7105 (iv).
——— Selection of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4828 (iii).
Coronation Day Celebration in Ottawa, Absence of Ministers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 9989 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Beattie) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10351 (v).
Coronation Decorations: in Com. of Sup. 9565 (v).
Coronation Expenses of Members and Senators: in Com. of Sup., 8679 (v).
Coronation Holiday and Bank Holiday: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 5836 (iii).
Coronation Naval Cadets, Method of Selection &c.: Ques. Mr. Macdonell) 9986 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 706 (i).
Coronation Stamps: Inquiry *re* (Mr. Armstrong) 9247 (v).
Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).
Courtice, Howard, Emplymt. by Liberal Bureau: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9784 (v).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 9897 (v).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3013 (ii).
Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).
Creighton, Mr. W. O., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent,: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4828 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).
Creston Fruit and Produce Association: Reciprocity Treaty, &c.: Res. *re* Read (Mr. Goodeve) 4119 (iii).
Cribbins Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
Criminal Code Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 40, 86.'
'Crissie Toomey' Schooner, Purchase of, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Crittenden, Mary Kathleen, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 180.'
Crooks, Mr. Wesley, Postmaster at Peggy's Cove, Increase in Salary: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Crop Statistics, Policy of Collecting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5937 (iv).
Cruisers manned by Canadian Marines, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr.Paquet) 805 (i).
———*See* 'Naval Service &c.
Cumberland Coal and Ry. Co., Strike of Employees, Reps., &c.: M. for Cor.*: (Mr. Rhodes) 1340 (i).
——— *See* 'Conciliation'
Curren, R. C., Gratuity *re* Injuries: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 3948 (ii).
Currie, Wm. Francis, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Customs Dept. Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 208.'

CUSTOMS:

Bonded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 4464 (iii).
Bricks, Tiles, &c., Amount imported from G.B. and U.S., 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2369 (ii).
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U.S. Citizens: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4672 (iii).
Canned Peas, Quantity Imported into Can.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3221 (ii)
——— Impure, Importation of into Canada, Number of Cases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3279 (ii).
Coal imported from U.S. for 1910 for Ont., Total Amounts of Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. D. Gordon) 4041 (iii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Coal and Coke, Quantities imported into Canada from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4674 (iii).

Customs Act Schedules, Average Value in 1896 and 1910: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 801 (i).

Customs Collections in Cities, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4042 (iii).

Customs Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1048 (i), 5992 (iv).

——— Dept. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).

Customs Duties, Average Value for 1896 and 1910, Units of: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2162 (ii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) *re* Speech of Hon. Mr. Foster, 7022 (iv).

——— Correction (Mr. Foster) 7104 (iv).

Customs Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value of Articles in Schedules of Customs Act: M. for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1105 (i).

Customs Duties *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

Customs, Free Entries of Goods, Date of last Entry: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 803 (i).

——— Free Goods entered at Vancouver, by Kelly & Co.: M. for Copies (Mr. Barnard) 931 (i).

Customs Officer at Ingram Dock, Dismissal of *re* Municipal Elections: M. for O. Cs, &c. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2218 (ii).

Customs Preventive Officers, Duties &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2160 (ii).

Customs Tariff with Foreign Countries, Arrangements by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 981 (i).

Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6268 (iv).

Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10196 (v).

Exports and Imports from Canada to Australia, Japan, &c. from 1906-1911, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9369 (v).

Fire Bricks imported into N. S., Number of Ports &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).

Guysborough Customs Revenue, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2161 (ii).

Halifax Customs Officials, Complaint *re* Treatment *re* Salaries: Remarks (Mr. R.L. Borden) in Com. on Bill, 8723 (v).

Imports by Provinces into U. S., Total Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 5634 (iii).

Mahone Bay Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4301 (iii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4383 (iii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Mercier, Mr. Geo., Customs Official at Dalhousie, Member of Town Council: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4044 (iii).

Mica Exports 1900 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Best) 5290 (iii).

Mica Imports, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4827 (iii).

Montreal Customs House, Employees leaving since 1st July, 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1340 (i).

Newfoundland Export Trade, Total Value, Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2854 (ii).

Nicolet Customs Collections for 1906-11: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

Oshawa Customs Collector, Retirement of Mr. Blamey: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3225 (ii).

Paper Imports into U. S., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).

Pig Iron Charcoal, Number of Tons Imported: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1721 (i).

Pig Iron Imports, used in Steel Rail Mills, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 4828 (iii).

Ploughs exported to U. S., Number, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 3223 (ii).

Port Stanley, Port Burwell and Aylmer Customs Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 985 (i).

Pulp Wood Exports to the U. S., Value of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).

——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Paterson) 5126 (iii).

Shafting imported, Quantities and Values since April, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 7593 (iv).

Stone Cut, Duty between U. S. and Can., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1287 (i).

Vancouver Customs, Entries by Robt. Kelly, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Barnard) 713 (i).

'Wanda' Yacht, Date of Entry at Canadian Port, Notice to Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5933 (iv).

——— Appraising by Customs &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4678 (iii).

——— Changed from American to Canadian Register, Date, &c,: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4300 (iii).

——— Length, Motive Power, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5834 (iii).

——— Valuation of: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Paterson) 5623 (iii).

Wolfe Island Customs Official, Apptmt. of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8099 (v).

See 'Reciprocity.'

Dairy and Farm Products, Quantity and Value of Importation from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9361 (v).

Dairy and Fruit Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6234 (iv).
Dairy Industry, Memorials *re*: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2671 (ii).
Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario: (Mr. Lalor); Correction *re* Stmnt. (Mr. Paterson) about Reciprocity, 4223 (iii).
——— Denial of Stmnt. of Minister of Customs (Mr. Armstrong) 4570 (iii).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Dakin, Violet Jane, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 190.'
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re*: Ans. (Mr. Brodeur) 9374 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9374 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 9247 (v).
Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. re Construction: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5832 (iii).
Daylight, Saving of: *See* 'B. No. 26.'
Debates Committee, 1st Rep.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 6438 (iv).
——— Status of: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7015 (iv).
Debates Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 6171 (iv).
Declaration of London, Adoption of: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Monk) 3530 (ii).
——— Consideration by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5935 (iv).
Deep Brook, N.S., Wharf, Expenditure *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 4383 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii).
Deferred Elections: *See* 'Elections.'
Deptl. Expenditure of Public Moneys, Investigations *re*: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
Departments Generally, Cleaning, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1486 (i).
Deputy Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Deputy Governor or Administrator, Apptmt. of Mr. Justice Girouard, Tel. to Cardinal Vanutelli *re* Eucharistic Congress: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 702 (i).
Digby Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).
Dini, Victor, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 8582 (v).
Dissolution of Parlt., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Opposition: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 5737 (iii).
Divorce: *See* 'B. Nos. 130, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 163, 164, 173, 180, 181, 182, 183, 190, 191, 199, 200, 215 and 218.'
Divorce Bills: Ques. of Privilege *re* Remarks made by Senator Kirchhoffer (Mr. Ethier) 4201 (iii).
Dixon Postoffice, Pets. *re* Change of Location: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4669 (iii).
Dog Fish Industry: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 8044 (v).
Dog Fish Works: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
Dom. Buildings, Caretakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).
——— Electric Power: in Com. of Sup., 3210 (ii).
——— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).
——— Que., General Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).
——— Rents, Engineers Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3212 (ii).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
Dom. Development Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 113.'
Dom. Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 107 and 194.'
Dominion Lands, Administration of : in Com. of Sup., 5553, 5581 (iii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).
Dom. Lands in Alberta, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 2271 (ii).
Dom. Lands in Saskatchewan, Gross Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3221 (ii).
See 'Interior.
Dom. Police Gratuities: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Donland Postoffice, Removal of Site: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 9994 (v).
Don Postoffice, Mail Service to Toronto, Name of Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).
Drawbars for Freight Cars, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for Current Year: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).
Dresden Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2105 (ii).
Drill Halls, Generally, Construction *re*: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).
See 'Militia,' 'Public Works,' &c.
Drill Halls, Man., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1975 (ii).
Drinking Water, Pollution of: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Drugs made with Opium, Regulation: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Cartoons used by Min. of Marine, published in 'Le Canada' of 1904: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 223 (i).
——— Cor. laid on Table, 194 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Denial of Mr. Begin *re* words quoted by Mr. Monk *re* Naval Defence (Mr. Tobin) 134 (i).
——— Statements in 'Le Devoir', Denial, &c. (Mr. Blondin) 145 (i).

Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Cartoons displayed to Hse. (Mr. Brodeur) 146 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska, Electoral Distrist: Certificate *re* (Mr. Speaker) 259 (i).
——— Disloyal Speeches: Remarks (Mr. Blondin) on Address 169 (i).
——— 'Le Devoir,' Quotations: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brodeur) 469.
——— Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 472 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Moneys used, &c.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Perley) 196 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, 'pounding England' speech of Notary Begin: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 57; Ques. of Order, Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 57 (i); Telling hon. mem. he 'lied to the House,' (Mr. Gauvreau) 57 (i); Ques. of Order, Insulting Language: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 77 (i).
——— Speeches: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 153 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Address, 54 (i).
Dry Docks, Applications for Subsidies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4383 (iii).
——— *See* 'Collingwood.'
Dry Docks at Quebec, Construction *re* by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Price) 9988 (v).
Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 662 (i)
Dufferin Board Trade Res., Reciprocity Treaty: Read (Mr. Black) 5547 (iii).
Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6268 (iv).
——— *See* 'Iron.'
Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10196 (v).
Duncan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii)
Dundas Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).
Dunnville Postal Collections, Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3470 (ii).
Dunnville Postoffice; :Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup. 1668 (i).
Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by 'International': M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1498 (i).
Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value of Articles in Schedules of Customs Act: M. for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1105 (i).
——— *See* 'Customs.'
Dynamite, Storage of: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
'Earl Grey.' Ice Breaker, Construction: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).
'Earl Grey', Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1972 (ii).
East Chezzetcook Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).
Easter Adjournment: Notice of M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6758 (iv).
Eastern Dredging Co., Letting of Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 813 (i).
E. B. Eddy Co.: *See* 'B No 54.'
Echo Lake Postoffice, Application *re* Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8993 (v).
Eclipse Mfg. Co., Office Specialty Co., and Ahearn & Soper, Paymenis to *re* Contracts: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1339 (i).
Eggs imported into Canada from Foreign Countries: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4467 (iii)
Elbow River Conserving of Water Flow: M. for Cor. (Mr. McCarthy) 1912 (i).
Elbow River Water Power License, Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. McCarthy) 1501 (i).
Elbow and Bow Rivers Water Power Privileges, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1345 (i).
Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 16, 28, 37, 38.'
Elections Deferred in B. C. and Generally: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 10376 (v).
Electricians at Sault Ste. Marie, Protest *re* Dismissals, Alien Labour Law Administration: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).
Electricity Exportation B. 101 (Mr. Conmee): Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Introduction, 2364 (ii).
Electric Light Attendant, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).
Electric Railway Charters, Number since 1896, Extensions *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4043 (iii).
Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William Terminals, Investigations *re* Mixing of Grain; Prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2377 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, System *re* Operating: Prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3472; Amt. (Mr. Neely) 3488. Agreed to (Y. 96, N. 54) 3524 (ii).
Elliott, Geo., Emplyt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 1497 (i).
Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractors, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).
Elora Post Office Site, Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 6505 (iv).
Elora Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).
Embargo on British Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10344 (v)

Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8111 (v).
Emo, Matilda, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
Empire Life Insurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Employees of Rys. paid fortnightly: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
English Mail Service to Maritime Provs: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8792 (v).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1080 (i).
——— *See* 'Naval Service, &c.
Ennis, D. N., Claims *re* Immigration Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 3847 (ii).
Escott, Postmaster, Date of Apptmt., Complaints *re* late Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).
——— Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
——— Salary, Date of Increase: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7601 (iv).
Esquimalt Fort, Removal of Guns: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3220 (ii).
Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Negotiations *re* Transfer: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 799 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 799 (i).
Essex Public Building: in Com of Sup., 2110 (ii).
Estimates, 1912: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695 (i).
——— Further Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 3068 (ii), 5525 (iii), 8355, 8534, 8675, 9312 (v).
Estimates of Depts., Procedure *re* Discussing: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) in Com. of Sup., 3185 (ii).
Estimates *re* Mail Service, Objection (Mr. Perley) to Passing, 4296 (iii).
Estimates for Man., Objections *re* Discussion (Mr. Staples) 2969 (ii).
Estimates, Order for Discussion *re* Depts.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2994 (ii).
——— Special Items reported as passed, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 9076 (v).
Estimates to be Voted *re* Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 9223 (v).
Eucharistic Congress at Montreal, Guards of Honour: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) on Address, 289 (i).
——— Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 704 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Govt. Authority *re* Decoration of Govt. Buildings: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 925 (i); Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3369 (ii).
——— Number of Buildings decorated by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4667 (iii).
Eucharistic Congress and Mess. of Homage from Administrator of Can. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 706 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Militia in Attendance, Authorization for: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3219 (ii).
——— Militia Officers at Reception in Uniform: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 707 (i).
——— Public Procession, Authority of Govt. *re* State Officials: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 925 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Reception to Cardinal Vanutelli, Imperfect Answer: Remarks Sproule) 158 (i).
——— Reception to by Federal Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Best) 5935 (iv).
——— Ref. to Questions: Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 158 (i).
——— Tel. to Cardinal Vanutelli by Administrator: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 702 (i).
'Eureka' Pilotage Boat, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6502-3 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Exchequer Court, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).
——— Reports, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Excursion Trains *re* Political Meeting, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 3776 (ii), 9076 (v).
Exhibition Grants, Subsidies paid to: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii).
See 'Agriculture.'
Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3157 (ii).
Experimental Farm Bulletins: in Com. of Sup., 6185 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Number established for past year: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 656 (i).
Experimental Farms, Number operated in Dom., Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1102 (i).
Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Milk Average, Eggs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 662, 1285 (i).
Experimental Farms, Reps.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).
——— Stock *re*: Remarks (Mr. Best) in Com. of Sup., 3795 (ii).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) on M. for Sup., 8995 (v).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Explosives, Regulation of: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
Explosives, Number of Factories, Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 2374 (ii).

Exports and Imports from Canada to Australia, Japan, &c. from 1906-11, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9369 (v).

Express Co.s.' Statements: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Express Cos'. Unclaimed Balances: *See* 'B. No. 8.'

Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 10196 (v).

—— *See* 'Post Office—Parcel Post.'

External Affairs, Absence of Minister from Washington Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 1658 (i).

—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 7 (i).

—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1472 (i).

Extradition: *See* 'Fedorenko.'

Fabre, Mr. Hector, Date of Apptmt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5933 (iv).

Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (i).

Falconer System of Book-keeping, Adoption of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1904 (i).

—— *See* 'Govt. Bookkeeping.'

Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of: M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2188 (ii).

—— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 2263 (ii).

Farmers' Bank Failure, Applications *re* Establishment: M. for Papers (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1726 (i).

—— Assets *re* Keely Mine, Value &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 2152 (ii).

—— Application *re* Charter, Date and Names: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1970 (ii).

—— Cor. with Dom. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1726 (i), 2230 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1904 (i).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4468 (iii).

—— Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation *re* Double Liability: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4111 (iii).

—— Par. in 'News' *re* Endorsation of Premier: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 2264 (ii).

—— Proceedings *re* Commission: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10471 (v).

Farmers' Bank, Negligence of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. on Ways and Means, 8193, 8209, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 97) 8232 (v).

—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) *re* Mr. Calvert's connection, 5730 (iii).

—— Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4826 (iii).

—— Representations to Finance Dept. *re* Stability: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2151 (ii).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation: Amt. (Mr. Henderson) to Com. on Ways and Means, 5295: Neg. (Y. 62; N. 97) 5523 (iii).

Debate:

(Mr. Fielding) 5306; (Mr. Lalor) 5314; (Mr. Beattie) 5316; (Mr. Middlebro) 5324; (Mr. Porter) 5325; (Mr. Foster) 5329; (Mr. Miller) 5354; (Mr. Northrup) 5363; (Mr. Crothers) 5377; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5389; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5395; (Mr. Edwards) 5412; (Mr. Nesbitt) 5424; (Mr. Blain) 5431; (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5438; (Mr. Thornton) 5440; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 5450; (Mr. Armstrong) 5453; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5456; (Mr. Lalor) 5456; (Mr. Donnelly) 5461; (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5465; (Mr. Carvell) 5481; (Mr. Porter) 5487; (Mr. Hughes) 5496; (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 5498; (Mr. Boyce) 5508; Neg. (Y. 62; N. 97) 5523 (iii).

Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission *re*: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1510 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 7560 (iv).

Farmers' Bank Investigation, Treasury Board Ref.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) 5552 (iii).

—— Treasury Board Minutes: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4741 (iii).

Farmers' Bank Failures, Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificate: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2666 (ii).

—— Remarks *re* Answer to Question, 2679 (ii).

Farmers' Delegation from the West, Article in Grain Growers' Guide *re* Hudson Bay Ry., Denial of Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1574 (i).

—— Control of Hudson Bay Ry. Rates: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1508 (i).

—— Govt. Ownership of Elevators: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1504 (i).

Farmers' Delegation: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to print Speeches, 3054 (ii).

—— Distribution of Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 6908 (iv).

—— Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1454 (i).

—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Farm and Garden Products imported from Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c. (Mr. Boyce) 7034 (iv).

Farmers' Interests, Assurance of Member for N. Oxford *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 5541 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4663 (iii).

—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Farm Labourers, O.C. *re* Immigration Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 10099 (v).

Farm Products, Dutiable Exports by Provs. into U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 7026 (iv).

Farm Products entered at Windsor from 1906-1910: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 7596 (iv).

Farm Products exported through Windsor, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 8701 (v).

Farm Products imported from U.S. into Kingston Port, Quantities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3668 (ii).

Farm Products imported from other Countries, &c., Reciprocity Treaty: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3668 (ii).

Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets, 1910-11: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 8096 (v).

——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Farm Stock and Products, Value of Customs Imports from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1496 (i).

Farran's Point, Lower Entrance improvement: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

Favoured Nation Treaties before Imperial Conference, Abrogation of: Par. in Toronto 'Globe' (Mr. Armstrong) 5292 (iii).

——— Importations from Most Favoured Nations: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4111 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4113 (iii).

——— Member's remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 4114 (iii).

——— Names of Countries affected by Treaty *re* Importations into Canada (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4131 (iii).

——— Entry of Canadian Goods into their Markets: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4104; Reply (Mr. Fielding) 4134 (iii).

———Names of Favoured Nation Treaty Countries: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4665 (iii).

Fedorenko, A., Extradition of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10 (i).

Fences on Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 23.'

Fencing along Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Fenelon Falls Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation: on Amt., M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Middlebro) 9595, Neg. (Y. 45; N. 61) 9633 (v).

——— Compensation to: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 658 (i).

——— Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1089 (i).

——— Number surviving, Pensions &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1715 (i).

——— *See* 'Militia.'

Fergus Post Office Site, Remarks (Mr. Stratton) in Com. of Sup., 1883 (i).

Fergus Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii).

Festival of the Empire in London: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) in Com. of Sup., 3775 (ii).

Festival of the Empire: Chateauguay, Battle, Abandonment of: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 8105, 9251 (v).

FINANCE :

Accounts Outstanding, Total Amounts *re* Financial Statement: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5403 (iii).

American Silver Coin, Amount exported from Canada: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).

Aud. Gen., Cor. *re* Overpayments by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Best) 1010 (i).

——— Report: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1485 (i).

Bank Act, Consideration of by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6674 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6441, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).

——— Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govt. Action: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5632 (iii).

——— *See* 'Farmers Bank.'

Bankers Association, Agreement *re* Competition: Ques. (Mr. Low) 3466 (ii).

Bankers Association, Bylaws, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4116 (iii).

Bank Curators' Reports: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 3142 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2670 (ii), 4569, 5038 (iii), 7556 (iv).

Bank Failures, Stmnt. of Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses: (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2670 (ii).

Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., Ref. to Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 926, 1091 (i).

Budget, The—Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 6577 (iv).

——— Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).

Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency, Charge *re* Frauds: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1716 (i).

Charing Cross Bank and Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. with Govt. (Mr. Ames) 1726 (i).

——— *See* 'Railways.'

Coins, Foreign and Uncurrent, Removal of: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).

Estimates, 1912: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695 (i).

——— Suppl. (1911): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 3068 (ii). 5525 (iii), 8355 (v).

——— Suppl, 1912: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 8534, 8675, 9312 (v).

Estimates, Order for Discussion *re* Depts: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2994 (ii).

——— Procedure *re* Discussing: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) in Com. of Sup., 3185 (ii).

Estimates to be Voted *re* Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 9223 (v).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission *re* Investigation: Amt. (Mr. Henderson) to Com. on Ways and Means, 5295; Neg. (Y. 62; N. 97) 5523 (iii).

——— Negligence of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. on Ways and Means, 8193, 8209, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 97) 8232 (v).

——— Application *re* Charter, Date and Names: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1970 (ii).

——— Assets *re* Keeley Mine, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 2152 (ii).

——— M. for Papers (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1726 (i).

——— Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation *re* Double Liability: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4111 (iii).

——— Incorporation, Cor. with Dom. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1726 (i), 2230 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4468 (iii).

——— Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 7560 (iv).

——— Par. in 'News' *re* Endorsation of Premier: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 2264 (ii).

——— Proceedings *re* Commission: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10471 (v).

——— Question *re* Incorp.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1904 (i).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) *re* Mr. Calvert's connection, 5730 (iii).

——— Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4826 (iii).

——— Representations to Finance Dept. *re* Stability: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2151 (ii).

——— Royal Commission *re*: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1510 (i).

——— Treasury Board, Ref.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) 5552 (iii).

——— Treasury Board Minutes: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4741 (iii).

——— *See* 'Treasury.'

——— Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificate: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2666 (ii).

——— Remarks re answer to question, 2679 (ii).

Financial Statement—The Budget, 6577; Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).

——— Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6441 (iv).

Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U.S. and British, Authority *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9985 (v).

Govt. Savings Banks, Number of Depositors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 794 (i).

Loans and Investments in U.S., Amount, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rutan) 6595 (iv).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Loans, Negotiations for 1909-10, Financial Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 797 (i).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3281 (ii).

Loans and Sinking Funds, ref. to by Mr. Guthrie for 1895-6: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3772 (ii).

Mint Operations, Implementing Information: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).

Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation, &c., Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3065 (ii).

Revenue and Expenditure, Total for 1890-1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9992 (v).

Sinking Fund, Legal Amount required, Bounties paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 982 (i).

Treasury Board Minutes: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4659 (iii).

Treasury Board Minutes *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5136 (iii).

——— *See* 'Bank Curators,' &c.

Vancouver Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3066 (ii).

Financial Statement—The Budget, 6577: Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).

——— Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6441 (iv).

Fire Arms, Carrying of: *See* 'B. No. 86.'

Fire Bricks imported into N.S., Number of, Ports &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).

Fire Escapes for Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3160 (ii).

Fire Extinguishers for Passenger Cars, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii).

Fires in Forest Reserves: *See* 'B. No. 85.'

Fiscal Policy of Canada, P.M.G.'s Speech at Montreal Banquet: Remarks (Mr. Neely) 2079 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2266 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 58 & 185

FISHERIES—

Bait Freezer at Barrington Passage, Assistance *re* Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Jameson) 3947 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5039, 5293 (iii), 8791 (v).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) 8889 (v).

Bait Freezers, Construction in Louisburg, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 6505 (iv).

Bay of Fundy Fishing Service: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Bounty in Kings, P.E.I., Names of Persons Receiving Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7246 (iv).

Bounties, Payments *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 6670 (iv).

Canadian Fisheries Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).

Canadian Fisheries, Extent in Marine Miles, Amounts realized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1289 (i).

Dog Fish Industry: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 8044 (v).

Fish Ladders on Trent Canal: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 4824 (iii).

——— Preservation, Action of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 1503 (i).

Fish Landed by Canadian Atlantic Fisheries since 1870, Quantities, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1501 (i).

Fish Transportation: in Com. of Sup., 6092 (iv).

Fish Transportation, Expenditure annually, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6271 (iv).

——— Amounts paid out of Aiding Funds, Further Information: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6506, 7106 (iv).

——— Statement read (Mr. Brodeur) 7259 (iv).

Fisheries Appointments: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Porter) 5836 (iii).

Fisheries Commission *re* Saskatchewan and Alberta, Interim Rep., laid on Table (Mr Brodeur) 10590 (v).

Fisheries Arbitration at Washington, Sir John Thompson's Memorandum: M. for Copy* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2004 (ii).

Fisheries on the Great Lakes, Regulations *re* Commission: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) on M. for Sup., 5217 (iii).

Fisheries Inspectors, Dom. Appointments in Ontario: in Com. of Sup., 6613 (i).

Fisheries Regulations, Changes at Washington: on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8479 (v).

——— Further Information: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8479 (v).

——— Mess. from Wash.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6504 (iv).

——— 1908, Proclamation *re*: Remarks (Mr. . D. Taylor) 5035 (iii).

———1908, Non-fulfilment by U.S.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6528 (iv).

——— *See* 'Fisheries, International.'

Fisheries Regulations between Can. and U.S., Proclamation *re*, Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1725 (i).

Fisheries Regulations agreed to at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2088 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Fisheries Regulations at Washington Conference, Printing of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4207 (iii).

Fisheries Regulations at Washington, Trap Nets, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2070 (ii).

Fisheries Regulations agreed to at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2088 (ii).

Fishery Regulations, Complaint *re* C. K. Golden for Violation of: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2367 (ii).

——— Penalties *re* Violation of: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Rhodes) 1806 (i).

Fisheries Service of Can., Control by Federal Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 983 (i).

Fisheries Treaty of 1871 *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7022 (iv).

Fishing Vessels and Customs Regulations, Request to place on Govt. Orders (Mr. Jameson) 3373 (ii).

Fish Tariff Application *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2886 (ii).

Fish Wardens in Victoria, N.B.: Inquiry for Rets. (Mr. Maddin) 5629 (iii), 6672 (iv).

———Remarke (Mr. Brodeur) 5732 (iii).

Fishways and Clearing Streams: in Com. of Sup., 6659 (iv).

Fishways on Pembina River: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pembina.'

Glace Bait Association, Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 4044 (iii).

——— Payments to from 1906-10, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3670 (ii).

——— M. for Copy* (Mr. Maddin) 3948 (ii).

Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1976 (ii).

Grand Manan Fisheries, Prices charged per Hogshead, Weir Licenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2367 (ii).

——— Hatcheries under Dom. Control, Location, Applications for Fish Fry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1494 (i).

——— Hatcheries in East Elgin, Construction *re*: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) 5137 (iii).

Herring Traps, Close Season *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) 2086 (ii).

International Fisheries Commission Regulations, Modifications of: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1803 (i).

——— Date of Operation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3465 (ii).

——— *See* 'Fisheries Regulations.'

FISHERIES—*Con.*

International Fisherise Commission Regulations: Proclamation *re* Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1725 (i).

——— Ratification of: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 1654 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7259 (iv).

James Bay, Fishing Lease to Arch. McNee, Duration of, Rental &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thoburn) 4830 (iii).

Lake Winnipeg Fisheries Investigation Commission, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 796 (i).

Legal Expenses *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).

Lobster Fishery Regulations laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 529 (i).

Manitoba Fisheries Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Bradbury) 4207, 5035 (iii).

Manitou Lake, Fishing Privileges, Lease *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1348 (i).

Markey Fishing Rights on Nelson River, Extension of, Cancellation of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4664 (iii).

——— M. for Papers (Mr. Campbell) 4382 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5954 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 6119 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 4208 (iii), 6761 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6914 (iv).

Modus Vivendi Licenses: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).

Montreal Govt. Weir: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 2065 (ii).

Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmnt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1104 (i).

Newfoundland Fisheries, North Atlantic, &c.: *See* main heading 'Hague.'

Northwest Fishing Co.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5630 (iii).

Ontario Fisheries Service, Number of Officers, Services, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6157 (iv).

Otter, Beaver or Stream Trawling in Northumberland Strait: M. for Cor* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 980 (i).

Overseers: in Com. of Sup., 3809 (ii), 6159 (iv).

Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).

Oyster Industry, Memorials, Surveys, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Warburton) 714 (i).

Pelagic Sealing Conference: in Com. of Sup., 8678 (v).

——— Further Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 3670, 3769, 3839 (ii).

——— *See* 'Seal'.

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Pembina Fish Dam, Placing of Ladder, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1090 (i).

——— *See* 'Fishway'.

Poachers in Lake Superior, Par. in Otawa Free Press: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 1459 (i).

Poachers on Pacific Coast, Protective Service *re*: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 2080 (ii).

——— Par. in Victoria Daily Colonist: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 1458 (i)

P. E. I. Coast Fisheries, Fines, Penalties *re* Breach of Regulations: M. for Ret. (Mr. Fraser) 1501 (i).

Protection Service *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 3807 (ii).

——— Number of Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 805 (i).

——— Seizure by 'Rainbow' of Str. 'Edric': Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 4116, 4208 (iii).

Robichaud, Wm., Compensation *re* Fire: in Com. of Sup., 6105, 6159 (iv).

St. Andrew's Dam, Fishway, Correction in Stmnt. (Mr. Bradbury) 1650 (i).

St. Andrew's Rapids, Fish Ladders &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).

Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2853 (ii)

Seal Fisheries Treaty, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9594, 10196 (v).

——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10337 (v).

——— *See* 'Pelagic.'

Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3607 (ii)

Smelt Fishing in N.S., Pet. *re* Change for Open Season: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9984 (v).

Steam Trawlers, Application *re* Fishing Bounty: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4046 (iii).

——— 'Wren' and 'Croquette', Registration in Can.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4046 (iii).

Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3074 (ii).

Tetagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishing: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7806 (iv).

Whitemouth River Fishway: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).

Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery, Apptmt. of Keeper &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4041 (iii).

Fishing Vessels' Licenses: *See* 'B. No. 27'.

Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders from P. W. Dept. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 2648 (ii).

——— *See* 'St. George's'

Flags flying on Govt. Buildings on St. David's Day: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3671 (ii).

Flags Flying on Public Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4724 (iii).
Flags, Regulation by Govt. *re* Flying with Foreign Flags: Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4347; M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) to adjn. Debate, Agreed to (Y. 89; N. 49) 4380 (iii).
Flax Exports from Saskatchewan: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 10521 (v).
Fleming Grain Growers' Association, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5550 (iii).
Floods on the Assiniboine, Pets. to Govt., Political Interference *re*: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii), 6006 (iv).
Flour and Meal, Sale of in Bags: *See* 'B. No. 117'.
Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale: Prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 3226. (ii)
Foods; Adulteration of: *See* 'B. No. 35 & 112.
Foreign Consuls, Official Status: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 9511 (v).
Forest Fires caused by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 197'.
Forest Reserves and Parks: *See* B. No. 85'.
Forestry Convention at Quebec, in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).
Fort Churchill and Nelson River Survey: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5954 (iv).
Fort Frances Water Power: *See* 'B. No. 109'.
Fort Osborne Barracks, Purchase by Man. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Fort William Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).
'Fossy Jaw': *See* 'B. No. 10 & 96.'
Franking Privilege, Fraudulent Use of: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
Fraser River Mail Service, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).
Fraser Mills Postmaster, Defalcations, Bonds &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1566 (i).
Fredericton, Increased Accommodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii).
Fredericton Public Building, Pavement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1612, 1665 (i).
Freight Car Service, I.C.R., Complaints, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).
Freight Rates on Coal &c. in Mar. Provs., Classification, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6156 (iv).
——— *See* 'C.P.R.'
Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1285 (i).
Free Delivery of Mail: in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Freeman, Cecil Ernest, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Free Trade Offer by U.S., Pres'dt. Taft's Speech: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 5293 (iii).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
French, Gen. Report: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 76 (i).
——— Inquiry for Report (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9 (i).
French Imports, Quantity, Value, Rates of Duty, &c., Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8097 (v).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
French River Dam: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
French Translation of Inland Revenue Act: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
French Translation of Revised Statutes: *See* 'B. No. 136.'
Fruit Clause in Reciprocity Treaty, Par. in Ottawa Citizen: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 3283 (ii).
Fruit Duty, Res. from B. C. Inland Board of Trade: Read (Mr. Burrell) 3377 (ii).
Fruit Growers Association, B. C., Protest *re* Duty: Read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3373 (ii).
——— Burlington: Read (Mr. Henderson) 4122 (iii).
——— Tel. read from Fruit Dealers *re* Duty affecting B. C. (Mr. Burrell) 3770 (ii).
——— Tel. from Mission City Agricultural Ass'cn.: Read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3955 (iii).
Fruit Growers Delegation: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Burrell) 6120 (iv).
Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Delegates, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3529 (ii).
——— Report of Proceedings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Print, 3952 (iii).
——— French Editions: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9075 (v).
Fruit and Vegetables Amt. *re* Reciprocity: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sealey) 7666 (iv).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Apptmt., Qualifications &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 8701 (v).
Fruit Packing and Marking: *See* 'B. No. 154.'
Galleries of the House of Commons, Applause by Visitors: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4468 (iii).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
Galops Canal—Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).
Gananoque Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).
Garden Seeds, Purchase for Indians in N.W., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1717 (i).
Garnishment of Civil Servants' Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 12.'

Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i).
Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* Appropriatinfg Scrap Brass, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6664 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* Charges: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7601 (iv).
Gas Meters in Toronto, Complaints *re* Excessive Measurements: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3280 (ii).
Gaspe and Dalhousie SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8785 (v).
Gaspe Mail Service, Revenue *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3854 (ii).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging Contracts: Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10203, Neg. (Y. 59; N. 92) 10308 (v).
Geological Survey Explorations: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
Geological Survey Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 9690 (v).
Georgetown Public Building, Drainage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).
Georgian Bay Ship Canal, Estimates *re*: Remarks (Mr. G. White) 2004 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Globe' *re* Commencement of: Remarks (Mr. German) 2261 (ii).
——— Use by Americans: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7804 (iv).
——— *See* 'Transportation.'
Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Germany, Trade Relations with: *See* 'Trade Relations.'
Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt., Fined for Electoral Corruption: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2673 (ii).
Glace Bay Bait Association, Application re Subsidy for Building: M. for Copy* (Mr. Maddin) 3948 (ii).
——— Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c.: (Mr. Maddin) 4044 (iii).
——— Payments to from 1906-10, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3670 (ii).
Globe Printing Co.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Goderich Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).
Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U.S. and British, Authority *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9985 (v).
——— *See* 'Finance.'
Goldschmidt Thermit Co.: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Govt. Appointments from South Grey since 1904, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 1912 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 2555, 3059 (iii).
Govt. Bills, Withdrawal of: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2080 (ii).
Govt. Book-keeping, Names of Employees in Depts: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1718 (i).
——— *See* 'Falconer.'
Govt. Business, Morning Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10095 (v).
——— Precedence on Mondays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4114 (iii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).
See 'Business.'
Govt. Buildings, Draping for His Majesty's Death: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
Govt. Goods purchased in U.S., Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 817 (i).
Govt. Loans, Negotiations for 1909-10, Financial Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 797 (i).
Govt. Loans and Sinking Funds, ref. to by Mr. Guthrie for 1895-6: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3772 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 982 (i).
Govt. Loans, Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3281 (ii).
——— *See* 'Finance.'
Govt. Officials in Political Contests: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 1054 (i).
——— *See* 'Civil Servants.'
Govt. Printing, Amounts paid to Newspaper Offices: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Monk) 944 (i).
Govt. Railways constructed previous to Confederation, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 4829 (iii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Govt. Savings Banks, Number of Depositors, &.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 794 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com of Sup., 5811 (iii).
Govt. Steamers of Marine Dept., Winter Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Gov. General's Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6446 (iv).
Gov. General, Duke of Connaught, Rumours *re* Apptmt: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 1725 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec. Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
Graham, Mr. Duncan, Apptmt. as Indian Agent: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).
Grain Elevators: *See* 'Elevators.'
Grain Growers Grain Co. Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
Grain Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 209.'
Grain stored in Port Arthur and Ft. William Elevators, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3605 (ii).
Grand Bend, Ont., Right of Way, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1287 (i).

Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).
Grand Falls and St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Cor. re: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 9371 (v).
——— *See* 'St. John Valley.'
Grand Forks Public Building, in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).
Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1976 (ii).
Grand Manan Fisheries, Prices charged per Hogshead, Weir Licenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2367 (ii).
Grand Narrows, I.C.R. Construction at, O.C.s, &c., *re* Claims of Contracts: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5640 (iii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
G.T.R. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. Nos. 55 and 223.'
G.T.Ry. and I.C.R., Arbitration Commission, Points to be determined, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3665 (ii).
——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. Foster) 4205 (iii).
Grand Trunk Development Co., Govt. Reserve *re* Homestead Lands: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3466 (ii).
G.T.Ry., Pension Fund. Rules, Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2153 (ii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, and Action of Labour Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).
——— Agreement *re* Reinstatement: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 811 (i).
——— Arrangement *re* Reinstatement: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 654 (i).
——— Basis of Settlement by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 809 (i).
——— Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 3383 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Apptmt. of Judge Barron *re* Investigation: Ques. Mr. Macdonell) 2158 (ii).
——— Investigation by Judge Barron, Remuneration to: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 1805 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Northrup) 2376 (ii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, Minister's Efforts a Success: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 810 (i).
——— Reinstatement of Dismissed Officials: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1071 (i).
——— Reinstatement of Employees: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 1507 (i).
——— Res. from Order of Ry. Conductors: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).
——— Settlement of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Northrup) 786 (i).
——— Settlement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 9692 (v).
——— Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike: Status of Men Reinstated: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3375 (ii).
——— Tel. sent by Minister of Labour to Messrs. Berry and Murdock: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1105 (i).
G. T. P. Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY:

Classification, Arbitrators Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Sharpe) 696 (i).
Eastern Division Overbreak, Agreement *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1570 (i).
Government Director, Remuneration, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6448 (iv).
G. T. P. Developing Co., Number of Acres sold by Govt., Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 2366 (ii).
——— Land Purchased from: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 2666, 3466 (ii).
Labourers at Lafond in Alberta, Amounts owing for Wages: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3669 (ii).
Lake Superior Division, Construction Limit, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1492 (i).
Lumsden Investigation, Total Cost re: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1493 (i).
See 'Natl. Transcl.'
Grant, Gertrude Maud, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 200.''
Grazing Leases in the Foothills, Application *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1492 (i).
G. B. and Canada, State-owned Cable, Proposal *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1905 (i).
G. B. and U. S., Arbitration Treaty, Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowke) 5834 (iii).
——— *See* 'U. S.'
Great Northwestern Telegraph Co., Request for Board of Conciliation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5639 (iii).
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, Conditions *re* Public Health: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 5535 (iii).
——— Water Filters, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).
Guardian Accident and Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 115.'
Guelph and Goderich Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
Guysborough Customs Revenue, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2161 (ii).
Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7038 (iv).
Guysborough 'Times', Application *re* Postal Privileges: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6505 (iv).

Hague Arbitration (Bay of Fundy) North Atlantic Fisheries, Production of Papers: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) on M. for Sup., 4588 (iii).
——— Debate resmd.: (Mr. Brodeur) 4678 (iii).
Hague Arbitration Award, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8093 (v).
Hague Arbitration Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 6164 (iv), 9560 (v).
Hague Arbitration, Award *re* Fisheries: Remarks in Speech on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 24 (i).
——— Fisheries Negotiations with U. S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1725, 1804 (i).
——— Fisheries Regulations: Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 2365 (ii).
——— Stmnt. (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 1988 (ii).
Hague Arbitration: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 4337 (iii).
Hague Arbitration *re* Newfoundland Fisheries, Counsel, Expenditure &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 797 (i).
——— Statement on Address (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 664 (i).
Hague Tribunal, Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1913 (i).
——— *See* 'Fisheries'.
Haileybury Dock, Total Expenditure &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 7806 (iv).
Half-breed Scrip, Cor. with Rt. Rev. George Holmes: M. for Copy* (Mr. Ames) 1912 (i).
Half-breed Scrip issued to J. W. Malboeuf: M. for Cor* (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2161 (ii).
Halifax Citadel, New Quarters: on Com. of Sup,. 1581 (i).
Halifax Customs Officials, Complaint *re* Treatment *re* Salaries: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Bill, 8723 (v).
——— *See* 'Civil Service'.
Halifax Docks: in Com. of Sup., 9561 (v).
Halifax Dom. Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1592 (v).
Halifax Increased Accomodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
——— Pier at Cunard Wharf, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2150 (ii).
Halifax Post Office Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
——— Completion of Repairs &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 653 (i).
Halifax and St. John Wharfage &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7807 (iv).
Halifax Terminals, Accommodation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2647 (ii).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Hall's Prairie P. O., Pets *re* Location, Postmaster &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3468 (ii).
Hall's Prairie Timber Limits, Requests *re* Removal of Timber: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3282 (ii).
Hamilton Cotton Co., Stmnt. of Employees *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Goodeve) 5747 (iii).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 10101 (v).
Hamilton Provident and Loan Society: *See* 'B. No. 172'.
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 149'
Hampton Public Building: Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).
Haney, Quinlan & Robertson, Contract *re* Construction of Locomotive Shops east of Winnipeg: M. for Copy*(Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1339 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
——— N. S., Estimates to be Voted for Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9501 (v).
——— *See* 'Public Works'.
Harling, Mr. Thos., Compensation *re* Report: in Com. of Sup., 6092 (iv).
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).
Hartland Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1617 (i).
Haskett, Havelock and New Tusket Post Offices, Distance between &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8991 (v).
Hawke, Mr. John T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).
See 'I. C. R.'
Hawkesbury and Grenville Bridge, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 930 (i).
Hawkesbury Interprovincial Bridge: Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. Perley) 4224 (iii).
Hay Claims, Delay in Repayment to Canadian Exporters: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5403 (iii).
Hay and Grain Imports into Canada from U. S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8984 (v).
Hay transported free from Quebec Prov. to Mar. Provs: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5134 (iii).
Healy, Fanny Mary, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 199'.
Herring Traps, Close Season *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) 2086 (ii).
Hickman, W. A., Immigration Agent to G. B.: Payments to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).
High Commissioner's Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup. 1486 (i).

High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 202.
Highways on I. C. Rys., Protection: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii), 9560 (v).
Hillsborough Brirge, P. E. I., Material purchased, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i).
Hochelaga Census Enumerators, Name, &c: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9432 (v).
Holland Peat Bog, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4303 iii).
Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).
Homage: *See* 'Eucharistic.'
Homestead Applications, Cancellations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5553 (iii).
—— Infractions of Regulations, Punishment, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5561-2 (iii).
Homestead Applicants in New Westminster District, Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).
Homestead Entry of Mr. John Bradley, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 5584 (iii).
Homestead Inspectors at Medicine Hat, Number, Salaries, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1722 (i).
Homestead Lands thrown open since 1908, Total Amount in Townships 21 to 33, Ranges 18 to 23: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4112 (iii).
Homestead Regulations in B.C., Application *re* Ry. Belt: M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Ret., 2855 (ii).
Homesteading by Women, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1284 (i).
Homesteading in Western Ters., Acreage available: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1907 (i).
—— *See* 'Interior.'
Homicide while Hunting: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Hope Suburban Townsite, Date of Payment by Mr. Wardle, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3068 (ii).
—— Payments by T. D. Shorts, Approval by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3846 (ii).
Hornell, Ethel May, Relief: *See* 'B. No 144.'
Horses admitted into Canada from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).
Horses Diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 7427 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Govt. Works: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Hours of Labour on Public Works, Printing of Proceedings *re* Com.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3280 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, Representation *re* I.C.R. Workingmen: Correction of Stmnt. (Mr. King) 4116 (iii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4825 (iii).
Charwomen: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1453 (i).
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Committees: in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).
Coronation of King George V., Invitation to Members of Parlt: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1580 (i).
See main heading.
Divorce Bills: Ques. of Privilege *re* Remarks made by Senator Kirchhoffer (Mr. Ethier) 4201 (iii).
Drummond and Arthabaska, Electoral District: Certificate *re* (Mr. Speaker) 259 (i).
Elections Deferred in B.C. and Generally: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 10376 (v).
Electric Light Attendant: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Fraudulent Use of: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
Galleries of the House of Commons, Applause by Visitors: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4468 (iii).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 10101 (v).
House of Commons' Appointments: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 5288, 5400 (iii).
—— Number of people residing in: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3847 (ii).
See 'Restaurant.'
—— Sessional Employees since 1896: M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3471 (ii).
House of Commons and Senate: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2556 (ii).
Library Improvements *re*, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2590 (ii).
Messengers, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6172 (iv).
Minority Representation, Redistribution Bill, Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9988 (v).
Pages: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).
Parliament, Opening and Closing Date of from 1896 to 1910: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 786 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Quebec Members, Revolt against Extra Session, Newspaper Articles: Denial of (Mr. Talbot) 10096 (v).

Questions and Answers, Orally and Written: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 989 (i).

——— Copies given to Press (Mr. Hughes) 900 (i).

——— Procedure *re* Answering orally or written: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 700 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1080 (i).

——— Incomplete Answers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1013 (i).

Restaurant, Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 469 (i).

Restaurant and Speaker Rooms, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1085 (i).

Richelieu Electoral District, Charges against Mr. Lanctot *re* Painting Private Dwelling: Notice of Motion (Mr. Nantel) 4566 (iii).

Rules of House, Amendment *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 10470 (v).

Servants: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).

Sessional Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).

——— Application *re* Increase of Salary: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5404 (iii).

Sessional Employees of H. of C., Names, Ages, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 980 (i).

Speakers' Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 926 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* Pianos: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).

——— Purchase of Birds: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).

——— Purchase of Glassware: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).

——— Purchasing Gramaphone Records: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).

Speaker's Gallery, Discourtesy to Clergymen: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 269 (i).

Speaker of House of Commons, Wearing of Official Robes on State Occasions, Procedure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 705 (i).

Speech from Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

Stationery: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).

Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 6171, 6337 (iv).

Translators for H. of C., Apptmt. of: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7015 (iv).

——— Translation Staff, Promotions: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 527 (i).

Vacancy, Arthabaska and Drummond Electoral District: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Ventilation of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Black) on M. for Sup., 4473 (iii).

——— *See* 'Ottawa Buildings.'

——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4209 (iii).

Victoria Electoral Div., Convictions, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 7602 (iv).

Voter's Lists, Preparation of: Inquiry for Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10096 (v).

——— On Stmnt. of Sec. of State: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10455 (v).

Voter's Lists in Unorgnized Territories, Proclamation *re* Earlier Date: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 9900, 10142 (v).

Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 56.'

Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'

Hudson Bay, Position *re* Hague Award: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 673 (i).

Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, Policy of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 660 (i).

——— Lands, Number of Acres sold *re* Construction Fund: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 796 (i).

Humber River Bridge, G.T.Ry. Plans *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2885 (ii).

——— Obstruction to Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5403 (iii).

Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).

Hungry Bay Dyke Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).

Hunting Accidents: *See* 'B. No. 40.'

Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 101.'

Hydro-Electric Commission Toronto, Mr. McGann's Application *re*: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 1574 (i).

——— Decision of Minister: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1598 (i).

Hydro-Electric Commission, Water Power Lease on Ottawa River: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9430 (v).

———Tenders called for: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9352 (v).

Iberville Bridge Construction: in Com of Sup., 6356 (iv).

Ice Contracts, I.C.R., at Rivière du Loup, Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2437, 3853 (ii).

Immigration Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 47, 146.

IMMIGRATION:

Agencies, Can. and G.B.: in Com of Sup., 6047 (iv).

Agents in G. B. and Europe, List, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 981 (i).

———Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 5165; Reply (Mr. U. Wilson) 5177 (iii).

Agents: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 4729 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Aliens Outside of Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 7554 (iv).

Amount expended in Belgium and France: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9990 (v).

Amount expended in U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9991 (v).

Bonuses paid *re* Three Swiss Girls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2436 (ii).

Cameron, Miss, Emplymt. by Govt. as Immigration Agent: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 5191 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Act, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv).

Chinese Immigration, Total Number, Capita Tax, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 788 (i).

Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1103 (i).

Chinese Immigration, Investigation Commission, Rep. of Mr. Justice Murphy: Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9594 (v).

——— Censure of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10383, Neg. (Y. 54; N. 90) 10454 (v).

——— Discussion *re* Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9926 (v).

——— Evidence read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9786 (v).

——— Rep. of Judge Murphy: Laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9897 (v).

——— Stmnt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion with Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Ralph Smith) 2738 (ii).

Civil Service, Apptmt. of Coloured Persons: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4930, 5038 (iii).

Coeli, Mr. Treau de, Payments to *re* Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8308 (v).

Coloured Aliens as Immigrants from U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4470 (iii).

Commission to Agents in Western Canada: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9991 (v).

Commission to Immigration Agents, Total Amount paid: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2436 (ii).

Creighton, Mr. W. O., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4828 (iii).

——— Payments to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).

Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8111 (v).

Ennis, D. N., Claims *re* Immigration Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 3847 (ii).

Expenditure in U.S. and G.B. for 1910: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 4300 (iii).

Farmers sent to G. B. from Man.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1489 (i).

——— as Immigration Agents: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 799, 1284 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Farm Labourers, O. C. *re* Immigration Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 10099 (v).

Hickman, W. A., Immigration Agent to G. B.: Payments to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).

Immigration Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

Immigrants entering Canada, Cognizance of Destination: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 814 (i).

Immigrants, Money Qualifications *re* Operation of Act: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 150 (i).

Immigrants, Number received from Europe, Amount expended &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 809 (i).

——— Number from G. B., U. S. &c., Amount expended, Names of Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 807 (i).

Immigration into Eastern Canada: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).

Immigration, Number since 31st March last to present, &c.: M. (Mr. U. Wilson) for Ret., 1498 (i).

Immigration Organizations, Cor. with Miss Wileman: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 9376 (v).

Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions in Canada: M. (Mr. Lake) to adjn., 1551 (i).

——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Lake) 1503 (i).

——— Ruling *re* Discussion (Mr. Speaker) 1551 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Number landed, Special Applications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 790 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1339 (i).

Lake St. John Repatriation Society, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Girard) 9994 (v).

Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Doherty) 9375 (v).

Medical Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1716 (i).

Negro Immigrants, Prohibition into N. W.: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 5911 (iii).

——— Restrictions re: Remarks (Mr. Thorburn) 6523 (iv).

——— Treatment of, Prohibition into Canada &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 5941 (iv).

See 'Civil Service', 'Coloured' &c.

Premiums by Canadian Govt. for 1910-11: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9991 (v).

Seed Grain for Immigrants: in Com. of Sup., 3836 (ii).

Statistics, Publication of: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 2366, 2556 (ii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Statistics, Publication of: Statement (Mr. (Mr. Oliver) 2557 (ii).

Swertlove, Berel, Deportation by Immigration Dept., Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1723 (i).

U. S. Immigration Agents and Canadian Travellers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6119 (iv).

U. S. Immigration Officers residing in Can. Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1723 (i).

Imperial Conference, Attendance of Prime Minister, Opposition Compromise: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8033 (v).

Imperial Defence Conference, Additional Copies: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 2215 (ii).

—— M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 944 (i). 3073 (ii).

—— Navy Defence Papers: Laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10467 (v).

Imperial Conference Proceedings, Cor. with Mr. Harcourt: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10338; M. to print, 10340 (v).

Imperial Conference, Minister's Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 8679 (v).

Imperial Conference, Precis *re* Conference: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9693 (v).

—— Information *re* Precis Rep. and Further Reps.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 9690, 9783 (v).

Imperial Conference, Report *re*, Complete Rep. presented to Parlt.: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10103 (v).

Imperial Conference, Questions to be submitted by Canada: Par. from 'Morning Post' quoted (Mr. Lennox) 4298 (iii).

—— Secretariat Formation: on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Foster) 7352 (iv).

Imperial Steamship Co.: *See* 'B. No. 105.'

Imperial Traction Co.: *See* 'B. No. 102.'

Implements, Agricultural, Imports into Can. since 1908, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1350 (i).

—— Manipulation re Duties: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1358 (i).

—— *See* 'Agriculture.'

Imports by Provinces into U. S., Total Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 5634 (iii).

Indian Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 95 & 117.'

Indian River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'

INDIANS—

Annuities for Indians, Man. Sask., &c.: in Com. of Sup. 8884 (v).

Bear Indian Reserves, Medical Officer, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3223 (ii).

Beausoleil Indian Agent at Christian Island, Place of Residence: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5288 (iii).

INDIANS—*Con.*

Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits *re* cutting Timber, Agent's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4304-5 (iii).

—— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4567 (iii).

Chacastapasin Indian Reserve, Owner, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 4301 (iii).

Garden Seeds, Purchase for Indians in N. W., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1717 (i).

Graham, Mr. Duncan, Apptmt. as Indian Agent: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).

—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4725 (iii).

—— Medical Attendance, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 6035 (iv).

James Smith Indian Reserve, Burning of two Indians, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1082 (i).

Lafferty, Dr. J. D., Payments to *re* Indians N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6046 (iv).

Obabikong Bay and Sabiskong Indian Land, Tenders *re* Burnt Timber: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1344 (i).

Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages re Fires: Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 8586 (v).

——Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1082 (i).

Reserves in Ont., Fences, Settlement of Disputes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1910 (i).

Reserve Lands Outside of Ry. Belt, B.C., Jurisdiction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2678 (ii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instructions to Rev. J. McDougall, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Bradbury) 1292 (i).

—— Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 5837 (iii).

—— Amounts received from Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).

—— Chief Justice Howell's Commission: M. for Copy of Evidence* (Mr. Bradbury) 7039 (iv).

—— Investigation by Rev. Dr. McDougall: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).

—— Moneys paid by Govt., Complaints, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1974 (ii).

—— Original Document, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Bradbury) 8109, 8192 (v).

—— Original Documents before Royal Commission: Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 8477 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 8356 (v).

—— Rep. in 'Winnipeg Telegram' *re* Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Oliver) 3840; Explanation (Mr. Bradbury) 3841 (ii).

INDIANS—*Con.*

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Request by Commission for Official Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 9899 (v).

Semmens, Rev. John, Payments to *re* Indians, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6036 (iv).

Sinclair, Mr. John, Indian Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6272 (iv).

Six Nation Indians Reserve, Grant to Merrill to bore for Natural Gas, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Amts. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii).

—— Act, Demand for Repeal: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) 6929 (iv).

—— *See* 'Conciliation.'

Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 2927 (ii).

Industrial Training Royal Commission, Incompetent Reporting: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 3463 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act, French Translation: *See* 'B. No. 132.'

Inspection and Sale Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 9, 35, 117, 153, 154, 157.'

I.C.Ry., Equipment Renewal: *See* 'B. No. 156.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:

Accidents, Causes of, Pars. from N. S. Newspapers: Read (Mr. Rhodes) 6676 (iv).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Stanfield) 1571 (i).

Advertising Time Tables in Conservative Papers, N.B.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6388 (iv).

——*See* 'Printing.'

Air Brake, Triple Valve: in Com of Sup., 5913 (iii)

Air Brakes for Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii)

Bell, G. W., Pass Investigation *re* I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

Branch Lines, Acquisition of: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6768 (iv).

Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 5913 (iii).

Builders Woodworking Co., Expropriation of Land for Moncton Extension: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Crocket) 6158 (iv).

—— *See* 'Moncton.'

Campbellton, Increased Ry. Accommodation in Com. of Sup., 5914, 5983 (iv).

Chatham, Diversion of Line: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Construction, Letter of Gloucester Farmers Union: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 5985 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5832 (iii).

Dismissals from Nov. 1908, Number reinstated &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3666 (ii).

Drawbars for Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Eastern Extension: Prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1106 (i).

Excursion Rates *re* Monument National Demonstration in Montreal: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1347 (i).

Excursion Trains *re* Political Meetings: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).
See 'Special Trains,' 'Truro' &c.

Fire Extinguishers for Passenger Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii).

Fredericton Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii).

Freight Car Service, Complaints, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

Freight Rates on Coal &c. in Mar. Provs., Classification, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6156 (iv).

Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* Appropriating Scrap Brass, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6664, 7601 (iv).

General Operations: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

Grand Narrows Contract: *See* 'Macdonald' &c.

Gross Earnings, Cost per Ton Mile, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5129 (iii).

Halifax, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).

Halifax Terminals, Accommodation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).

—— Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2647 (ii).

Halifax Docks: in Com. of Sup., 9561 (v).

Hawke, Mr. John T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

—— *See* 'Moncton.'

Hay Transported free from Quebec Prov. to Mar. Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5134 (iii).

Highways Protection: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii); 9560 (v).

Ice Contracts at Riviere du Loup, Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2437, 3853 (ii).

I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8513 (v).

I.C.R. and G.T.Ry. Arbitration, Commission, Points to be determined, Cost, &c.: (Mr. Foster) 3665 (ii).

—— Disputed Questions: Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. Foster) 4205 (iii).

Locomotives purchased since 1896, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7033 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Macdonald and McLellan, Construction at Grand Narrows, O. Cs., &c. *re* Claims of Contracts, M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5640 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10470 (v).

Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

Mail Clerks, allowing Friends to travel in Mail Cars: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

Moncton Extension, Acquisition of Land from Builders Woodworking Co., Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6157 (iv).

——— Site purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1291 (i).

——— *See* 'Builders.'

Moncton Freight Transfer, Letter to Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 653 (i).

——— *See* 'Hawke.'

Moncton, Locomotive and Car Shops: in Com. of Sup., 5926 (iii).

Payments to Dr. C. A. Murray *re* Tickets: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7031 (iv).

Pension Fund, Delegation *re* Amendments: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2159 (ii).

Petit Rocher, Spur, Cost, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6156 (iv).

Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2152 (ii).

Porters: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 6339 (iv).

Printing, Amounts paid to 'Globe': Corrected Statement (Mr. Graham) 2886 (ii).

——— See 'Advertising.'

Pullman Berths: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5990 (iv).

Renewal Equipment, Cor. &c., with Aud. Gen., Stmnts. &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 784 (i).

Rolling Stock,: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii), 8513 (v).

Rolling Stock, &c., Mileage, Value of: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3668 (ii).

Ste. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 2436 (ii).

Special Trains *re* Monument National Demonstration: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2996 (ii).

——— *See* 'Excursion.'

Steamer 'Scotia,' New Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).

Sydney Mines Diversion; in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Telegraphers Board of Conciliation, Statute re Grant: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2853 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Traffic Westbound and Eastbound for five Years, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2162 (ii)

Truro, Freight Shed Fire: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

——— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Truro Political Meeting, Excursion Train over I.C.R., Instruction to Agents, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).

——— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 3343 (ii).

———*See* 'Excursion.'

Windsor Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).

Working Expenses: in Com of Sup., 6338 (iv).

Interest Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 6, 146.'

INTERIOR.

Algoma Timber Permits, Amounts paid *re* Dues: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4673 (iii).

Aylwin Irrigation Grant, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Campbell) 6158 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 6445 (iv), 8192, 9076 (v).

Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).

Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application *re* Homestead, Date of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3221 (ii).

Bidwell Bay, B.C., Govt. Land Reserves, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1284 (i).

Coal Mining Rights in School Lands, Leases issued: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).

Dominion Lands, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 5553, 5581 (iii).

———Patents for S. E. ¼ of Section 6, Twp. 7, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Stables) 5834 (iii).

——— Sections 11, 12, 14, 22 in Twp. 10, Range 22, Applications *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wallace) 980 (i).

———S. W. ¼ Section 10, Twp. 38, Range 15, 2nd Meridian, Applications *re* Entry, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lake) 1501 (i).

——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).

Dom. Lands, Timber, Natural Resources &c. of Alberta, Provl. Control of: M. for Cor. (Mr. Herron) 1500 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 2271 (ii).

Dom. Lands in Saskatchewan, Gross Receipts &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3221 (ii).

Dom. Lands, Timber and Mineral Rights: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3955 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of: M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2188 (ii)..

——— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 2263 (ii).

Grand Trunk Development Co., Govt. Reserve *re* Homestead Lands: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3416 (ii).

Grazing Leases in Foothills, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1492 (i).

Half-Breed Scrip, Cor. with Rt. Rev. George Holmes: M. for Copy* (Mr. Ames) 1912 (i).

Half-Breed Scrip issued to J. W. Malbœuf: M. for Cor.* (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2161 (ii).

Hall's Prairie Timber Limits, Requests *re* Removal of Timber: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3282 (ii).

Homesteads, Applications, Cancellations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5553 (iii).

——— Infractions of Regulations, Punishment &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5561-2 (iii).

Homestead Applicants in New Westminster District, Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).

Homestead Entry of Mr. John Bradley, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 5584 (iii).

Homestead Inspectors at Medicine Hat, Number, Salaries, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1722 (i).

Homestead Lands thrown open since 1908, Total Amount in Townships 21 to 33, Ranges 18 to 23: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4112 (iii).

Homestead Regulations in B. C., Application *re* Ry. Belt: M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Ret., 2855 (ii).

Homesteading in Western Ters., Acreage available: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1907 (i).

Homesteading by Women, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1284 (i).

Hope Town Lots, Payments by T. D. Shorts, Approval by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3846 (ii).

——— Date of Payment by Mr. Wardle, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3068 (ii).

Interior, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4726 (iii).

Krenzer, Mr. J., Dispute with Mr. Greenway *re* Purchase of Land: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 3225 (ii).

Leech, R. E. A., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iii).

Manitoba Swamp Lands, Concession to Province: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6759 (iv).

New Westminster District, Govt. Lands, grants issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Tayloy) 1291 (i).

———*See* 'Timber.'

INTERIOR—*Con.*

Pre-emptions and Purchased Homesteads, Total Acreage, Amounts received, Annual Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 812 (i).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Pet. *re* Withdrawal of Lands &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8636 (v).

Ruddock, Mr. R. F., Application *re* Homestead in B. C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3279 (ii).

School Lands in Alberta, Revenues from, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1488 (i).

School Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Procedure *re* Disposal: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 800, 1345 (i).

——— Total Acreage, Revenue from Sales: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 1911 (i).

School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3462 (ii).

Total Acreage, Amounts realized &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1908 (i).

Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10121 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1293 (i).

Seed Grain, Advances to Settlers: in Com. of Sup., 6047 (iv), 9551 (v).

——— Indebtedness, Amount *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3225 (ii).

——— Quality and Price: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 8041 (v).

Talbot, Hon. Senator, Applications for Irrigated Lands Reserve: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 803 (i).

Timber Licenses in New Westminster, B.C., Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3222 (ii).

——— *See* 'New Westminster.'

Internal Economy Commission: Mess. from His Ex., 377 (i).

International Naval Conference, Final Protocol: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 3073 (ii).

——— *See* 'Imperial.'

International Fisheries Regulations, Mess. from Wash.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6504 (iv).

——— Modifications of: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1803 (i).

——— Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7259 (iv).

——— Ratification of: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 1654 (i).

——— *See* 'Hague.'

International Prison Congress, Canadian Representative, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5405 (iii).

International Ry. Co. and International Traction Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 74.'

International Ry. Traffic, Points of Crossing Boundary &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 4466 (iii).

International Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Sir George Gibbons: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4741 (iii).

——— Names of Members, Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3861 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Macdonell) 4569 (iii).

International Waterways Commission (Lake Erie) Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 924 (i).

International Waterways Commission: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 6158 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3470 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Renewal of: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3274 (ii).

——— Total Amounts paid since 1896: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3607 (ii).

'Iroquois', Str. Report *re* Wreck: Remarks (Mr. Ralph Smith) 7104 (iv).

Irrigation Rights in Boundary Rivers: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Jackson Postmaster, Name and Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).

Jacques Cartier Census Enumerators, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9431 (v).

James Bay Fishing Lease to Arch. McNee, Duration of, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thoburn) 4830 (iii).

James Smith Indian Reserve, Burning of two Indians &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1082 (i).

——— *See* 'Indians.'

Japan, Customs Arrangements: *See* 'B. No. 224.'

Japanese Immigration, Application *re* Special Purposes: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1339 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Number landed, Special Applications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 790 (i).

Japanese Treaty, Action *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9076 (v).

Jardine, John, Par. in 'Daily Times' *re* Claims on Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3847 (ii).

——— Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 4670 (iii).

——— Payment to by Govt. in excess of Work performed: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 5405 (iii).

Jesus River Improvements, Completion, Suspension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 804 (i).

'John B. Young' Str., Stranding of, Govt. Assistance *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2368 (ii).

Johnston, Mary Hamilton, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 140.'

Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 186.'

Judges appointed since 1896, Names, Residence &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8095 (v).

Judicial Vacancy in P.E.I., Delay in Apptmt.: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 7553 (iv).

——— *See* 'P. E. I.'

Justice, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 469 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i), 6160 (iv).

——— Deputy Minister acting as Counsel for outside Cases: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i).

——— *See* 'Bank of Montreal.'

Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 39 & 189.

Juvenile Delinquents Act, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) 4383 (iii).

Kelly, Robt., Emplymt. by Govt. at Vancouver, B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 2665 (ii).

Kentville Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Crosby) 5548 (iii).

——— Read (Mr. Rhodes) 5749 (iii).

Kerr, Mrs. Elizabeth, Compassionate Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).

Kettle Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'

King, Dr., Residence at Experimental Farm, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 804, 1349 (i).

Kingston Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2886 (ii).

Kingston R. M. College Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

——— Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

Kingston Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

Kirkland, Walter Harvey, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 164.'

Knight's Point Breakwater, P.E.I., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7805 (iv).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'

Krenzer, Mr. J., Dispute with Mr. Greenway *re* Purchase of Land: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 3225 (ii).

La Banque International du Canada: *See* 'B. No. 123.'

Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 3801 (ii).

——— Conciliation Board: in Com. of Sup., 3378, 3399 (ii).

——— *See* 'G.T. Trainmen.'

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. King) 7 (i).

Labour Dept., Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1484 (i).
'Labour Gazette:' in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii), 6057 (iv).
——— Name on Mailing List: M. for Copy* (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1727 (i).
Labour, Hours of on Govt. Works: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Labour Strikes, Letter from Mr. Geo. Taylor, M.P., *re* Militia: Read (Mr. King) 10344 (v).
——— 'Point of Bayonet': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9784 (v).
——— Militia Interference: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 10345 (v).
——— *See* 'Coal Strikes.'
Lachine Canal, Concrete Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6358, 6410 (iv).
——— Tugs: in Com. of Sup., 6359, 6388 (iv).
Lachine, Jacques-Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Lachine Wharfs and Basins: in Com. of Sup., 6359 (iv).
Lafleur, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt., Interference in Elections: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1907 (i).
Lafferty, Dr. J. D., Payments to, *re* Indians N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6046 (iv).
Lajord Post Office, Change to Accounting Office: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iv).
Lake St. Francis Protection Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iv).
Lake St. John Repatriation Society, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Girard) 9994 (v).
Lake Winnipeg Fisheries Investigation Commission, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 796 (i).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Lake Winnipeg Navigation: Ice-breaker, *re* Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4217 (iii).
Lanctot, Mr. A.: *See* 'Privileges and Elections,' 'Richelieu.'
Land Patents for S.E. ¼ of Section 6, Twp. 7, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5834 (iii).
——— *See* 'Southwest.'
Lands, Timber and Mineral Rights: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3955 (iii).
Land, Timber, Natural Resources, &c. of Alberta, Provl. Control of: M. for Cor. (Mr. Herron) 1500 (i).
——— *See* 'Interior.'
Langdon Subdivision of C. P. Ry., Mail Service in Northwest: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1346 (i).
L'Ardoise Beach Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
La Sauvegard Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, Prime Minister's Birthday, Congratulations (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8 (i).
——— Reception at Montreal, Montreal Harbour Commission's Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 9982 (v).
——— See 'Post Office, Ministers' Speeches.' 'Premier', &c.
Leach, R. E. A., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iii).
Leamington Postoffice, Cost in Detail, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 9782 (v).
"Le Devoir": *See* 'Drummond', &c.
Legal Agents, appointed by Govt. Precautions *re* acting for Private Parties: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 813 (i).
——— *See* 'Justice'.
Legal Expensese re Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).
Lethbridge Postoffice, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).
Lethbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).
Lethbridge, Speech of Member for Pictou: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).
Letter Carrier's Boots: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).
Letter Carriers, Free Transportation *re* Tramway System: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1104 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2194 (ii).
Letter Carriers Superannuation, Amt. to the Act: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1488 (i).
Levis Armoury and Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (i).
Levis Dry Dock, Plans filed by Sir Robt. Perks, Subsidy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 712 (i).
Library of Parlt., Apptmt. of Mr. O. Souliere: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8789 (v).
——— Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 309 (i).
Lt. Governor, N.S., Apptmt. of, Cor. *re* Director of N. S. Steel & Coal Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2670 (ii).
Life Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5822 (iii).
——— Names of Recipients: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3849 (ii).
Life Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6090 (iv).

Lighthouse Agencies, Rents: in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091, 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse, Construction and Purchase of Supplies: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Dates of Apptmts., Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 771 (i).
Lime Kiln Crossing Boat: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2141 (ii).
Live Stock Industry and Cold Storage Systems: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1184; Neg. (Y. 66; N. 111) 1275 (i).
Lloydminster Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).
Load Lines on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
Lobster Fishery Regulations laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 529 (i).
Lockmen Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
——— *See* 'Canals.'
Logan, Robert William, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
London and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Long Sault Dam, Cor. between Govt. and British Ambassador: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3530 (ii).
Long Sault Dam, on St. Lawrence River: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3228 (ii).
——— on M. for Sup., 2887 (ii).
——— Rep. of American Commissioners, Canada's action, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1651 (i).
——— *See* 'St. Lawrence.'
Long Sault Water Power: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Lorneville Wharf, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (iii):
Loughrin, Police Commissioner at Cochrane, Number of Convictions before: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1568 (i).
Lumber Cargoes Regulations: *See* 'B. Nos. 210 and 212.'
Lunenburg, N.S., Dredging, Plans *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2157 (ii).
Lunenburg Postoffice, Clock Tower: in Com. of Sup., 1592, 1625 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2359, 2578 (ii).
Lunenburg Post Office Clock, Statement of Chief Architect: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 2360 (ii).
Lymburner Contracts with Govt.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3205 (ii).
Macdonald & McLellan, Construction Contract, I.C.R.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10470 (v).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Macleod Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3003 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9588 (v).
McClary Manufacturing Co.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
McGillivray, Judge *re* Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
McGill University, Grant *re* Applied Science: in Com. of Sup., 6445 (iv).
Magazines sent through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv,.
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).
Magnetic Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).
Mahone Bay Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4383 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4301 (iii).
Mail Clerks, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (iii).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Mails delayed and mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii) 4667 (iii).
Mail Delivery Free in Towns &c., Conditions: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4925 (iii).
Mails, Illegal Use of for fraudulent Schemes: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 802 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1356; ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1364; Statement (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).
Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mildlebro) 9538 (v).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Mail Service with Allan SS Co.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4428 (iii).
Mail Service to Mar. Provs., Delivery of English Mails: Remarks on M. for Sup (Mr. Emmerson) 9541 (v).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv), 8752 (v).
Maisonneuve Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1685 (i).
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals *re*: Remarks (Mr. Staples) on M. of Sup., 6201 (iv).
——— Negotiations with Dom. Govt.: M. for Cor *(Mr. Staples) 980 (i).
——— Speech of Prime Min. at Winnipeg re, Cor. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 709 (i).

Manitoba Fisheries Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Bradbury) 4207, 5035 (iii).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Man. Grain Act, Inspection &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Man. Legislative Building, Purchase of Fort Osborne Barracks, Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii), 6054 (iv).
Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* B. No. 19.'
Man. Radial Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Manitoba and Southeastern Ry. Co.'s Charter, Transfer, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCarthy) 6505 (iv).
——— Inquiry for O. C. (Mr. Foster) 6915 (iv).
Manitoba Swamp Lands, Concession to Province: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6759 (iv).
Manitou Lake Fishing Privileges, Lease *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1348 (i).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
Maple Sugar, Adulteration, Pet. *re* Amt. to Foods Act: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5131 (iii).
Margaree Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
Marieville Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4666 (iii).
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1697 (i).

MARINE:

Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 6455 (iv).
Aids to Navigation on St. Lawrence, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 799 (i).
'Alva' Str., Purchase of, Dimensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1909 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* to Philip & Son: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2438 (ii).
'Arctic' Str., Provisions: in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).
——— Rep. of Capt. Bernier: Inquiry for (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Bay of Fundy Buoy Lights: in Com. of Sup., 6458 (iv).
Beddington, Mr., Pension *re* Pilotage: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Brier Island Light, Application *re* new House: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).
——— Lightkeeper's Salary: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3859 (ii).
Callender Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 6497 (iv).
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid *re*, Complaints of Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 661 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

Clayoquot Life Saving Station, Investigation *re* Irregularities: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Barnard) 785 (i).
'Crissie Toomey' Schooner, Purchase of, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re*: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 9247 (v).
——— Ans. (Mr. Brodeur) 9374 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9374 (v).
Declaration of London, Consideration by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5935 (iv).
——— Adoption of: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Monk) 3530 (ii).
'Earl Grey' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1972 (ii).
——— Construction: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).
'Eureka' Pilotage Boat, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6502-3 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iii).
——— Winter Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Lake Winnipeg Navigation, Icebreaker *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4217 (iii).
Life Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5822 (iii).
——— Names of Recipients: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3849 (ii).
Life Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6090 (iv).
Lighthouse, Agencies, Rents: in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091, 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse Construction, Salaries &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
——— Purchase of Supplies: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Dates of Apptmts., Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 771 (i).
Lime Kiln Crossing Boat: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Magnetic Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Committee, Meetings, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 4048 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 7 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1463 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchase of Ships: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).

Marine Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 6567 (iv).

Masters and Mates Examiners Certificates, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5821 (iii).

Masters Certificates for Inland Lakes, Dates, Examiners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).

Menzies, Wm., Payments to *re* Magnetic Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).

Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Midland and Tiffin Lighthouse: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).

'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1724 (i).

Morrison, N. L., Pocock, H. A., and Stevens, Captains, Dates of Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).

Navigation Licenses on Great Lakes, Regulations from Washington: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2375 (ii).

Obstructions in Navigable Waters, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).

Owl's Head Lighthouse, N.S., Construction, Apptmt. of Lighthousekeeper, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3465 (ii), 5832 (iii).

Patrol Boats in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).

Pensions for Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).

'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3605 (ii).

Pilotage Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 6533 (iv).

Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9782 (v).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (iv).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Buoys at Sorel Shipyards, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).

——— *See* 'Sorel'

Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iii).

Shipbuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6484 (iv).

Shipping from Guysborough County, Number of Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4467 (iii).

Shipping Registration: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*

Shipping List: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 9690 (v).

Shipwrecks on B.C. Coast, Inspection *re* Loading Vessels, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 7257 (iv).

Shipwrecked Seamen, Care of: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).

Sick Mariners Dues, Amount of Money in Trust, Investment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9993 (v).

——— Law *re* Payment of Dues: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1904 (i).

Sick Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 6567 (iv).

Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).

Sorel Shipyards, Investigation into Irregularities: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6758 (iv).

——— Buoys stolen, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7216 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7026 (iv).

——— Complaints *re* Thefts: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1088 (i).

——— Dismissal of Mr. A. Senecal: Remarks (Mr. Blondin) 5732 (iii).

——— Instructions to Commissioners: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7039 (iv).

——— Rep. of Commissioner *re* Investigation Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9994, 10203, 10096 (v).

Sorel Shipyards: Painting Member's House

——— *See* 'Priv. and Elections.'

'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1910 (i).

Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).

Telephone for Life Stations on St. Lawrence Route: in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).

Thunder Bay Ice Breaker: in Com. of Sup., 6500 (iv).

Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2367 (ii).

U.S. Tax on Canadian Shipping, Legislation at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 9247 (v).

Vessels Transferred between Can. and Newfoundland, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3464 (ii).

Westport Signal Stations, when erected, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1091 (i).

Wharfs for Lighthouse and Coast Service Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6538 (i).

Wireless Telegraph Stations owned by Govt., Locations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Armstrong) 1340 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6457 (iv).

MARINE—*Con.*

Wood Island Life Boat, Dimensions, Accommodation, &c., :Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3224 (ii).

Wrecking Plant Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).

Maritime Mail, Delays *re*, Representations by Board of Trade at Halifax: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).

——— *See* 'Postoffice.'

Maritime Road, Gaspé Shore: in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

Markey Fishing Leases, Cancellation of, Delays, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 4208 (iii), 6761 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6914 (iv).

——— M. for Papers (Mr. Campbell) 4382 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4664 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5954 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 5630 (iii), 6119 (iv).

Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Doherty) 9375 (v).

Marriage Laws, Parliamentary Powers, Govt.'s Intention: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8585, 10195 (v).

Marriage Laws in Quebec, Action of Roman Catholic Church: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7207 (iv).

Marriages, Validity of, Law respecting: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6269 (iv).

Masonic Property stolen in Montreal, Par. in 'Free Press' *re* Apology to Counsel: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Hughes) 7873 (iv).

——— Verdict of Montreal Jury, Counsel's Action: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7552 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7207 (iv).

Masters Certificates for Inland Lakes, Dates, Examiners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).

Masters and Mates Examiners Certificates, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5821 (iii).

Match Factories, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1976 (ii).

Match Factories using Phosphorus, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1717 (i).

Matches of White Phosphorus: See 'B. Nos. 10 and 96.'

Mather Bridge and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'

Meaford Harbour Improvements, Adoption of Plan, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1347 (i).

Medical Council Bill, Par. in 'Globe', Correction *re* (Mr. Black) 2991 (ii).

Megantic Postoffice: in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1860 (i).

Melfort Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Menzies, Wm., Payments to *re* Magnetic Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Merchants and Employers Guarantee and Accident Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'

Mercier, Mr. Geo., Customs Official at Dalhousie, Member of Town Council: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4044 (iii).

Mergers: *See* 'Industrial.'

Mess. from His Ex., Estimates 1912, Suppl.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 8534 (v).

——— Estimates, 1911: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695 (i).

Messengers, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6172 (iv).

Meteghan Landing Place, Report *re* Defective Conditions: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4043 (iii).

Meteghan Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).

Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c.: Ques.: (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).

Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Mexico Trade: *See* 'Trade Commissioner.'

Meyer, Paulin Verena, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 145.'

Mica Exports 1900 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Best) 5290 (iii).

Mica Imports: Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4827 (iii).

Midland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2142 (ii).

Midland and Tiffin Lighthouse: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).

MILITIA:

Alberta Rangers, Macleod Squadron, Organization of, Capt. D. J. Campbell's connection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7340 (iv).

Annual Drill, Number called out from 1894 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 8699 (v).

——— Number of Officers, Men, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 9352 (v).

Armouries, &c. in Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Edwards) 1460 (i).

——— *See* 'Drill Halls.'

Baby Farm, Toronto, Sale of, Competition *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2155 (ii).

——— *See* 'Toronto.'

Bear River Rifle Range, Pets. *re*: Ques. Mr. Jameson) 3606 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii), 6057 (iv).

Bliss, Lt.-Col. D. C., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8100 (v).

B.C. Militia, Complaints *re* Treatment, Par. in B.C. Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) 9248 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Coal Miners Strike, Remarks of Mr. Geo. Taylor, 9720 (v).

——— *See* 'Labour.'

Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of: Remarks (Mr. Russell) 9996 (v).

Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4659 (iii).

——— Apptmnt. of Col. Landry: Personal Explanation (Mr. Lemeiux) 8093 (iv).

——— Cadets from Canada: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 706 (i).

——— Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3608 (ii).

——— Indian Contingent, Par. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6506 (iv).

——— Names of Officers, Cadets, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7105 (iv).

——— Naval Cadets, Method of Selection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9986 (v).

——— Regulations *re* Apptmt., Number, &c,: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3277 (ii).

——— Regulations *re* Selecting Corps: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4464 (iii).

——— Rule *re* Apptmts: Ques. (Mr Middlebro) 3220 (ii).

——— Selection of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4828 (iii).

Customs Duties *re* Militia: in Com of Sup., 6054 (iv).

Drill Halls, Generally, Construction *re*: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).

Drill Halls, Man., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1975 (ii).

Esquimalt Fort, Removal of Guns: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3220 (ii).

Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 799 (i).

——— Negotiations *re* Transfer: Ques (Mr Paquet) 799 (i).

Eucharistic Congress, Militia in Attendance, Authorization for: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3219 (ii).

——— *See* 'Eucharistic.'

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation: Amt. to Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Middlebro) 9595, Neg. (Y. 45; N. 61) 9633 (v).

——— Compensation to: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 658 (i).

——— Number surviving, Pensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1089, 1715, (i).

——— *See* 'Veterans.'

Fort Osborne Barracks, Purchase by Man. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii), 6054 (iv).

——— *See* 'Winnipeg.'

MILITIA—*Con.*

French, Gen.: Inquiry for Report (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9 (i).

——— Report: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 76 (i).

Imperial Conference, Military Adviser to, Apptmt. of Mr. S. Hughes: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 9072 (v).

Imperial Defence Committee Report: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 944 (i).

Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2886 (ii).

Kingston Military College Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

——— *See* 'R.M.C.'

Labour Strike, Militia Interference: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 10345 (v).

——— Privelege, Ques. of: (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9784 (v).

——— Letter from Mr. Geo. Taylor, M.P. *re* Militia: Read (Mr. King) 10344 (v).

——— *See* 'Coal.'

Military School, Montreal, Selection of Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).

Militia Allowances: in Com. of Sup., 8514 (v).

Militia and Agriculture Expenditure from 1867 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9371 (v).

Militia Dept, showing Passes by Members of Parlt.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1090 (i).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 7 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1020 (i).

Militia Expenditures, Total Amount since Confederation: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 3467 (ii).

Militia Officers: *See* 'Eucharistic.'

Militia Regiments, Number in Montreal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 7595 (iv).

Militia Regulation governing Admission to Militia Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 1001 (i).

——— Ques.(Mr. Campbell) 1090 (i).

Militia Supplies, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4667 (iii).

Militia Surveys, Expenditure in each of last five years: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 1102 (i).

Militia, Total Annual Cost from 1867 to 1910, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1289 (i).

Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse.: Remarks (Mr Crosby) 2261, 2265; Members' remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 2262 (ii).

Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 3144 (ii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

N.B. Regiment of Artillery, Annual Drill: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).

Nicolet Military Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).

Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Association, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 7340 (iv).

Pensions to Veterans: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 6915 (iv).

——— *See* 'Veterans.'

Petewawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Force Training: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4465 (iii).

——— Extent of Damage by Fire: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 9090 (v); Remarks (Mr. King) 9250 (v).

Rifle Associations: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).

Rockliffe Rifle Ranges, Additional Land purchased: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8994 (v).

——— M. for Cor.*, 8994 (v).

Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own while in England: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1087 (i).

——— Loaned by Can. to G.B. at Bisley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1085 (i).

——— Number issued to Queen's Own Regiment: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9781 (v).

——— Recommendation to British Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7552 (iv).

R.M. College, Additions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

——— College Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

——— *See* 'Kingston.'

St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2674 (ii).

Springhill Mines, N.S., Strike: Remarks *re* Militia (Mr. Blain) 2641 (ii).

Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10335 (v).

——— Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 8583 (v).

Toronto Barracks Site (Baby Farm) Reps., Valuation, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 981 (i).

——— *See* 'Baby.'

Veterans, Grants to: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 5211 (iii).

Veterans of 1866, Compensation to: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9999 (v).

——— *See* 'Fenians.'

Winnipeg, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 3052 (ii).

——— Fort Osborne Barracks, Purchase of, Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii).

——— *See* 'Ft. Osborne.'

MILITIA—*Con.*

Winnipeg Rifle Range: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iv).

——— Sale of, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7343 (iv).

Milk and Cream exported to U.S. for 1910-11, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7038 (iv).

——— Value of Export to U.S. for March and April, 1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8790 (v).

Milk and Cream exported, Quantity for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6269 (iv).

Milk and Cream Shipped from Western Ont., Accommodation *re* Handling: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).

Milk River Diversion: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Milk River and St. Mary's River Boundary: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. on Bill, 9101 (v).

Milton Post Office Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 1871 (i).

Mineral Deposits, Circular *re* Information by F. H. Forchet: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4305 (iii).

Miner, Bill, Capture of, Return to Can.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 4384 (iii).

Mines Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1475 (i).

Ministerial Association, Ottawa, Attack *re* Speech: Personal Explanation (Mr. Hughes) 3352 (ii).

——— Res. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Miller) 3059 (ii).

Ministers of Crown, Absence on Public Business for 1908-10, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1340 (i).

Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials, Acceptance of: Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2747, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 118) 2826 (ii).

——— Explanation *re* Discussion (Mr. Boyce) 2438 (ii).

——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Boyce) 2150, 2254 (ii).

Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 2261, 2265; Member's remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 2262 (ii).

Ministers' Travelling Expenses for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 817 (i).

——— *See* 'Public Works.'

Minnedosa Public Building, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 9993 (v).

Minnedosa Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Roche) 3046 (ii).

Minority Representation, Redistribution Bill, Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9988 (v).

——— Speech by Sir Richard Cartwright: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 9693 (v).

Mint Operations, Implementing Information: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).
'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1724 (i).
Miramichi Bay, N.B., Dredging Contracts, Specifications, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Crocket) 1340 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2556 (ii).
Mississippi, Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 9252 (v).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2146 (ii).
Modus Vivendi Licenses: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation &c., Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3065 (ii).
Moncton Armoury: in Com of Sup., 1623 (i).
Moncton Extension, I.C.R., Acquisition of Land from Builders Woodworkng Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6157 (iv).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Moncton, Locomotive and Car Shops: in Com. of Sup., 5926 (iii).
Moncton Station, I.C.R., Site purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1291 (i).
Monetville Cut, Lake Nipissing Public Works, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1495 (i).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1863 (i), 2567, 3144 (ii).
Montreal Customs House Employees leaving since 1st July, 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1340 (i).
Montreal Govt. Appointments since 1st Jan., 1904: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Gervais) 3225 (ii).
Montreal Govt. Weir: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 2065 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Montreal Legal Firms, Amounts paid for Services: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 984 (i).
Montreal Letter Carriers, Additional Number: Remarks (Mr. M. Martin) 2647 (ii).
Montreal and Maritime Provs., Mails forwarding of: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Montreal Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 1861 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Alterations &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1862 (i).
——— Electrical Fixtures, Drawings *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).
——— Mailing and Registering Facilities: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1715 (i).
Monument Nationale Demonstration in Montreal, Excursion Rates *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1347 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2996 (ii).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Moodie, Maj. J. D., Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 6090 (iv).
Moosejaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).
Mormon Propaganda, Prevention by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5135 (iii).
Morrison, Nellie Bridgland, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Morrison, N. L., Pocock, H. A., and Stevens, Captains, Dates of Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).
Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1104 (i).
Mossy River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).
Mounted Police: *See* 'R. N. W. M. P.'
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2149 (ii).
Munderloh & Co., Ltd., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
Murray Canal Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).
Murray Canal, New Scow: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).
Murray, Dr. C. A., I. C. R. Payments to *re* Tickets: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7031 (iv).
Nanaimo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).
Napanee River Dredging, Instructions &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 981 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table, 1903 (i).
——— Ret.: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 2065 (ii), 4049 (iii).
Napierville Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1865 (i).
Nash, Fred. J., Emplymt. by Govt. in Inland Revenue, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2668 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. No. 222.'

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY:

Changes in Original Specifications &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
Change in Structures to the amount of $10,000: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
Classification, Arbitration *re*, Rep. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1490 (i).
——— Investigation, Reps.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 4677 (iii).
——— Information *re*: (Mr. Lennox) 6272 (iv), 9995 (v).

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Classification: Reductions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 9899 (v).

Commission, List of Members of Engineering Staff, who have resigned &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

Commissioners' Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).

Construction Work, Change in Concrete used, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 1499 (i).

Construction Work, Estimated Quantity, Bridges, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).

Contracts, Estimated Quantities *re*: Ques (Mr. Ames) 1491 (i).

Contracts, Security Deposit, Amount of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1971 (ii).

Contract Work, Delay *re* Execution: Ques (Mr. Lennox) 6668 (iv).

Contractors, Amounts paid on Force Account, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

Cost Estimated and Mileage of Fencing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1094 (i).

Customs Duties on Supplies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8583 (v).

Defaulting Contractors, Penalties &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1281 (i).

Eastern Division, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1099 (i); correction of figures (Mr. Graham) 1293 (i).

Eastern Division, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1095 (i).

—— Overbreak, Agreement *re* Progress Estimates: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2434 (ii).

—— Section Houses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1099 (i)

Eastern Division, Total Cost to 31st Dec. 1910, inclusive of Quebec Bridge: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5130 (iii).

—— Eastern Div., Total Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 9430 (v).

—— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 5136 (iii).

Eastern Div., Total Cost to Dec. 1910: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2434, 3064 (ii).

—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 3144 (ii).

Expenditure, Difference in Amounts in Ret.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4827 (iii).

Expenditure, Estimated Cost of Completion of Winnipeg and Moncton Div.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1727 (i).

G.T.P. taking over Completed Sections, Provision in Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1093 (i).

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Haney, Quinlan & Robertson, Contract *re* Construction of Locomotive Shops east of Winnipeg: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).

Labour Conditions, Charges *re* Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 8596 (v).

Land Damages, Compensation *re* Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3949 (iii).

Moncton and Winnipeg Contracts, Original Estimates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

N.B. Section, Pusher Grade: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4051 (iii).

—— Standard, Estimated Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4047 (iii).

Payments to: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 1572 (i).

Rails and Fastenings, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1099 (i).

Roy, Mr. Ferdinand, Emplymt. by Govt., or N.T.Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2851 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Moncton Div., Completion of: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1711 (i).

Shops, Plans and Specifications for Machinery: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1569 (i).

—— Emplymt. of Mr. W. J. Press: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2157 (ii).

Temiskaming and Northern Ry., Agreement *re* Running Rights: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2435 (ii).

Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5135 (iii).

Total Expenditure to 31st Dec. 1910, Estimated Cost of Winnipeg and Moncton Section: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1497 (i).

Train Hauled Filling, Payments *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

Western Div., Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7591 (iv).

National Weekly Indemity Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'

Natural Resources, &c.: in Sask. and Alberta, Provincial Control, Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3462 (ii).

Naval Policy of Govt.: *See* 'Address.'

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA:

Applications from Canadian and British Navy: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1339 (i).

Boot Contract, Tenders, Patterns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2675 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1723 (i).

'Bristol' Type, Specifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1279 (i).

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA—*Con.*

'Bristol' Type, Building of Cruiser: Remarks (Mr. Nantel) 196 (i).

Canadian Navy *re* Home Rule: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 1461 (i).

Coal Consumption by Govt. Cruisers, Quantity per Day: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv). (iv).

Construction, Tenders *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8355 (v).

Coronation Contingent, Names of Officers. &c.: Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) 9375 (v).

Cruisers manned by Canadian Marines, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 805 (i)

Date and Port of Sailing of Niobe and Rainbow: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1091 (i).

English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1080 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1093 (i)

Expenditure *re*: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Monk) 786 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5638 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 4471 (iii)

—— Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) 4659 (iii).

International Naval Conference, Final Protocol: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 3073 (ii).

Medical Examiners *re* Recruits: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 8991 (v).

Naval Cruisers ordered for Canada, Stmnt. in'Navy': Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 793 (i).

Naval Defence Proposals: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 34 (i).

—— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).

Naval Defence. Govt. Proposals: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Address, 112, Amt. 133, Neg. (Y. 67; N. 120) 651 (i).

—— Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Amt., 228, Neg. (Y. 70; N. 126) 649 (i).

Naval Service Dept., Names of Employees Domicile, Duties assigned, Salaries, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Monk) 932 (i).

Navy Act, Rules and Regulations: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1499 (i).

—— Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4665 (iii).

Navy Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 1463 (i).

'Niobe', Contracts *re* Provisions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).

—— Date of laying Keel, Repairs in England, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).

—— Wages of Seamen, Discontent *re*: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 530 (i).

—— statement : read (Mr. Brodeur) 664 (i).

'Niobe' and 'Rainbow', Cost to Date, Price, Repairs and Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 791 (i).

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA--*Con.*

'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 792 (i).

—— Gun Practice, Approximate Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv)

—— Loan by Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 983 (i).

—— Names of Officers: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 9090 (v).

—— Par. in Naval Annual *re* Scrapping of Cruisers: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 931 (i).

—— Speed, Result of Official Trials: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv).

'Rainbow' Cruiser, Date of Purchase, Price Paid, &c.: Ques (Mr. Monk) 788 (i).

—— Guns, Type, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1490 (i).

—— Listed as ineffective: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1070 (i).

—— Struck off effective List: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1081 (i).

Recruiting by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7261 (iv).

—— Regulations, O. C. *re* Remuneration &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7804 (iv).

Roper, Commander, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 799 (i).

Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service at Public Function: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 932 (i).

—— Approval of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1288 (i).

—— Preparation of Answer: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 1351 (i).

Ships ordered by Govt.: Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press': Remarks (Mr. Monk) 866 (i).

Tenders for Cruisers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8700 (v).

Total Cost of Cruisers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 791 (i).

Navigable Waters, Pollution of: *See* 'B. No. 178.

Navigation Licenses on Great Lakes, Regulations from Washington: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2375 (ii).

Neepawa Postoffice Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

Negro Immigrants, Prohibition into N. W.: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 5911 (iii).

—— Restrictions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thorburn) 6523 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 5941 (iv).

—— *See* 'Civil Service.'

Nelson Postal Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

Nelson Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage.'

Netherland Loan Co., Cor. between Mr. Preston and Dom. Govt.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 3142 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5639 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 7349 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co., Investments in Canada, Rep. of Mr. W. T. R. Preston *re* : M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 776 ; Prop Res. (Mr. Monk) 781 (i).
——— Rep. of W. T. R. Preston, Cor. with Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 789 (i).
——— Statement by Mr. Preston *re* Chief Justice Fitzpatrick, Official Notification : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2669 (ii).
N.B. Regiment of Artillery, Annual Drill: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
New Edinboro', N.S., Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1283 (i)
Newfoundland Export Trade, Total Value, Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2854 (ii).
Newfoundland, North Atlantic Fisheries, &c.: *See* 'Hague.'
New Harmony Post Office : Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 6084 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Cor. with Mr. E. J. Walsh and Dept.: M. for Copies.* (Mr. Wallace) 5136 (iii).
——— Expenditure for 1910, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5830 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Wallace) 7556 (iv).
——— Rep. of Mr. Walsh *re* : Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10474; Neg. (Y. 45; N. 79) 10532 (v).
Newmarket Canal : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Newspaper Special Train, Cost of Operation : Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 9982 (v).
New Westminster District, Govt. Lands, Grants issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D.Taylor) 1291 (i).
New Westminster Penitentiary Employees, Increase of Salaries: M. for Cor. (Mr. J D. Taylor) 2183 (ii).
Niagara Falls Water Power: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Niagara Falls Water Power, Quantity developed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5132 (iii).
——— Regulations *re* : Stmnt. (Mr. Pugsley) 8890 (v).
——— Treaty Obligations, &c., Par. in Press: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8791 (v).
Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 99.'
Nicolet Customs Collections for 1906-11: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).
Nicolet Military Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).
Nicolet Post Office, Amount paid to Guardian, Rent collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8789 (v).
Nicolet Post Office Building, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).
——— Pet. re Annex: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).
Nicolet River Dredging, Contract re : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).
'Niobe' Cruiser, Contracts *re* Provisions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).
——— Date of laying Keel, Repairs in England, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).
——— Gun Practice, Approximate Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (v).
——— Names of Officers: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 9090 (v).
——— Speed, Result of Official Trials: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv).
——— Wages of Seamen, Discontent *re*: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 530 (i).
——— statement: Read (Mr. Brodeur) 664 (i).
——— *See* 'Naval Service.'
Nominingue Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1884 (i).
North Atlantic Collieries, Application *re* Conciliation Board: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Maddin) 3947 (ii).
——— Protest *re* Nomination on Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) 4209 (iii).
——— *See* 'Labour.'
North Bay; Burk's Falls and Maganatawan Wharfs, Total Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Arthurs) 981 (i).
——— Information *re* (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 2556 (ii).
Northern Ontario, Settlement of by Govt. Assistance: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 6767 (iv).
North Shore Tax Payers and Voting at Federal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1082 (i).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2435 (ii).
Northumberland, East Riding, Opposition to Reciprocity: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Owen) 6767 (iv).
Northwest Fishing Co.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5630 (iii).
See 'Markey.'
N. W. Ter. School Lands, Complete Procedure *re* Disposal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 800 (i).
N. W. M. Police, Coronation Contingent, Number, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 5836 (iii).

N. W. M. Police, Loss of Men on Macpherson Yukon Patrol: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7254 (iv).
Northwest Scrip to Old Settlers, Refusal of Claims &c.: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1293 (i).
North York, Challenge *re* Contest Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7220 (iv).
N. S. Breakwaters, Contracts *re* Construction in Digby County: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 657 (i).
Oaths of Office: B. No. 1, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, *pro forma*, 1 (i).
Obabikong Bay and Sabiskong Indian Land, Tenders *re* Burnt Timber: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1344 (i).
Objections *re* Interruptions Reciprocity Treaty: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4451 (iii).
Obstructions in Navigable Waters, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iii), 6089 (iv).
Offensive Weapons: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Offensive Weapons, Pets. *re* Legislation: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 3064 (ii).
——— Sale of, Par. in Montreal Papers: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 2557 (ii).
Official Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).
Okanagan Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).
Oleomargarine, Admission of Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6504, 6668 (iv).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges Against *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. 8309; Amt. (Mr. Borden) 8309-14, Neg. (Y. 69; N. 102) 8347; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8348, Neg. (Y. 65; N. 99) 8353 (v).
——— M. for Com. *re* Investigation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8791 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8032 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 8092 (v).
——— Inquiry for Meeting of Com. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9899 (v).
Ontario and Abitibi Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Ontario Fisheries Service, Number of Officers, Services, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6157 (iv).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Ont., Hudson Bay and Western Ry. Co.: *See* B. No. 76.'
Ontario-Michigan Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Ont. and Minnesota Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B No. 109.'
Ont. Northern and Timagimi Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Opium, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. Nos. 13, 22, 97.'
Orders Discharged (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4464 (iii).
Orders Dichharged: M. (Mr. Macdonell) 4464 (iii).
Order, Ques. of *re* Homestead, Member asked to withdraw Word 'Liar' (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 5561 (iii).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 100.'
Oshawa Customs Collector, Retirement of Mr. Blamey: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3225 (ii).
Oshawa Fruit Growers Ass'cn., Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Fowke) 5747 (iii).
Ottalie Stream, N. B., Public Works, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1287 (i).
Ottawa Buildings: Elevators &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).
——— Excessive Rentals by Govt., Censure *re*: Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2271; Neg. (Y. 61; N. 104) 2358 (ii).
——— Furniture &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2590, 3162 (ii), 6027 (iv).
——— Improvement Commission's Report: Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 2004, 3672 (ii).
——— Lavatories: in Com. of Sup., 2583 (ii).
——— Lighting Contract: in Com. of Sup., 3173 (ii).
——— McGillivray's Contract: in Com of Sup., 5993 (iv).
——— Municipal Lighting Plant, Number of Govt. Buildings lighted by: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1280 (i).
——— New Leases, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1281 (i).
——— Parlt. Grounds, Pavement: in Com. of Sup., 2593, 2602 (ii).
——— *See* 'Parliament.'
——— Pavements &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8883 (v).
——— Plaza, 6507 (iv).
——— Rideau Hall Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 3170 (ii), 8872 (v).
——— Sanitary Condition of City, Rep. of Dr. Hodgetts: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5535 (iii).
——— Seybold Building Elevator, Reimbursement *re* Installation: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 1350 (i).
——— Steel Cases: in Com. of Sup., 2582 (ii).
——— Sussex Street Deptl. Buildings, Alterations in Plans: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 2075 (ii); Plans laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 4824 (iii).
——— Sussex St. Deptl. Block: in Com. of Sup., 3172 (ii).
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 3169 (ii)
——— Victoria Museum: *See* 'Victoria.'
Ottawa City Health Conditions: Amt. (Mr. Lewis) to Com. of Sup., 6367 (iv).
Ottawa City, Typhoid Epidemic, Criticism of: Remarks: Explanation (Mr. Black) 4720 (iii).

Ottawa City Typhoid Epidemic, Pollution of City Water: Remarks (Mr. Black) on M. for Sup., 4475 (iii).
—— Prorogation of House: Remarks (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4676 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Black) *re* Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' 4656 (iii).
—— Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 2583 (ii).
—— Water Supply for Parlt. Buildings, *re* Typhoid Epidemic: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 2004 (ii).
Ottawa City, Woods and Canadian Buildings, Cancellation of Contracts *re* Heating and Elevators: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1088, 1344 (i).
—— Cor. with Mr. Ellis and City Council: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3672 (ii).
—— Date of last Cheque paid to Imperial Realty Co. for Lighting: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1279 (i).
—— Lighting Contract with Electric Co.: in Com. of Sup., 3175 (ii).
—— Inaccurate Answer: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 999 (i).
—— Contract with Imperial Realty Co. *re* Lighting &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 794 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. S. Sharps) 3948 (ii).
—— Stmnt. *re* Discrepancy in Figures (Mr. Pugsley) 1011 (i).
—— *See* 'Public Works.'
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
Ottawa River and Carillon Water Power, Leases &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Monk) 9994 (v).
Ottawa, Beaver or Steam Trawling in Northumberland Strait: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 980 (i).
Ottlecock Dam, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2852 (ii).
Owen Sound Dock, Work *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 10337 (v).
Owl's Head Harbour, Pet. *re* Light: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3465 (ii).
Owl's Head Lighthouse, N.S., Construction, Apptmt. of Lightkeeper, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5832 (iii).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).
Oyster Industry, Memorials, Surveys, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Warburton) 714 (i).
Pacific and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Pacific, Northern and Omenica Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Pacific and Peace Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Pages, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).
Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Association, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 7340 (iv).
Paper Imports into U. S., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).
—— *See* 'Pulp.'
Parcel Post between Canada and G. B. Colonies, &c., Loss *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 805 (i).
Parcel Post, Express Rates: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 9930 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9909 (v).
Parcel Post Rates, Reduction *re*: Ques. (Mr Armstrong) 5934 (iv).
Paris Agency: in Com of Sup., 8694 (v).
Paris Exposition, 1900, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 7602 (iv).
Parliament Grounds, Condition of: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6768, 7023 (iv).
—— *See* 'Ottawa.'
—— Water Supply, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7345 (iv).
Parliament, Opening and Closing Dates from 1896 to 1910: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 786 (i).
—— Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 1805 (i).
Parliament, Opening of: Com. from Gov. Gen's. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Parliament Site, Winnipeg, Reservation in Crown Grants, &c.: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. A. Haggart) 7039 (iv).
—— *See* 'Manitoba,' &c.
Parrsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1598 (i).
—— Instructions to Officials *re* Plans, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Rhodes) 1727 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Rhodes) 8535 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).
Parry Sound Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).
Pasqua's Indian Reserves, Claims for Damages re Fires: Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 8586 (v).
—— *See* 'Indians.'
Patent Record: in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
Patent Relief: *See* Bills Nos. 43, 165, 187, 188 203.
Patrol Boats in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).
Peace River Water Belt: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Peat Gas, Generating Electric Power, Process, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 708, 985 (i).
Pecuniary Claims Convention, *re* Hay Claims, Objections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 802 (i).
Peel County Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7247 (iv).
—— *See* 'Post Office.'

Pelagic Sealing Conference: in Com. of Sup., 8678 (v).
—— Treaty between G. B. and U. S. *re* Protection to: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 3670 3769, 3839 (ii).
—— *See* 'Fisheries'.
Pembina Fish Dam, Placing of Ladder, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1090 (i).
—— *See* 'Fisheries'.
Penny Bank Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 221'.
Pensions for Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).
Pensions to Veterans: Remarks (Mr. G. V White) 6915 (iv).
—— See 'Militia'.
Peoples Ry. Co.: See 'B. No. 110'.
Percy Aylwin Irrrigation Grant,' O. Cs.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Campbell) 6158 (iv).
——*See* 'Interior'
Peterborough Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 5750 (iii).
Peterborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2603 (ii).
Petewawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Force Training: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4465 (iii).
—— Extent of Damage by Fire: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 9090; Remarks (Mr. King) 9250 (v).
Petewawa Wharf: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).
Petit Rocher Spur, I. C. R., Cost, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6156 (iv).
Petit Rocher Wharf, Expenditure since April 1910: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6267 (iv).
'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3605 (ii).
Pickford and Black, SS Service between Can. and W. Indies, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 4465 (ii).
—— *See* 'W. Indies.'
Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2152 (ii).
Pig Iron Charcoal, Number of Tons, Imported: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1721 (i).
Pig Iron Imports, used in Steel Rail Mills, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 4828 (iii).
Piles Federal Works, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 7590 (iv), 8103 (v).
Pilotage Fees on Coal Barges: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
Pilotage Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 6533 (iv).
Pilotage Rules: See 'B. No. 155.'
Plains of Abraham, Battlefield: *See* 'B. No. 222'.
Plaza, Ottawa, Removal of Poles: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6507 (iv)
—— *See* 'Ottawa.'
Ploughs exported to U. S., Number, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 3223 (ii).
Poachers Fishing on Pacific Coast, Par. in Victoria Daily Colonist: Remarks (Mr. Bernard) 1458 (i).
—— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9782 (v).
Poisons, Sales of: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Pontiac Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Porcupine, Disasters by Fire, Aid to: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 9694 (v).
——Remarks (Mr. W. R. Smyth) 9635 (v).
—— Request for Tents, Supplies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 9983 (v).
Pork Packing Industry, Delegation *re*: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Blain) 3530 (ii).
Portage le Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5994 (iv).
Port Colborne Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).
Port Credit, Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iv).
—— Public Works, Expenditures for 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5638 (iii).
Port Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1101 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Port Mulgrave, &c., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8786 (v).
Port Perry Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1880 (i).
Port Stanley, Port Burwell and Aylmer Customs Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 985 (i).
Post Office Act Amts.: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Post Office Act (salaries) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 216.'

POST OFFICE:

Acton Vale, Upton and St. Pie Post Office Revenues: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 980 (i).
Allan SS. Co. Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4428 (iii).
Arrow Lake Postal Clerk: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
Athol Mail Route, Establishment of, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Rhodes) 2161 (ii).
Atlantic Fast Service and All Red Route, Establishment of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Armstrong) 1726 (i).
Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).
Austin Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Aylmer Post Office Revenue for 1908-9, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 984 (i).

Bark Lake Post Office, Closing and Opening: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).

Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

Birch Grove Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) 6073 (iv).

Bonaventure River, Quebec, and N.B. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8764 (v); M. for Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).

Canada and Japan Mail Subsidy: Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1802 (i).

Canso and Guysborough Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8994 (v).

Chemin Gouin Postmaster, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7038 (iv).

—— A. C. Miquelon, Pension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames, 7210 iv).

Cobalt Mail Service, Delays and Inefficient Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1649, 1663, 1804 (i).

Coronation Stamps: Inquiry *re* (Mr. Armstrong) 9247 (v).

—— *See* 'Stamps.'

Collingwood Corner, Postmaster, Name Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).

Crooks, Mr. Wesley, Postmaster at Peggy's Cove, Increase in Salary: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).

Curren, R. C., Gratuity *re* Post Office Service: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 3948 (ii).

Dixon Post Office, Pets. *re* Change of Location: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4669 (iii).

Donland Post Office, Removal of Site: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 9994 (v).

Don Post Office, Mail Service to Toronto, Name of Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).

Dunnville Postal Collections, Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3470 (ii).

Echo Lake Post Office, Application *re* Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8993 (v).

English Mail Service to Maritime Provs.: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8792 (v).

—— *See* 'Mails,' &c.

Escott Postmaster, Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

—— Date of Apptmt., Complaints *re* late Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).

—— Postmaster's Salary, Date of Increase: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7601 (iv).

Fergus Post Office Site: Remarks (Mr. Stratton) in Com. of Sup., 1883 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Fraser Mills Postmaster, Defalcations, Bonds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1566 (i).

Fraser River Mail Service, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).

Free Delivery of Mail: in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).

Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1285 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4925 (iii).

Gaspé Mail Service, Revenue *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3854 (ii).

Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7038 (iv).

Guysborough 'Times,' Application *re* Postal Privileges: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6505 (iv).

Halifax Post Office Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).

—— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 653 (i).

Hall's Prairie P.O., Pets. *re* Location, Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3468 (ii).

Haskett, Havelock and New Tusket Post Offices, Distance between &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8991 (v).

Jackson Postmaster, Name and Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).

Lajord Post Office, Change to Accounting Office: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).

Langdon Subdivision of C. P. Ry., Mail Service in Northwest: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1346 (i).

Leamington Post Office, Cost in Detail, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 9782 (v).

Letter Carrier's Boots: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).

Letter Carriers, Free Transportation *re* Tramway System : Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1104 (i).

Letter Carriers in New Westminster, Free Transportation on Tramways: M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2194 (ii).

Letter Carriers Superannuation, Amt. to the Act: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1488 (i).

Magazines sent through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).

——*See* 'U. S.'

Mails delayed and mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii), 4667 (iii).

Mails, Illegal Use of for fraudulent Schemes: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 802 (i).

Mails used Illegally for Lottery Schemes &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1356 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Mails Used Illegally for Lottery Schemes, &c.: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1364; Stmnt. (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).

——— *See* 'Sheldon.'

Mail Service to Mar. Provs., Delivery of English Mails: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Emmerson) 9541 (v).

———Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).

——— *See* 'English.'

Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 9538 (v).

——— *See* 'Rural.'

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv), 8752 (v).

Meteghan Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).

Ministers Speeches distributed by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9253 (v).

——— Speeches of Prime Minister, Distribution by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9071 (v).

Montreal Letter Carriers, Additional Number: Remarks (Mr. M. Martin) 2647 (ii).

Montreal Post Office, Mailing and Registering Facilities: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1715 (i).

Montreal and Maritime Provs., Forwarding of Mails: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).

Neepawa Post Office Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

Nelson Postal Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

New Harmony Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 6084 (iv).

Newspaper Special Train, Cost of Operation: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 9982 (v).

Nicolet Post Office Building, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

——— Pet. *re* Annex: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

——— Amount paid to Guardian, Rent collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8789 (v).

N. S. Post Office Service, Weekly and Biweekly, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 982 (i).

Parcel Post between Canada and G. B., Colonies, &c., Loss *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 805 (i).

Parcel Post System, Express Rates: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 9930 (v).

——— Reduction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5934 (iv).

———Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9909 (v).

Parrsboro Post Office: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Rhodes) 8535 (v).

Peel County Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7247 (iv).

——— Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 10355 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Postal Clerks, Superannuation *re*: in Com. of Sup., 4284 (iii).

Postal Conventions with Spain, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 1104 (i).

Postal Regulations, Distribution of short date Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10340 (v).

Postmasters' Association, Pets. *re* Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).

Postmaster General's Mission to Rome, Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3606 (ii).

Postmasters' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4289 (iii).

——— Increase to, Classification of Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5934 (iv).

Post Office Buildings, Policy of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1870 (i).

Post Office Buildings in Rural Districts, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).

Post Office Buildings, Total Value, Expenditure, Subsidies *re* Mails, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

Post Office Buildings: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 3954 (iii).

Post Office Collections, Revenues in Cities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3862 (ii).

Post Office and Customs Revenue for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw from 1906 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4673 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).

——— Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).

——— Estimates *re* Mail Service, Objection (Mr. Perley) to Passing, 4296 (iii).

——— Money Orders, Printing of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1101 (i).

——— Outside Service, Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 6073 (iv).

——— Outside Service, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6178 (iv).

——— Overcrowding in Basement: Ques. Mr. Sproule) 6667 (iv).

——— Post Office Matters, Generally: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).

——— Promotions and Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 10469 (v).

——— Revenue and Expenditure: Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 10335 (v).

——— Savings Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1568 (i).

——— Supplies for Western Provs., Distribution of: Ques. (Mr. A. Haggart) 1282 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Pratt's Siding, Establishment of Post Office, Requests *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3067 (ii).

P.E.I. Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Use of: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7109 (iv).

——— *See* 'Stamps.'

Railway Mail Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 4281, 4285 (iii), 6179 (iv).

——— Compensations: in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

——— Accidents to, Grants *re* Injuries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3859 (ii).

——— Compensated for Accidents, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9537 (v).

——— Examinations: Remarks (Mr. Armsrong) in Com. of Sup., 6082 (iv).

——— Increases to: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

——— Maximum and Minimum Salary, Claims *re* Increase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2160 (ii).

——— Names and Date of Apptmts. of Persons not passing Qualifying Examinations: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3855 (ii).

Railway Mail Clerk's Salaries: *See* 'Civil Service Bill 217."

Revenue for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw from 1906 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4673 (iii).

Roberval Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).

'Review of Reviews,' Collection of Extra Postage: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).

Rosendale Mail Service, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1291 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Generally: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10365 (v).

Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery in Renfrew County: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Stamps and Postcards, Manufacture of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).

——— *See* 'Mail Routes,' 'Peel,' &c.

Rural Mail Service in East Elgin, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 983 (i).

——— Number operating in Man.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1105 (i).

——— Routes, Number in Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 983 (i).

Rural Postmasters: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (iii).

St. Johns Postmaster, Refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir': Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1089 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Ste. Marie de Monnoir Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1698 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

Saskatchewan Post Offices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6505 (iv).

Selkirk Post Office Box: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Shelburne Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Best) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Sheldon, Mr. C. D., Illegal Use of Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).

——— Action of Govt. *re* Returning to Canada: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6200 (iv).

——— *See* 'Mails,' &c.

Stamp Cancelling Machines, Cost, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).

Stamps, New Issue by P.O. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).

——— Canadian Design: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 7106 (iv).

——— Condemnation *re*: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 9990 (v).

——— Prize *re* Best Design, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 5402 (iii).

——— Refusal of Imperial Design: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6908 (iv).

——— *See* 'Coronation,' 'Quebec,' &c.

Tadousac Postmaster, Dismissal, Charges *re*, Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5133 (iii).

Tilbury, &c., Post Office Revenue at, for 1904-10: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 807 (i).

——— *See* 'Walkerville.'

Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3466 (ii).

Toronto Post Office, Addition to, Changes *re* Specifications: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 805 (i).

Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance to Widow: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3861 (ii).

U. S. Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 984 (i).

———*See* 'Magazines.'

Walkerville Post Office Building and Mail Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) *re* Staff, 2559 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).

——— *See* 'Tilbury.'

Westbrook Mail Contract, Tenders re: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1103 (i).

Westville Post Office, Number of Bricks used: Ques. Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Windsor, N.S., Letter Carriers, Salary: Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).

Potato Barrels, Standard Size: *See* 'B. No. 9.'

Potato Bushel, Standard Weight: *See* 'B. No. 153.'

Potatoes exported, Quantity, Value from 1901 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6271 (iv).

Pratt's Siding, Establishment of Post Office, Requests *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3067 (ii).

Precedence at Official Receptions: M. for Cor. (Mr. Sproule) 949 (i).

——— *See* 'Eucharistic.'

Pre-emptions and Purchased Homesteads, Total Acreage, Amounts received, Annual Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 812 (i).

——— *See* 'Interior.'

Preferential Tariff Concessions granted to G. B.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

Premier's Return from Conference, Reception, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9780 (v).

——— *See* 'Laurier, Sir W.'

Prime Minister's Tour through the West: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 25 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 45 (i).

Prime Minister's Visit to Imp. Conference, Reciprocity and Editorials in 'Christian Guardian': Read (Mr. Thornton) 9072 (v).

P. E. I. Coast Fisheries, Fines, Penalties *re* Breach of Regulations: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Fraser) 1501 (i).

P. E. I. and G. B., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8788 (v).

P. E. I. Ry.—Harmony-Elmira Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).

P. E. I. Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 6923, 7553 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7428, 7803 (iv) 8355 (v).

P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Warburton) 3863, 3917 (ii).

P. E. I. Supreme Court, Apptmt. of Judges: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8355 (v).

P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorials, Reps., &c., *re* Survey; M. for Copies (Mr. Richards) 2176 (ii).

P. E. I. Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

——— Contracts *re* Coal, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 2677 (ii).

Prince Rupert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Islands, B.C., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8787 (v).

Printing Bureau Boilers: in Com. of Sup., 2361, 2582 (ii).

Printing Bureau Employees, Religious Status: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3606 (ii).

Printing Bureau Investigation: M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7687, Neg. (Y. 56; N. 92) 7801 (iv).

——— Distribution of Evidence: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1364 (i).

——— Evidence under Oath, Printing, &c., Dismissal of Mr. R. E. Cook: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2672 (ii).

——— Irregularities, Money Loss, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 794 (i).

——— Number of Dismissals, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. Taylor) 708 (i).

——— Paper purchased, Inspection of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2373 (ii).

——— Investigation, Report of: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 8; M. to print, 8 (i).

——— Printing of: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1351 (i).

Printing, Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 309 (i).

Private Bills: M. to extend Time (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1454 (i).

——— Second Readings: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 8641 (v).

Privileges and Elections Com., 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. German) 6756 (iv).

Privileges and Elections Com., Charges *re* Mr. A. Lanctot: M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7873; Amt. (Mr. Monk) 7889, Neg. (Y. 56, N. 98) 8030 (v).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Molloy) *re* Absence from his seat in the House, 1353 (i).

——— *re* Blocking Public Accounts Com.: (Mr. Lennox) 990 (i).

——— (Mr. Geo. Taylor) *re* Labour Strikes, 9784 (v).

——— (Mr. Best) *re* Members paying for Speeches, 1355 (i).

——— *re* Montmagny Electors, (Mr. Roy) Correction in Hansard, 1356 (i).

——— *re* Speech by Member for Dauphin as to Selection of Capital for Saskatchewan (Mr. Neely) 5620 (iii).

——— Telegram delayed, &c : (Mr. Gilbert) 1456 (i).

Privy Council, Clerkships: in Com. of Sup., 8750 (v).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).

Protection Service *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 3807 (ii).

——— *See* 'Fisheries.'

Public Accounts Com.: M. (Mr. Warburton) to ref. Aud. Gen's. Rep. to Committee, 527, 818; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 823; Amt. to Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 827; Agreed to (Y. 98; N. 74) 864 (i).

Public Accounts Committee: Meetings and Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 309 (i).
—— Proposed Amendment (Mr. Lennox) Notice *re*, 696 (i).
Public Buildings, Erection of and Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lalor) 4319 (iii).
Public Buildings in former Estimates, Precedence over new ones: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).
Public Buildings: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 5541 (iii).
Public Buildings for Post Offices, &c., Number, Expenditure &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 786 (i).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7347 (iv).
Public Buildings, System adopted *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).
—— Total Cost for several Years: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2100 (ii); Ques. of Order *re* Discussion (Mr. Pugsley) 2101; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2101 (ii).
Public Work Contracts, Penalties *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).
Public Works, Expenditure generally: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).
Public Works promised during Western Tour: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1630 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS:

Advertising Govt. Works, Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).
Alien Labour Law, Employment of Foreigners on Public Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 10367 (v).
Amaguadees Pond, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 9500 (v).
Ancona Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Argyle Sound, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).
Arthabaska Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Assiniboine Floods, Pets. to Govt., Political Interference *re*: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii).
—— River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).
Athens Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2088 (ii).
Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Aylmer, Que., Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1672 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Banff Park Water Works: in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).
Bathurst Dredging Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 803, 1285 (i).
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2970 (ii).
—— Cor.: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3005 (ii).
—— Further Cor.: Read (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 3029 (ii).
Belleville Docking Facilities: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. of Sup., 6011 (iv).
Belleville Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).
Big Bay Point Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).
Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiation with U. S. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1575 (i).
Bracebridge Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).
Brantford Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 2098 (ii).
Brighton Wharf, Vote *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 1655 (i).
Bronte Harbour Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iv).
Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247 (iv).
Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).
—— Caretakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).
—— Draping for His Maj.'s Death: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).
—— Electric Power: in Com. of Sup., 3210 (ii).
—— Rents, Engineers Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3212 (ii).
Buildings, Que., General Repairs &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).
—— Yukon, Salaries &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3214 (ii).
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sealey) 7341 (iv).
—— Remarks on Question (Mr. Sealey) 7348 (iv).
Calgary Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).
Campbellton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).
Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities dredged, Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1905 (i).
Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).
Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8983 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Chatham, N.B., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1610 (i).

—— Purchase of Site, Name of Owners: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (iii).

Chesley Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2103 (ii).

Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).

Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).

Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3013 (ii).

Cribbins Point Wharf: in Com of Sup., 6029 (iv).

Deep Brook, N.S., Wharf, Expenditure *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 4383 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii).

Digby Public Works, Expenditures *re*: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).

Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for Current Year: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).

Dresden Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 2105 (ii).

Duncan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii).

Dundas Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Dunnville Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 1668 (i).

Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by 'International': M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1498 (i).

East Chezzetcook Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).

Eastern Dredging Co., Letting of Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 813 (i).

—— *See* 'Gaspereaux.'

Elbow and Bow Rivers Water Power, Privileges *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1345 (i).

—— M. for Copies* (Mr. McCarthy) 1501 (i).

Elora Post Office, Site, Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 6505 (iv).

Elora Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Essex Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2110 (ii).

Experimental Farms Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3157 (ii).

Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (i).

Fergus Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii).

Fire Escapes for Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3160 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders from P.W. Dept. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 2648 (ii).

Fort William Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Fredericton Public Building, Pavement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1612 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).

French River Dam: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).

Gananoque Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i).

Gaspereau Harbour Dredging Contracts: Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10203, Neg. (Y. 59; N. 92) 10308 (v).

Gaspé Shore, Maritime Road: in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

Georgetown Public Building Drainage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).

Goderich Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).

Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).

Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).

Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).

Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, Water Filters &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).

Haileybury Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 7806 (iv).

Halifax Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1592 (i).

—— Citadel, New Quarters: in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).

Hampton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1339 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).

—— N. S., Estimates to be Voted for Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9501 (v).

Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).

Hartland Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1617 (i).

Hawkesbury and Grenville Bridge, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 930 (i).

Hillsborough Bridge, P. E. I., Montreal, purchased, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works, Printing of Proceedings *re* Com: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3280 (ii).

Humbolt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).

Hungry Bay Dyke, Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).

Iberville Bridge Construction: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (iv).

Immigration Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

Jesus River Improvements, Completion, Suspension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 804 (i).

Kingston Postoffice Building: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

Knight's Point Breakwater, P. E. I., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7805 (iv).

Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iv).

L'Ardoise Beach Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).

Lethbridge Postoffice, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).

——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).

Levis Armoury and Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (i).

Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2141 (ii).

Lloydminster Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).

Lorneville Wharf, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (ii).

Lunenburg, N. S., Dredging, Plans re: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2157 (ii).

Lunenburg, Public Building, Clock Tower: in Com. of Sup., 1592, 1625 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2359 (ii).

——— Statement of Chief Architect: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 2360 (ii).

——— Specifications *re* Tower Clock : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2578 (ii).

Macleod Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3003 (ii).

——— Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9588 (v).

Maisonneuve Postoffice: in Com. of Sup., 1685 (i).

Margaree Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).

Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1697 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Marieville Public Building, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4666 (iii).

Meaford Harbour Improvements, Adoption of Plan, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1347 (i).

Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1710, 1860 (i).

Melfort Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Meteghan Landing Place, Report *re* Defective Condition: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4043 (iii).

Midland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2142 (ii).

Milton Postoffice Building : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 1871 (i).

Minnedosa Public Building, Purchase of Site &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 9993 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. Roche) 3046 (ii).

Miramichi Bay, N. B., Dredging Contracts, Specifications, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Crocket) 1340 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2556 (ii).

Mississippi, Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 9252 (v).

Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2146 (ii).

Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1623 (i).

Monetville Cut, Lake Nipissing Public Works, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1495 (i).

Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1863 (i), 2567 (ii).

Montreal Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 1861 (i).

Montreal Postoffice, Alterations &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1862 (i).

——— Electrical Fixtures, Drawings *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).

Moosejaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Mossy River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2149 (ii).

Nanaimo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).

Napanee River Dredging, Instructions &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Wilson) 981 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 1903 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 2065 (ii), 4049 (iii).

Napierville Postoffice: in Com. of Sup., 1865 (i).

Nelson Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

New Edinboro, N.S., Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1283 (i).

Nicolet River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).

Nominingue Postoffice Building: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1884 (i).

North Bay, Burks Fall and Maganatawan Wharfs, Total Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Arthurs) 981 (i).

—— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 2556 (ii).

'Northumberland' Dredge, Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2435 (ii).

N. S. Wharfs and Breakwaters, Contracts *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2160 (ii).

—— Contracts *re* Constructions in Digby County: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 657 (i).

Okanagan Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Ottalie Stream, N.B., Public Works, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1287 (i).

Ottawa City, Dom. Buildings, Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2590 (ii).

—— Deptl. Steel Cases: in Com. of Sup., 2582 (ii).

—— Lavatories: in Com. of Sup., 2583 (ii).

—— Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 2583 Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2553 (ii).

—— Woods Building, Lighting Contract, Cor. with Mr. Ellis and City Council: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3672 (ii)

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3948 (ii). *See* 'Ottawa.'

Ottawa River and Carillon Water Power, Leases, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Monk) 9994 (v).

Ottlecock Dam, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2852 (ii).

Owen Sound Dock, Work *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 10337 (v).

Parrsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1598 (i).

—— Plans, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).

—— Instructions to Officials *re* Plans, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Rhodes) 1727 (i).

Parry Sound Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).

Petawawa Wharf: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).

Peterborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2603 (ii).

Petit Rocher Wharf, Expenditure since April, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6267 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Piles Federal Works, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 7590 (iv), 8103 (v).

Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).

Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5994 (iv).

Port Credit Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iv).

Port Credit Public Works, Expenditure for 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5638 (iii).

Port Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1101 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).

Port Perry Postoffice Building: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1880 (i).

Postoffice Buildings, Total Value, Expenditure, Subsidies *re* Mails, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

—— Inquiry for Rets,. 4567. 5541 (iii).

Postoffice Buildings, Policy of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1870 (i).

Postoffice Buildings in Rural Districts, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).

Prince Rupert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of and Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lalor) 4319 (iii).

Public Buildings in former Estimates, Precedence over new ones: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).

Public Buildings, Plans approved by Depts. previous to Aug. 5th, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 698 (i).

Public Buildings for Postoffices, &c., Number, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 786 (i).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7347 (iv).

Public Buildings, System adopted *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in of Sup., 1669 (i).

Public Buildings, Total Cost for several Years: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2100 (ii).

—— Ques. of Order *re* Discussion (Mr. Pugsley) 2101: Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2101 (ii).

Public Works, Contracts, Penalties *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).

Public Works, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 7 (i).

—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1032 (i), 5993 (iv).

—— Travelling Expenses: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8356, 9071 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Public Works Estimates, Objection to Vote in full: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).

Public Works Estimates, Quebec, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com of Sup., 1639 (i).

Public Works, Expenditures generally: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).

Public Works, Labour Hours: *See* 'Hours.'

Public Works promised during Western Tour: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1630 (i).

Public Works, Supply for: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 10354 (v).

Quebec City Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).

——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

Red Point Wharf, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).

Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3017 (ii).

Rigaud Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).

——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 3067 (ii).

Rivière des Prairies, Completion of Deepening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).

——— Rep. of Engineer &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 2161 (ii).

——— M. for Copy (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2162 (ii).

Rock Island Building: in Com. of Sup., 1889 (i).

St. Andrew's Dam, Bridge, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3035 (ii).

——— Sums for Completion: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 1508 (i).

St. Andrew's Wharf, P.Q., Tenders *re* Construction, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3608 (ii).

St. Catharines Drill Hall Site: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1680 (i).

St. Croix River, N.B., Construction of a Public Work, Proposal *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1348 (i).

St. Gabriel de Stratford Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i), 4666 (iii).

St. Jacques de l'Achigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).

St. John Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1624 (i).

——— Contract *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).

St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar Contract, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5631 (iii).

——— Quantity of Material taken out by Maritime Dredging Co. under Beacon Bar Contract: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5129 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, completed, &c.: Ques, (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).

——— Rental of Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2673, 3065 (ii).

St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1894 (i).

——— Option *re* Lands: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2677 (ii).

——— Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2577 (ii).

St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 10509 (v).

Ste. Marie Division Post Office, Defective Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10336 (v).

St. Peter's Bay, P.E.I., Wharf &c., Expenditure *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247, 7344 (iv).

Ste. Therese Post Office, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 1715 (i).

Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).

Seagull Dock, St. Joseph's Island, Date of Construction, Expenditures, &c.: (Mr. Boyce) 1349 (i).

Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4825 (iii).

Sharbot Lake Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).

Shawinigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).

Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).

Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).

Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).

Summerside Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1602 (i).

Swan Creek Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings, &c. for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 2159 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, Sask. and Alberta, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Three Rivers, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).

——— Post Office, Temporary Building: Ques. (Mr. Clare) 8984 (v).

Tignish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1602 (i).

Tilbury Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).

Tilbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).

——— *See* 'Walkerville.'

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Toronto Barracks, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7557 (iv).

——— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2153 (ii).

——— *See* 'Militia.'

Toronto Federal Buildings, Plans of Erection: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8479 (v).

Tillsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).

Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).

Uxbridge Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1084 (i).

——— Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9782 (v).

Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2630 (ii).

Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).

Vegreville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).

Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).

Victoria Harbour, Ont., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).

Wallaceburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2633 (ii).

Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1101 (i).

Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2634 (ii).

Water Powers owned by the Dom., Legislation *re* Regulation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7803 (iv).

Water Powers on St. Lawrence, Concessions granted: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 9780 (v).

West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 811 (i).

West Dublin Bay, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).

Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).

Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).

Weyburn Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).

Weymouth Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 1601 (i).

Whitby Post Office Site, Purchase of: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1867 (i).

Wiarton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2636 (ii).

Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 6272 (iv).

Wingham Public Building Tower Clock, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6664 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Winnipeg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018, 3029 (ii).

Winnipeg River, Water Rights, Grants, Leases, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 2162 (ii).

Wolfe Island, Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).

——— Protection to Road: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1599 (i).

Yarmouth, Dredging Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6031 (iv).

——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1600 (i).

Pullman Berths, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5990 (iv).

Pulp and Paper Duties, Par. in New York 'Herald': Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2638 (ii).

——— Information *re* (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2646 (i).

——— Alteration *re* Pulp and Paper by U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4468 (iii).

Pulp Wood Exports to the U. S., Value of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).

——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Paterson) 5126 (iii).

——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Pure Foods: *See* 'B. No. 35.'

Quaker Oats Co., Reciprocity with U.S.: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 4120 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Govt. Advances: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 7245 (iv).

Quarantine, Animals Health: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Quarantine, Public Health: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iv).

Quarantine Stations, Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3213 (ii).

Que. Battlefields: *See* 'B. No. 222.'

Quebec and Blanc Sablon SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8788 (v).

Quebec Boundaries, Cor. with Ont. and Dom. Govts., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 981 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders *re* Contract: M. for Copies (Mr. Lennox) 713 (i).

——— Advertisement *re*: M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copy, 1497 (i).

——— Tenders *re*: M. for Copies (Mr. Lennox) 3068 (ii).

Quebec Bridge, American Engineers consulted by Min. of Rys.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 697 (i).

——— British Empire Bridge Co.'s Deposit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9981 (v).

Quebec Bridge, Caisson, Damage to, Claims *re*:Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4045 (iii).
—— Carriage Way, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9979 (v).
—— Commission of Expert Engineers, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Emplymt. of Mr. Cooper *re* Inspection: Ques. Mr. Lennox) 6663 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Construction, Information re: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4319 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Contract with M. P. Davis, dated July 27th 1903, Transfer of same to Govt, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 4567 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Contract *re* Construction, Resignation of Chairman, Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4205 (iii).
—— Contract *re* Reconstruction: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4740 (iii).
—— Date of Completion, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2667 (ii).
—— Estimated Cost, Tunnelling, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Donelly) 3278 (ii).
—— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8102 (v).
—— Fair Wage Clause *re* Workmen: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6757 (iv).
—— Fair Wage Clause, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5835 (iii).
—— Financial Loan, Interest &c.: (Mr. Lennox) 4665 (iii).
Quebec Bridge and Labour Organizations: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 7039 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Members of Construction Board: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9981 (v).
—— Payment of $100,000 with Phœnix Bridge Co.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 981 (i).
—— Plans, Contracts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6273 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Price) 7103 (iv).
—— Approval by Chief Engineer of G. T. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4826 (iii).
—— Specifications, Instructions *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lennox) 4677 (iii).
Quebec Bridge River Bed, Tests, &c., Investigations: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 658 (i).
—— Superstructure Contract, Letting of: Announcement (Mr. Graham) 6669 (iv).
—— Supervision, Amount expended: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6671 (iv).
—— Supervisor, Remuneration by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6449 (iv).
—— Tunnel Construction, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6268 (iv).
Quebec Civil Servants, Names of Permanent and Temporary Employees since 1st Jan. 1905, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lachance) 2376 (ii).
Quebec, Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
—— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).
Quebec Experimental Farm, Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8992 (v).
Quebec and Great Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Quebec Harbour Commission, Advances to, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2851 (ii).
—— Number *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2436 (ii).
Quebec Members, Revolt against extra session, Newspaper Articles: Denial of (Mr Talbot) 10096 (v).
Quebec , Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Que. and N. B. Ry: Co.: See 'B. No. 120.'
Quebec Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Que. Savings Banks Act. Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 219.'
Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Use of: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7109 (iv).
Questions, Answering orally or written, Procedure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 700 (i).
Questions and Answers, Orally and Written: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 989 (i).
—— Copies given to Press (Mr. Hughes) 900 (i).
Questions answered orally: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1080 (i).
Questions, Incomplete Answers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1013 (i).
Questions and Motions proposed to be Introduced: Notice of (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1502 (i).
Questions of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Mr. Pugsley's Public Record, 10202 (v).
Ques. of Priv., Charges *re* Obtaining Lumber for Govt. Stores (Mr. Lanctot) 8695 (v).
—— *See* 'Privileges and Elections Com.'
Ques. of Privilege, Cor. *re* Connection with Riordan Paper Co. and Reciprocity (Mr. Perley) 10197 (v).
—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Rabies, Outbreak of, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).
Racial and Religious Prejudices, Liberal Pamphlets, Quotations &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Address, 531 (i).
Race Track Gambling: M. to print Evidence (Mr. Miller) 10467 (v).
Ry. Accidents, Inquests: *See* 'B. No. 2.'

Railway Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 4, 8, 23, 78, 197.'
Rys. and Canals Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Ry. Act Amt. (1903), c. 31, Proclamation *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 786 (i).
Ry. Water Belt in B. C.: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Railway Commission, Apptmt. of French Canadian: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1103 (i).
Ry. Commission's Powers: *See* 'B. No. 197.'
Railway Committee: M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of House, 10190 (v).
——— M. to sit during sessions of the House (Mr. Guthrie) 9226 (v).
Ry. Employees, Forthnightly Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
Ry. Employees, Permission to Vote: *See* 'B. No. 38.'
Ry. Employees, Protection: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Ry. Locomotive Boilers, Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Railway Mail Clerks, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4285 (iii), 6179 (iv).
——— Compensations: in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).
——— Compensated for Accidents, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9537 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3859 (ii).
——— Examinations: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6082 (iv).
——— Increases to: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
——— Maximum and Minimum Salary, Claims *re* Increase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2160 (ii).
——— Names and Dates of Apptmts. of Persons not passing Qualifying Examinations: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3855 (ii).
Railway Mail Clerks Salaries: *See* 'Civil Service Bill 217.'

RAILWAYS:

Accidents *re* Canadian Railways, Investigation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3922 (ii).
Accidents since 1st April, 1909, on running Trains, Construction Work, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ralph Smith) 713 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3853 (ii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Quebec Oriental Ry. Co. and New Canadian Co., Date of Incorporation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2161 (ii).
——— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 4048 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re*: Personal Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 8187 (v).
——— *See* main heading.

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

C. P. R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 766 (i).
——— Land Tax, Information *re* Privy Council's Decision, (Mr. Bradbury) 2992 (ii).
——— Reduction of Rates, &c.: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1806 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1573 (i).
Capitalization of Railways: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 5233, 5246 (iii).
Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Charters to Railway, Granting to by Parlt. Conditions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) on Railway Estimates, 5122 (iii).
Electric Railway Charters, Number since 1896, Extensions *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4043 (iii).
Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 10196 (v).
——— *See* 'Postoffice—Parcel Post.'
Gov. General's Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6446 (iv).
Govt. Railways constructed previous to Confederation, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 4829 (iii).
See 'I. C. R.'
Grand Falls and St. John Ry. Subsidy, Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 9371 (v).
——— *See* main heading.
G. T. Ry. Trainmens' Strike, Reinstatement of, Apptmt. of Judge Barron: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Northrup) 2376 (ii).
——— Settlement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 9692 (v).
——— *See* main heading.
Humber River Bridge, G. T. Ry. Plans *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2885 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, Policy of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 660 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Lands, Number of Acres sold *re* Construction Fund: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 796 (i).
I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 8513 (v).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
International Ry. Traffic, Points of Crossing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 4466 (iii).
Level Crossings: in Com. of Sup., 9509 (v).
——— *See* 'Ry. Crossings.'
Manitoba and Southeastern Railway Co.'s Charter, Transfer, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCarthy) 6505 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Manitoba and South Eastern Ry. Co.: Inquiry for O. C. (Mr. Foster) 6915 (iv).

Official Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).

P. E. I. Ry.—Harmony-Elmira Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).

—— Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractors, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).

—— Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (iv).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Govt. Advances: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 7245 (iv).

Railway and Canals Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).

—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1473 (i).

Ry. Commission Board: in Com. of Sup., 6427 (iv), 9508 (v).

—— Apptmt. of French Canadian: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1103 (i).

—— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).

—— Ry. Commission and Interstate Commerce Commission, Agreement *re* Traffic between U. S. and Can.: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 3054 (ii).

—— Vacancy on, Apptmt. of Farmer: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1291 (i).

Railway Crossings, Action of Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).

—— *See* 'Level.'

Railways Owned, Operated in U. S. and Can., Mileage, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Rutan) 6158 (iv).

Ry. Rates to Clergymen, Reduction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2434 (ii).

Railway Rates in the West: Remarks on Address (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 98 (i).

Railway Rates, Comparison with U.S. Ry. Rates: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6431 (iv).

Railway Traffic Connections, Arrangements between Province and Ry. Commissioners: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 696 (i).

Railways, Transportation problem: Stmnt. on M. for Sup. (Mr. Graham) 5039 (iii).

Regina and Moosejaw Town Site, C.P.R.'s Interest *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 3281 (ii)

Section Men, Complaints *re* Overwork: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).

Shelters for Working Men: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6437 (iv).

Subsidies, Total Amount since Confederation: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 3467 (ii).

—— Corrected Statement (Mr. Graham) 6196 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Surveys and Inspections, Canals and Railways: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii) 6452 (iv).

Telegraph &c., Control of Rates: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 8356 (v).

—— *See* 'Express.'

'Rainbow' Cruiser, Date of Purchase, Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 788 (i).

'Rainbow' and 'Niobe,' Cost to Date, Price, Repairs and Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 791 (i).

—— Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 792 (i).

'Rainbow', Struck off effective List: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1081 (i).

—— *See* 'Naval Service.'

Rainy River Power Development: *See* 'B. No. 109.'

Rapide Plat Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Absence of Ministers during Discussion: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8358 (v).

Agricultural and Farmers Associations, Res. approving Tariff: Read (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5546 (iii).

Agricultural Implements: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5745 (iii).

Agricultural and Manufactured Products of the U.S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Stmnt. made by Mr. M. Clark, 4196 (iii).

Alterations &c., Better information placed before House: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4933 (iii).

American Boats through Can. Canals: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).

Answers of Ministers to Questions: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4137 (iii).

Associated Boards of Trade, Ont., Res. by: Read (Mr. Middlebro) 4121 (iii).

Australia and Can., Reciprocal Negotiations since 1900: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

Berlin Board of Trade Res., Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) 5726 (iii).

Boards of Trade, Saskatchewan, Despatch from W. A. Shepherd: Read (Mr. Schaffner) 5752 (iii).

Boston Speech of Min. of Militia: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 5751 (iii).

British Ambassador's Warning to Can. Ministers: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6200 (iv).

—— *See* 'Negotiations.'

British Demand for Tariff Concessions: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6574 (iv).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

British Preference, Increase of, Readjustment of Tariff, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7210 (iv).

British Preference Trade Policy: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5619 (iii).

——— *See* 'Preference.'

British Tariff Commission, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6268 (iv).

Butter and Eggs, Prices in London, Statistics *re*: Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce *re* Return (Mr. Perley) 6508 (iv).

Canadian Coasting Laws, affecting Grain and Hogs: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 5133 (iii).

Champ Clark, Speech of, *re* Annexation: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3608 (ii).

——— Cor. with U. S., *re* Speech of Champ Clark; Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 3954 (iii).

——— Stmnt. of Mr. Clark *re* Opposition to: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 4227 (iii).

Comparative Prices Special Rep. of: Laid on Table (Mr. King) 10468; M. to Print 10590 (v).

——— *See* 'Statistics.'

——— Printing of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10469 (v).

Conferences, Length of Session, Names of Representatives, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 7036 (iv).

——— *See* 'Negotiations.'

Correction of Figures in Speech in Hansard (Mr. Lennox) 3770 (ii).

Cor. laid on Table (Mr. Fielding) 3068 (ii).

Cor. with G. B. and Can. *re* Negotiations &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Turcotte) 3948 (ii).

Countries affected by Treaty *re* Importations into Canada (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4131 (iii).

Creston Fruit and Produce Association, Res. from: Read (Mr. Goodeve) 4119 (iii).

Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario, Denial of Stmnt. of Minister of Customs (Mr. Armstrong) 4570 (iii).

——— Correction *re* Stmnt. (Mr. Paterson) from Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario (Mr. Lalor) 4223 (iii).

Debate: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).

———Resuming of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 5939 (iv).

See 'Obstruction.'

Denial of Stmnt. of member for Cape Breton (Mr. Northrup) 5035 (iii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Northrup) *re* Quotations made by member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) 5410 (iii).

Dufferin Board of Trade Res.: Read (Mr. Black) 5547 (iii).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Editorial in Montreal 'Star': Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 4139 (iii).

Farmers' Delegation from the West, and Govt. Ownership of Elevators: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1504 (i).

——— Article in Grain Growers' Guide *re* Hudson Bay Ry.: Denial of Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1574 (i).

——— Control of Hudson Bay Ry. Rates: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1508 (i).

——— Representations to the Govt., Printing &c.; Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1454 (i).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to print Speeches, 3054 (ii).

——— Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 6908 (iv).

Farmers and Manufacturers Interests, Speech of Mr. Nesbitt: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4663 (iii).

Farmers Interests, Assurance of member for N. Oxford: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 5541 (iii).

Farm Products imported from other Countries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3668 (ii).

Favoured Nations, Importations from: Ques (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4111 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4113; Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 4114 (iii).

——— Entry of Canadian Goods into their Markets (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4134, Reply (Mr. Fielding) 4134 (iii).

——— Favoured Nation Treaty Countries, Names of: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4665 (iii).

Fishing Bounties, Payments *re*: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 6670 (iv).

Fish Tariff, Application *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2886 (ii).

Fleming Grain Growers' Association Res.: Read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5550 (iii).

Free Trade Offer by U. S., Pres'dt. Taft's Speech *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 5293 (iii).

French Imports, Quantity, Value, Rates of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8097 (v).

Fruit Clause in Reciprocity Treaty, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 3283 (ii).

Fruit Duty, Res. from B. C. Inland Board of Trade: Read (Mr. Burrell) 3377 (ii).

——— Tel. read from Fruit Dealers *re* Duty affecting B. C. (Mr. Burrell) 3770 (ii).

——— *See* 'Summerland.'

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Fruit Duty, Tel. from Mission City Agricultural Ass'cn: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3955 (iii).

Fruit Growers Association, B. C., Protest *re* Duty: Read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3373 (ii).

Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnson before Com. on Ag.: Remarks (Mr. Schell) 2992 (ii).

Fruit Growers' Association, Burlington, Res. from: Read (Mr. Henderson) 4122 (iii).

Fruit and Vegetables Amt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sealey) 7666 (iv).

——— *See* 'Vote.'

Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Delegates, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3529 (ii).

——— Report of Proceedings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Print, 3952 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Burrell) 6120 (iv).

——— French Editions: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9075 (v).

Hamilton Cotton Co., Stmnt. of Employees: Read (Mr. Goodeve) 5747 (iii).

Interruption of Speakers, Denial of Stmt. *re* member for East Hastings, 5029: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5032 (iii).

——— Interruptions not Relevant: Remarks Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7527 ,iv).

——— Objections *re* Interruptions: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4451 (iii).

Kentville Board of Trade, Res.: Read (Mr. Rhodes) 5749 (iii).

——— Read: (Mr. Crosby) 5548 (iii).

Letter from Market Gardeners: Read (Mr. Bradbury) 4130 (iii).

Letter read by Member for Saltcoats, Giving Name of Writer: Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7264 (iv).

Lord Strathcona's Telegram *re* Reported Interview: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5126 (iii).

——— Explanation (Mr. Goodeve) 5210 (iii).

——— Mess. from Associated Press : Read (Mr. Fielding) 5292 (iii).

Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 5545 (iii).

Minister's Visit to Washington, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 4566 (iii).

——— *See* 'Negotiations.'

Negotiations between U. S. and Can.: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 32 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 48 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 72 (i).

Negotiations at Washington: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1506 (i), 2271 (ii).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Negotiations at Washington: Further Information *re* (Mr. Foster) 2070 (ii).

——— Instructions to Mr. Bryce: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4140 (iii).

——— *See* 'Conferences.'

——— Reported Draft of Proposals: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2065 (ii).

——— Submission to Hse. for Ratification: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1805 (i).

Negotiations by Mr. J. A. Macdonald of 'Globe' at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) *re* Speech at St. Catharines, 2560 (ii).

——— Attack of Ministerial Association, Ottawa: Personal Explanation (Mr. Hughes) 3352 (ii).

——— Editorial in 'Globe': Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 2743 (ii).

——— Letter of J. A. Macdonald in Stratford 'Herald' *re* Visit to Washington: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4299 (iii).

Newspaper Reporters and Announcement of Treaty, Par. in Winnipeg 'Free Press' *re* Treatment of: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) 2642 (ii).

North York, Challenge *re* Contest: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7220 (iv).

Obstruction, Articles in Press *re*: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 9999 (v).

——— M. to adjn. debate (Mr. Best), Obstruction, &c., 9885 (v).

Oleomargarine, Admission of: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6668 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6504 (iv).

Opposition to Pact: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) 5739 (iii).

Opposition in Northumberland, East Riding: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Owen) 6767 (iv).

Oshawa Fruit Growers Ass'on. Res.: (Mr. Fowke) 5747 (iii).

Papers laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) M. (Mr. King) to print, 10590 (v).

Par. in Moosejaw 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 2639 (ii).

Par. *re* Quaker Oats Co.: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 4120 (iii).

Peterborough Board of Trade Res.: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 5750 (iii).

Pets. Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).

——— Inquiry for Pets. (Mr. Foster) 2439, 3057 (ii).

Preferential Tariff Concessions granted to G. B.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

——— *See* 'British.'

Prime Minister's Visit to Imp. Conference, Editorials in 'Christian Guardian': Read (Mr. Thornton) 9072 (v).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Private Cor.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2985 (ii).

Private Correspondence produced, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 10197 (iii).

Procedure in the House *re* Resolutions: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5752 (iii).

Protests *re*: laid on Table (remarks) 3951 (iii)

Protocols, Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2555 (ii).

Pulp and Paper Duties: Information *re* (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2646 (ii).

——— Alteration *re* Pulp and Paper by U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4468 (iii).

——— Par. in New York 'Herald': Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2638 (ii).

Ques. of Priv., Cor. *re* Connections with Riordan Paper Co. and Reciprocity (Mr. Perley) 10197 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Owen *re* Vote, 3343 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., Resolutions *re*: M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Fielding) 2440, Schedules laid on Table, 2465, 2477 (ii).

Debate:
(Mr. R. L. Borden) 2497; (Mr. Monk) 3284; (amt.) 3289, Neg. (Y. 72; N. 97) 3292; (Mr. Fielding) 3289; (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3294; (Mr Paterson) 3316; (Mr. Foster) 3327, 3530; (Mr. Neely) 3563; (Mr. Burrell) 3579, 3611; (Mr. Guthrie) 3629; (Mr. Lennox) 3681; (Mr. Warburton) 3709 (ii); (Mr. Armstrong) 3737 (ii); (Mr. Kyte) 3956; (Mr. Sproule) 3980, 3995; (Mr. Lemieux) 4005; (Mr. Monk) Amt. *re* Loyalty, 4051; (Mr. Fielding) Denial re Annexationist, 4054; (Mr. Lemieux) Denial *re* Annexationist, 4054; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4057; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4058; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4062; (Mr. Fielding) 4073; (Mr. Macdonell) 4078; (Mr. Devlin) 4082; (Mr. Ames) in Com. on Res., 4083; (Mr. M. Clark) 4143; (Mr. Blain) 4167; (Mr. Molloy) 4183; (Mr. Sifton) 4385; (Mr. Fisher) 4409; (Mr. German) 4482; (Mr. Carvell) 4496; (Mr. Middlebro) 4535; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4741; (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4771; (Mr. Templeman) 4811; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4830; Amt. 4844, Neg. (Y. 70; N. 111) 4875 (iii); (Mr. Fielding) 4845; (Mr. Foster) 4852; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4856; (Mr. Northrup) 4861; (Mr. Guthrie) 4868; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4873; (Mr. Harris) 4877; (Mr. Miller) 4937; (Mr. Goodeve) 4969; (Mr. McKenzie) 5014, 5260; (Mr. Bradbury) 6680 (iv); (Mr. Ralph Smith) 6709; (Mr. Broder) 6739; (Mr. Cash) 6952; (Mr. Jameson) 6966; (Mr. Hunt) 7006; (Mr. Thornton) 7040; (Mr. Devlin) 7064; (Mr. Crothers) 7077; (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 7110; (Mr. Hughes) 7126; (Mr. Sexsmith) 7224; (Mr. MacNutt) 7262; (Mr. Lancaster) 7281; (Mr. Robb) 7328; (Mr. Edwards) 7393; (Mr. Beauparlant) 7450; (Mr. Wright) 7461, 7481; (Mr. Turcotte) 7506; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 7517; (Mr. Sealey) 7530, amt. 7547; (Mr. Henderson) 7633; (Mr. Allen) 7661 (iv); (Mr. Nantel) 8130 (v); (Mr. Turriff) 8148; (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 8162; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8244; (Mr. Schaffner) 8281 (v); (Mr. Magrath) 8373; (Mr. A. Haggart) 8389; (Mr. Arthurs) 9646; (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9673; (Mr. U. Wilson) 9727; (Mr. Porter) 9745; (Mr. Macdonell) 9938; (Mr. Smyth) 9966, 10146; (Mr. S. Sharpe) 10151, 10310; (Mr. Donnelly) 10456; (Mr. Beattie) 10533; (Mr. Maddin) 10550; (Mr. Kidd) 10572 (v).

Resolutions, Presenting of, Reading &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 5948; (Mr. Speaker) 5948, Rule Read (Mr. Foster) 5953 (iv)

Ret., Incomplete: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1652 (i).

Ret. Suppl.: Laid on Table (Mr. Fielding) 4383 (iii).

Saskatchewan Boards of Trade, Res.: Read (Mr. McCraney) 5751 (iii).

——— Saskatchewan Municipalities, Telegrams: Read (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5534 (iii).

Speech of Min. of Ag. in Montreal: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) 6199 (iv)

Statement in White Book, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sharpe) 10193 (v).

Statistics, Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 6508 6675 (iv).

Statistics of Comparative Prices in U. S. and Canada: on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, (Mr. Perley) 6769; (Amt.) Neg. (Y. 64; N. 98) 6837 (iv).

——— Vote of Member for Labelle, Ques. (Mr. Perley) 6839 (iv).

Statistical Tables of Prices: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6840; Accepting as Read, and Printing in Hansard (Mr. Hughes) 6840 (iv).

Statistics, Purpose of Negotiations: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 7037 (iv).

Statistics, Further Inquiry for from Trade and Commerce Dept.: (Mr. Perley) 6508, 6675 (iv).

——— Tabulated Statement: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2985, 3059 (ii).

——— Trade Statistics, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2737 (ii).

Statistics from U. S., Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4931 (iii)

——— Mess. to President Taft *re* Request for Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4471 (iii).

——— Publication *re* Bureau of Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6673 (iv).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Summerland Farmers' Institute, &c.: Read (Mr. Burrell) 5549 (iii).

Summerland 'Review', Editorial re Fruit Growers: Read (Mr. Paterson) 4123 (iii).

——Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Obstruction by Minister of the Crown 4124: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4124 (iii).

Swift Current Board of Trade, Res. from: Read (Mr. Knowles) 4119 (iii).

Talking Between Ministers during Debate: Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 7292 (iv).

Tariff Negotiations &c., Prime Minister's Remarks in the West: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 26 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 65 (i).

Tel. from Min of Fin. to High Commissioner: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3274 (ii).

Tel. of Senator Cummins *re* Manufactured Products: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 4115 (iii).

Trade with other Countries affected: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3667 (ii).

Trent River Paper Co. Res.: Read (Mr. Porter) 4117 (iii).

Tupper, Sir Charles, Letter from, Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) Reference to Previous Debate, 8252; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) read, 8277; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 8279 (v).

Vote on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Personal Explanation (Mr. German) 4929 (iii).

Vote on Amt (Mr. Monk): Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Wallace) 3461 (ii).

Vote *re*, Par. in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lortie) 3953 (iii).

Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt.: 'Globe' Report *re* Explanation (Mr. Lennox) 7602: (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7619 (iv).

—— Original Document: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7668; Letter from Hansard Reporter: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 7675; Letter from 'Globe' Reporter, Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7675; Explanation (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7670 (iv).

Western Farmers Interests: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 5543 (iii).

—— *See* 'Farmers.'

Winnipeg Board of Trade, Res. from: Read (Mr. Lalor) 4121 (iii).

Wool in the Fleece omitted from Free List: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 6264 (iv).

Yarmouth Farmers' Association, Res. from: Read (Mr. Law) 4122 (iii).

Red Point Wharf, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).

Regina and Moosejaw Town Site, C. P. R's. Interest *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 3281 (ii).

Restaurant, Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 469 (i).

—— *See* 'House of Commons.'

Restigouche Riparian Association: *See* 'B. No. 176.'

Returns, Delay in Preparation: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 7554 (iv).

Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5733 (iii), 8093 (v).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7256 (iv).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 2150 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Rhodes) 1001 (i).

Returns, Notice to Members: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 5938 (iv).

Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3017 (ii).

Revenue and Expenditure, Total for 1890-1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9992 (v).

'Review of Reviews', Collection of Extra Postage: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).

Revillon Frères Trading Co. Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 158.'

Revised Statutes, French Translation: *See* 'B. No. 136.'

'Rexall', Registration by United Drug Co. in Canada: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4672 (iii).

Richelieu Electoral District, Charges against Mr. Lanctot *re* Painting Private Dwelling: Notice of Motion (Mr. Nantel) 4566 (iii).

—— Labour: M. for Com., 4654 (iii).

—— *See* 'Priv. and Elections.'

Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 192.'

Rideau Canal, Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

—— Lockmen, Increase of Pay: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

—— Removal of Stumps: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Pet. *re* Withdrawal of Lands &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8636 (v).

Rifle Associations: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).

Rigaud Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).

—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 3067 (ii).

Riordon Paper Co. and Reciprocity: *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Riparian Rights in Boundary Waters: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Riviere des Prairies, Completion of Deepening &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).

—— M. for Copy (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2162 (ii).

—— Survey, Rep. of Engineer &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 2161 (ii).

Robertson, Lorne Forbes, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 142.'
Roberval Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).
Robichaud, Wm., Compensation *re* Fine: in Com. of Sup., 6105, 6159 (iv).
Rock Island Building: in Com. of Sup., 1889 (i).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Additional Land purchased: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8994 (v).
—— M. for Cor.*, 8994 (v).
Rolling Stock, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii), 8513 (v).
Roper, Commander, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 799 (i).
—— Speech *re* Naval Service at Public Function: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 932 (i).
—— Speech *re* Naval Service, Approval of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1288 (i).
—— Speech, Meaning of Word 'Faction' Preparation of Answer: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 1351 (i).
Rosendale Mail Service, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1291 (i).
Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own while in England: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1087 (i).
—— Rifles loaned by Can. to G. B. at Bisley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1085 (i).
—— Number issued to Queen's Own Regiment: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9781 (v).
—— Recommendation to British Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7552 (iv).
R. M. College, Additions &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
—— *See* 'Militia.'
R. N. W. Mounted Police, Coronation Contingent: in Com. of Sup., 8752 (v).
—— Death of Inspector on Northern Patrol: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 8598 (v).
—— Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 8598 (v).
—— Pay and Allowance, &c: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 8101 (v).
Roy, Mr. Ferdinand, Emplymt. by Govt., or N. T. Ry. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2851 (ii).
Ruddock, Mr. R. F., Application *re* Homestead in B. C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3279 (ii).
Rules of House, Amendment *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 10470 (v).
Rural Mail Delivery, Generally: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10365 (v).
Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Stamps and Postcards manufacture of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).
—— Number in Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 983 (i).
—— East Elgin, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 983 (i).
—— Man.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1105 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery in Renfrew County: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).
Rural Postmasters: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (iii).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9995, 10095 (v).
St. Andrews Dam, Bridge &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3035 (ii).
St. Andrews Dam, Sums for Completion: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 1508 (i).
—— Correction in Stmnt. (Mr. Bradbury) 1650 (i).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Fish Ladders &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
St. Andrew's Wharf, P. Q., Tenders *re* Construction, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3608 (ii).
St. Catharines Drill Hall Site: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1680 (i).
St. Charles Rifle Range, Winnipeg, Sale of, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7343 (iv).
—— *See* 'Militia.'
St. Croix River, N. B., Construction of a Public Work, Proposal *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1348 (i).
St. Gabriel de Stratford Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i), 4666 (iii).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly Flag: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7553, 7687 (iv).
—— *See* 'Flags.'
St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2674 (ii).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).
St. John, N. B., Drill Hall, Contract *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1624, 1664 (i).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar Contract, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5631 (iii).
—— Quantity of Material taken out by Maritime Dredging Co. under Beacon Bar Contract: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5129 (iii).
St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, completed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).
—— Rental of Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2673, 3065 (ii).
St. John River, Navigation Rights: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
St. John River Vally Ry., Lease to Govt.: *See* 'B. No. 150.'
St. Johns, Que., Postmaster, refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir': Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1089 (i).

St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1894 (i).
——— Option *re* Lands: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2677 (ii).
——— Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2577 (ii).
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 10509 (v).
St. Lawrence Power Co., Annual Payments *re* Light and Power &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3468 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, Damming Long Sault Rapids: on M. for Com. of Sup., 2887 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Dams, Diversion of Channel: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3058 (ii).
——— Information *re* Bill before U.S. Senate: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4210 (iii).
——— Protests *re* from Dom. Govt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4210 (iii).
——— Further Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3058 (ii).
——— Legislation at Washington, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3282 (ii).
——— Letter from Mr. J. Wesley Allison: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3767 (ii).
——— Letter from Gov. Dix.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3839 (ii).
——— *See* 'Long Sault.'
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Buoys at Sorel Shipyards, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).
——— See 'Sorel.'
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (iv).
——— Depth at Low Tide below thirty feet: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1718 (i).
Ste. Marie Division Postoffice, Defective Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10336 (v).
Ste. Marie de Monnoir Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1698 (i).
St. Mary's River Diversion: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
St. Ours Locks, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).
Ste. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 2436 (ii).
St. Peter's Bay, P.E.I., Wharf Expenditure *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247 (iv).
St. Peter's Breakwater, Repair, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7344 (iv).
St. Peter's Canal, C.B., Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 8103 (v).
——— Answer to Ques.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8355 (v).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iv).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve: Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 5837 (iii).
——— Amounts received from Sales, &c.: Ques. Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).
St. Peters Indian Reserve, Chief Justice Howell's Commission: M. for Copy of Evidence* (Mr. Bradbury) 7039 (iv).
——— Instructions to Rev. J. McDougall, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Bradbury) 1292 (i).
——— Amounts received from Sales &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Moneys paid by Govt., Complaints, &c.: Ques. Mr. Bradbury) 1974 (ii).
——— Original Document, Cor, &c.: Read (Mr.
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 8477 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 8356 (v).
——— Rep. in Winnipeg 'Telegram' *re* Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Oliver) 3840; Explanation (Mr. Bradbury) 3841 (ii).
——— Request by Commission for Official Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 9899 (v).
Ste. Therese Postoffice, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 1715 (i).
Sadler, Maggie Florence, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 137.'
Sand supplied to Kingston Penitentiary, Payments to R. H. Fair: Ques. (Mr. Edwards 5406 (iii).
Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2853 (ii).
Saskatchewan Boards of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. McCraney) 5751 (iii).
Saskatchewan Capital City: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Neely) 5620 (iii).
Saskatchewan Municipalities, Telegrams *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5534 (iii).
Saskatchewan Postoffices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6505 (iv).
Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).
Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 214.'
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Upper Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).
——— Concrete Walls: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).
——— Lock Gates, Tugs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).
——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Labour Strike: Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in 'Sault Express', 6359 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Boyce) 6365 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6186 (iv).
Saunderson, Pauline Winslow, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 181.'

School Lands in Alberta, Revenues from, &c.: Ques (Mr. McCarthy) 1488 (i).
School Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Procedure *re* Disposal: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1345 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 1911 (i).
School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3462 (ii).
——— Total Acreage, Amounts realized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1908 (i).
Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iii).
Scientific Institutions: in Com. of Sup., 6556 (iv).
Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10121 (v).
——— *See* 'Interior.'
Scugog River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).
Seagull Dock, St. Joseph's Island, Date of Construction, Expenditure, &c.: (Mr. Boyce) 1349 (i).
Seal Fisheries, Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9594 (v).
——— Cor *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10196 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10337 (v).
——— *See* 'Pelagic'.
Secretariat at London: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 1506 (i), 5836 (iii).
——— *See* 'Imperial Conference.'
Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 7 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1472 (i).
Secret Commissions: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Sections 11, 12, 14, 22 in Twp. 10, Range 22, Applications *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wallace) 980 (i).
Security Trusts Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Seeds and Farm Weeds: in Com. of Sup., 6213 (iv).
Seed Grain for Immigrants: in Com. of Sup., 3836 (ii).
Seed Grain: in Com. of Sup., 6047 (iv), 9551 (v).
Seed Grain Indebtedness, Amount still owing by Farmers: Ques. (Mr. MvCraney) 3848 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3225 (ii).
Seed Grain, Quality and Price: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 8041 (v).
Seeds, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Selkirk Exhibition: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9076 (v).
——— *See* "Winnipeg.'
Selkirk Postoffice Box: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (v).
Selkirk Route, Welland Canal: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).
Semmens, Rev. John, Payments to *re* Indians, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 6036 (iv).
Senate, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2680 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) re Discussion, 1726 (i).
Senate Amendments to Public Bills, Consideration of: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3845 (ii).
Senate Chamber, Expenditure for Decorating, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1100 (i).
Senate of Canada, Cost for each year from 1896 to 1911: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1339 (i).
——— Correction in Motion (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1453 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 1805 (i).
Senate Messenger: in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iv).
Senate, Preparation of Address to His Ex.: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Senate of Canada, Reform of: Prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4306 (iii).
Senate Stationery: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) in Com. of Sup., 6337 (iv).
Senate Vacancy from P. E. I., Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 2072 (ii).
Sessional Clerks, House of Commons: in com. of Sup., 6167 (iv)
——— Application *re* Increase of Salary: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5404 (iii).
——— Names, Age, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 980 (i).
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4825 (iii).
Sevigny Island, Change of Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 1491 (i).
Sewage, Disposal of. *See* 'B. No. 122,' also 'Ottawa City.'
Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3607 (ii).
Shafting imported, Quantities and Values since April, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 7593 (iv).
Sharbot Lake Postoffice Building: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).
Shawinigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).
Sheep and Lambs imported into Canada from U. S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).
Sheet Steel Co., Emplymt. of Men *re* Ice Blockades. Remarks (Mr. Broder) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
Shelbourne Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Best) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Sheldon, C. D., Action of Govt., re Returning to Canada: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong 6200 (iv).
—— Illegal Use of Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).
—— *See* 'Mails.'
Shipbuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6484 (iv).
—— *See* 'Marine.'
Shipping from Guysborough County, Number of Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4467 (iii).
Shipping Registration: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
Ships, Load Lines: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
Shipwrecks on B. C. Coast, Inspection *re* Loading Vessels, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 7257 (iv).
Shipwrecked Seamen, Care of: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).
Sick Mariners' Dues: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Sick Mariner's Dues, Amount of Money in Trust, Investment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9993 (v).
—— Law *re* Payment of Dues: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1904 (i).
Sick Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 6567 (iv).
Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'
Sinclair, Mr. John, Indian Inspector, Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6272 (iv).
Six Nation Indians Reserve, Grant to Merrill to bore for Natural Gas, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
Small Pox Epidemic, Sanitary Condition of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7252 (iv).
—— *See* 'Ottawa', &c.
Smelt Fishing in N.S., Pet. *re* Change for Open Season: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9984 (v).
Soil Fertility, Memorandum from Experimental Farm: Read (Mr. Armstrong) 5965 (iv).
Songhees Indian Reserve: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Sorel Shipyard, Buoys stolen, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7216 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7026 (iv).
—— Complaints *re* Thefts: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1088 (i).
—— Dismissal of Mr. A. Senecal: Remarks Mr. Blondin) 5732 (iii).
—— Rep. of Commissioner *re* Investigation: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 10096, 10203 (v).
—— Instructions to Commissioners: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7039 (iv).
—— Investigation into Irregularities: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6758 (iv), 9994 (v).
Sorel Shipyards: *See* 'Priv. and Elections.'
Soulanges Canal, Claim for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).
—— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
—— Leaks and Trimming Slopes: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).
—— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
—— Protection Works, Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).
—— Rep. of Mr. Boyer *re* Administration of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6273 (iv).
Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).
S. African Parlt, Rep. of Postmaster General: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 1580 (i).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 84.'
South Grey Appointments: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3344 (ii).
South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
S. W. ¼ Section 10, Twp. 38, Range 15, 2nd Meridian, Applications *re* Entry, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lake) 1501 (i).
—— *See* 'Lands.'
Speakers' Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 926 (i).
—— Expenditure *re* Pianos: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).
—— Purchase of Birds: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).
—— Purchase of Glassware: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).
—— Purchasing Gramophone Records: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).
—— *See* 'House of Commons.'
Speaker's Gallery, Discourtesy to Clergymen: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 269 (i).
Speaker of House of Commons, wearing of Official Robes on State Occasions, Procedure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 705 (i).
Speech of Min. of Ag. on Reciprocity in Montreal: Ques. of Prv. (Mr. Lake) 6199 (iv).
Speeches of Prime Minister, Distribution by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9071, 9253 (v).
Speech from Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Springhill Mines Strike, Conciliation Board *re* Labour Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 4236 (iii).
—— Further Information: Stmnt. (Mr. King) 2740 (ii).
—— Present Condition: Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6362 (iv).
—— Remarks *re* Militia (Mr. Blain) 2641 (ii).
—— *See* 'Labour.'

Stamp Cancelling Machines, Cost, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).
Stamps, New Issue by P. O. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Stamp Vending Machines: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1910 (i).
Stapleton, Dalton Mabel, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
Statistics of Comparative Prices in U. S. and Canada *re* Reciprocity: on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, (Mr. Perley) 6769; Amt. Neg. (Y. 64; N. 98) 6837 (iv).
——— Vote of Member for Labelle, Questioned (Mr. Perley) 6839 (iv).
Statistical Tables of Prices *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6840 (iv); Accepting as Read and Printing in Hansard (Mr. Hughes) 6840 (iv).
——— Mess. to President Taft *re* Request for Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4471 (iii).
——— Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Perley) 6508, 6675 (iv).
——— Special Rep. Comparative Prices, Printing of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10469 (v).
——— Special Rep. M. (Mr. King) to print, 10590 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) 10590 (v).
——— Special Rep. of Comparative Prices laid on Table (Mr. King) 10468; M. to Print, 10590 (v).
——— Stmnt. in White Book, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 10193 (v).
Statistics, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2737 (ii).
Statistics from U.S., Information re: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4931 (iii).
——— U. S. Govt. Publication *re* Bureau of Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6673 (iv).
Statutes, French Edition, Corrections in Translation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8088 (v).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).
Steamer 'Scotia,' New Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).
Steamship Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Steam Trawlers, Application *re* Fishing Bounty: Ques. Mr. Jameson) 4046 (iii).
——— Negotiations *re* Prohibiting: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3074 (ii).
——— 'Wren' and 'Croquette', Registration in Can.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4046 (iii).
Steel Bounties, Govt. Inspectors, Salaries, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5936 (iv).
——— See 'Iron.'
Steel Company of Canada, Date of Incorporation, Capital, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 9690 (v).
Steel and Iron Bounties, Subsidies *re*: M. for Memorials* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3948 (ii).
——— Intention of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6613 (iv).
Sterling Trusts Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Stone Cut, Duty between U. S. and Can., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1287 (i).
Strathcona Public Building; in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).
Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10335 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 8583 (v).
Suburban Ry. Tickets: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).
Summerland Farmers' Institute, &c. Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Burrell) 5549 (iii).
Summerland 'Review,' Editorial *re* Fruit Growers: Read (Mr. Paterson) 4123 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Obstruction by Minister of the Crown 4124. Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4124 (iii).
Summerside Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1609 (i).
Superannuation *re* Postal Clerks: in Com of Sup., 4284 (iii).
Supply Bills: See 'Bills Nos. 128, 160 and 225'
Supply: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com, 695 (i).
Supply for Public Works: Remarks (Mr Owen) 10354 (v).
Supply Schedules, Proportion of Votes Presented (Mr. Fielding) 9566 (v).

SUPPLY—
Committee—
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 6184 (iv).
Dairying Industry, &c., 6234 (iv).
Dom. Exhibition, Grant, 9089 (v).
Exhibitions, 3775 (ii), 9076 (v).
Farm Bulletins, Printing, &c., 6185 (iv).
Health of Animals, 5955 (iv).
Patent Record, 6184 (iv).
Seed Control Act, 6213 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, 6262 (iv).
Year Book, 6184 (iv).
Charges of Management:
Foreign Coin in Circulation, 6059 (iv).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 1474 (i), 5954 (iv).
Customs, 1048 (i), 5992 (iv).
Depts., Generally, 1486 (i).
External Affairs, 1472 (i).
Gov. Gen's. Sec's. Office, 1013 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 1486 (i).
Indian Affairs, 4725 (iii).
Inland Revenue, 1047 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Civil Government—*Con.*

Interior, 4726 (iii).
Justice, 1014 (i).
Labour, 1484 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 1463 (i).
Militia, 1020 (i).
Mines, 1475 (i).
Post Office, 4280 (iii), 6062, 6068 (iv).
Privy Council Office, 1013 (i), 8750 (v).
Public Works, 1032 (i), 5993 (iv).
Railways and Canals, 1473 (i).
Secretary of State, 1472 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 1485 (i).

Customs:

Salaries, &c., 5993 (iv).

Dominion Lands:

Salaries, &c., 5552, 5581 (iii).

Dominion Police:

Gratuity to Constable Shore, 6161 (iv).

Fisheries:

Building Fishways, &c., 6659 (iv).
Can. Fisheries Exhibit, 6661 (iv).
Compensation to Wm. Robichaud, 6105, 6159 (iv).
Fresh Fish Transportation, 6092 (iv).
Legal Expenses, 6661 (iv).
Licenses, 6160 (iv).
Oyster Culture, 6661 (iv).
Protection Service, 3807 (ii).
Salaries of Inspectors, &c., 6613 (iv).

Geological Survey:

Explorations, 9551 (v).

Immigration:

Agents' Salaries, &c., 5165 (iii).
Contingencies, &c., 5196 (iii), 6047 (iv).
General Vote, 4739 (iii).
Seed Grain, 3836 (ii), 6047 (iv).
Winnipeg Hospital, 5208 (iii).

Indians:

Alberta, 6046 (iv).
North West, 6036 (iv), 8884 (v).
Nova Scotia, 6036 (iv).
Quebec, 6035 (iv).

Justice:

Exchequer Court, 6160 (iv).

Labour Dept.:

Combines Investigation Act, 4280 (iii).
Conciliation, &c., 3378, 3393 (ii), 6057 (iv).
Labour Gazette, 4229, 4232, 4241 (iii).
Technical Education Commission, 3801 (ii).

Legislation:

House of Commons, 6167, 6175 (iv).
Printing, Stationery, &c., 6175 (iv).
Senate, 6166 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service:

Agencies, Rents, &c., 6454 (iv).
Aids to Navigation, 6455 (iv).
Allowance to Mrs. Kerr, 6091 (iv).
Construction of Lighthouses, 6470 (iv).
Ice Breaking, 6500 (iv).
Lifting Buoys at Amherstburg, 6091 (iv).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamer, 6546, 6550 (iv).
Lime Kiln Crossing, 6545 (iv).
Maintenance and Repairs, 6455 (iv).
Pensions to Pilots, 6091, 6533 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service—*Con.*

Repairs to Maritime Road, 6542 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 6454 (iv).
Signal Service, 6502 (iv).
Steamer 'Eureka', 6502 (iv).
Telephone Reporting Stations, 6538 (iv).
Trade to the Orient, Report on, 6092 (iv).
Wharf Repairs, 6538 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions:

General Vote, 6058 (iv), 8752, 8788 (v).

Marine Hospitals:

Shipwrecked Seamen, 6572 (iv).
Sick Seamen, 6566 (iv).

Militia:

Allowances, 8514, 8528 (v).
Customs Duties, 6054 (iv).
Military College, 6054 (iv).
Winnipeg Rifle Range, 6053 (iv).

Miscellaneous:

Banff Waterworks, 6052 iv).
Can. National Parks, 6049 (iv).
Dom. Forestry Convention, 6052 (iv).
Imperial Conference, Expenses, 8679 (v).
Members' Contingent to Coronation, 8679 (v).
Paris Agency, 8694 (v).
Pelagic Sealing Conference, 8678 (v).
The Hague Tribunal, 6164 (iv), 9560 (v).

Mounted Police:

Coronation Contingent, 8752 (v).
Pay of Force, 8598 (v).
Subsistence, Forage, &c., 8599 (v).

Ocean and River Service:

'Arctic,' Str., 6089 (iv).
Cattle Inspection, 5828 (iii).
Compensation to Major Moodie, 6089 (iv).
Examination of Masters and Mates, 5821 (iii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 5811 (iii).
Obstructions in Navigable Waters, Removal, 5826 (iii).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 5829 (iii).
Registration of Shipping, 5826 (iii).
Rewards for Saving Life, 5822 (iii), 6090 (iv).
Schools of Navigation, 5823 (iii).
Winter Mail Service, 5828 (iii).
Wrecking Plants, 5829 (iii).

Post Office:

Mail Service, 4296 (iii), 6073, 6179 (iv).
Miscellaneous, 6182 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances, &c., 6178 (iv).

Public Works—Capital:

Buildings:

Archives, Ottawa, 5993 (iv).

Harbours and Rivers:

Port Arthur, &c., 5994 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., 6021 (iv).

Marine Department:

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 6554 (iv).

Public Works—Income:

Buildings:

British Columbia, 3012-3018 (ii).
Generally, 3156-3161 (ii), 6026 (iv).
Manitoba, 2969, 3018-20, 3029-3054 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Public Works—Income—*Con.*

Buildings—*Con.*

New Brunswick, 1603-1624 (i).
Nova Scotia, 1581-1603, 1625-1639 (i), 9500-09 (v).
Ontario, 2088-2150, 2361, 2582-2594, 2602-2638, 3156 (ii), 6033 (iv), 9551 (v).
Quebec, 1639, 1665-1682, 1685-1710, 1860-1903 (i), 2567, 3144 (ii).
Rents, Repairs, &c., 3161-3180, 3186-3218 (ii), 6027 (iv), 8872 (v).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2970, 3001-3012 (ii).
McGill Scholarships, 6445 (iv).
Railway Commission, 6427 (iv).
Surveys and Inspections, 6452 (iv).

Harbours and Rivers:

Nova Scotia, 6029-6033 (iv).

Miscellaneous:

Decorations *re* Coronation, 9565 (v).

Telegraph Lines:

B. C., 6033 (iv).
Sask. and Alta., 6033 (iv).

Quarantine:

Salaries, &c., 5979 (iv).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 6187 (iv).

Railways and Canals:

Canals:

Chambly, 6356, 6408 (iv).
Cornwall, 6409 (iv).
Farran's Point, 6409 (iv).
Galops, 6410 (iv).
Generally, 6452 (iv).
Lachine, 6357, 6410 (iv).
Murray, 6410 (iv).
Quebec Canals, 6388, 6411 (iv).
St. Ours, Lock, 6395 (iv).
St. Peters, 6418 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, 6397, 6416 (iv).
Soulanges, 6389 (iv).
Rapide Plat, 6413 (iv).
Rideau, 6413 (iv).
Trent, 6419, 6453 (iv).
Welland, 6397, 6425 (iv).
Williamsburg, 6408, 6426 (iv).

Miscellaneous:

Arbitrations and Awards, 6427 (iv).
Gov. Gen's. Car, 6445 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry., Govt. Director, 6448 (iv).

Railways:

Intercolonial Railway, 5913-5930 (iii), 5983, 6338 (iv), 8513, 9560 (v).
Prince Edward Island Railway, 6352 (iv).

Scientific Institutions:

Astronomical Surveys, 9546 (v).
Magnetic Observatory, 6557 (iv).
Meteorological Service, 6563 (iv).
Surveys of Dom. Lands, 9547 (v).

Steamboat Inspection:

General Vote, 6572 (iv).

Trade and Commerce:

Chinese Immigration Act, 6058 (iv).
Commercial Agencies, &c., 6059 (iv).
Salaries, &c., 6059 (iv).

Unprovided Items, 6160 (iv).

Surveys and Inspection for Canals and Railways: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii), 6452 (iv).

Surveys, Militia Expenditure in each of last five years: Ques. (Mr. Nantel 1109 (i).

Sussex Street Govt. Property, Names of Owners, Prices paid: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 6666 (iv).

——— *See* 'Ottawa.'

Sutherland, George Mackay, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 218.'

Swan Creek Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

Swertlove, Berel, Deportation by Immigration Dept., Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1723 (i).

Swift Current Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Knowles) 4119 (iii).

'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings, &c. for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 2159 (ii).

Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Tadousac Postmaster, Dismissal, Charges *re*, Appointment of Successor: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5133 (iii).

Talbot, Hon. Senator, Applications for Irrigated Lands Reserve: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 803 (i).

Tariff Negotiations &c., Prime Minister's Remarks in the West: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 26 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 48 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 65 (i).

Tariff Resolutions, Par. in Moosejaw 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 2639 (ii)

——— See 'Reciprocity.'

Taylor, Mr. Geo., Retirement as Chief Whip: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).

Technical Education Commission: in Com. of Sup., 3801 (ii).

——— Completion of Work: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1661 (i).

——— Progress *re*, Total Expenditure &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1721 (i)

Telegraphs Act Amt.: See 'B. No. 116.'

Telegraphs and Cable Service,: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9636 (v).

——— See 'Parcel Post,' &c.

Telegraph Cos.' Statements: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Telegraphers Board of Conciliation I. C. R. Statute re Grant: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2853 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, Sask. and Alberta, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Telephone Co.'s Statements: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Telephones, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6171 (iv).

Telephones for Life Saving Stations on St. Lawrence Route: in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Tetagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishway: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7806 (iv).
Thessalon Breakwater, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Smyth) 10532 (v).
Thibaudeau, Mr. Frank, Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 8100 (v).
Three Rivers Harbour Commission, Interest paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 814 (i).
Three Rivers Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).
Three Rivers Postoffice, Temporary Building: Ques. (Mr. Clare) 8984 (v).
Thunder Bay Ice Breaker: in Com. of Sup., 6500 (iv).
Tignish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1602 (i).
Tilbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).
Tilbury Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).
Tillsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).
Timber Licenses in New Westminster, B.C., Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3222 (ii).
Tipping System, Abolition of: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Tobacco Curing Experimental Stations: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).
Tobacco Duties, Imports and Exports from and to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).
Tobacco Leaf, Total Imports, &c. into Canada for last three years: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5405 (iii).
Tobacco Production, Encouragement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6262 (iv).
Toronto Barracks, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7557 (iv).
——— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2153 (ii).
——— See 'Militia.'
Toronto Barracks Site (Baby Farm) Reps. Valuation, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 981 (i).
Toronto Federal Buildings, Plan of Erection: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8479 (v).
Toronto Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 175'
Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2367 (ii).
Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3466 (ii).
Toronto Postoffice, Addition to, Changes *re* Specifications: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 805 (i).
Tower Clock, Parlt. Buildings, Complaint *re*: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto: in Com. of Sup., 1624 (i), 6187 (iv).
Trade and Commerce Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1485 (i).
Trade Commissioners: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Trade Commissioners for Canada, Names of Countries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2156 (ii).
Trade Commissioner to Mexico, Date of Mr. Bouley's Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8993 (v).
——— See 'Can. and Mexico SS. Subsidy.'
Trade Imports and Exports between B. N. A. Possessions and U. S.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4383 (iii).
Trade Relations with Germany, Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8403, 8534 (v).
Transcontinental Ry., Commissioners' Rep. Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
——— Eastern Div., Total Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 9430 (v).
——— *See* 'Natl. Transcontineneal Ry.'
Translator for H. of C., Apptmt. of: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7015 (iv).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
Transportation—Georgian Bay Canal as a Waterway: Amt. (Mr. Monk) on M. for Sup., 5137; Ruled out of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5163 (iii).
Transportation Problem, Stmnt. on M. for Sup., (Mr. Graham) 5039 (iii); Reply (Mr. J. Haggart) 5103 (iii).
——— *See* 'Canals', 'Railways', &c.
Travelling Expenses of Ministers, Govt. Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1340 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3954 (iii), 8356 (v).
——— on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Murphy) 4568 (iii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers, Tips, &c.: on M. for Com. of Ways and Means (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7432 (iv).
Treasury Board, Minutes *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5136 (iii).
Treasury Board Minutes: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4659 (iii).
——— *See* 'Farmers Bank', &c.
Treaty of 1871 *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7022 (iv).
Trent Canal, Floods by Damages: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
——— Lift Lock: in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).
Trent River Paper Co., Res. *re* Reciprocity with U.S.: Read (Mr. Porter) 4117 (iii).
Truesdell, Frances Whittington, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 183.'

Trussed Concrete Steel Co. of Can., Ltd., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Trusts: *See* 'Industrial.'
Truro Freight Shed Fire: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).
Truro Increased Accommodation I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).
Truro Political Meeting, Excursion Train over I. C. R., Instruction to Agents, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).
——— Rates on I. C. R.: Explanation (Mr. Graham) 3343 (ii).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Turkeys: *See* 'Blackhead.'
Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance to Widow: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3861 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ry. Mail Clerks.'
Unclaimed Balances in Banks: *See* 'B. No. 14.'
United Shoe Machinery Co., Application *re* Investigation, Govt. Representative, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2672 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Combines Act, Govtl. Action *re*: Remarks (Mr. Ethier) 4300 (iii).
U. S. Army Deserters at Niagara Falls, Subjects of Extradition: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 707 (i).
U. S. Consuls, Names, Fees &c. residing in Can.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1727 (i).
U. S. Immigration Agents and Canadian Travellers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6119 (iv).
U. S. Immigration Officers residing in Can.: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1723 (i).
U. S.—Japanese Treaty: Inquiry for Copy (Mr. Foster) 7256 (iv).
U. S. Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 984 (i).
U. S., Reciprocity with: *See* 'Reciprocity.'
U. S. Tax on Canadian Shipping, Legislation at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 9247 (v).
U. S. Trusts and Combines, Regulations in U. S. Courts, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 4342 (iii).
U. S. Warships on Great Lakes, Armament of: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7026 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6362 (iv).
——— Information from Official Sources, Delays, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6611 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1571, 1805 (i), 2556 (ii), 5629 (iii).
——— Manœuvres at Chicago, Permission of Can. Govt. *re* passing through Canals: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6116 (iv).
——— Permission to Traverse Canals: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7253 (iv).
Universal Life Assurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
University of Saskatchewan, Land Endowment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4111 (iii).
Unorganized Districts in Northern Ont., Deferred Elections: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) 10100 (v).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
Unprovided Items, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).
Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2630 (ii).
——— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1084 (i).
——— Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9782 (v).
Vacancy, Arthabaska and Drummond Electoral District: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Vancouver Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3066 (ii).
Vancouver Chinese Immigration Frauds: *See* 'Immigration.'
Vancouver Customs Entries by Robt. Kelly, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Barnard) 713 (i).
Vancouver Dry Dock Subsidy, Nature of: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 3469 (ii).
Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).
Vegreville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).
Ventilation of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Black) on M. for Sup., 4473 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4209 (iii).
Verdict of Montreal Jury *re* Masonic Property stolen: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7207 (iv).
——— *See* 'Masonic.'
Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).
Vessels Registered in Canada, Lists: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 9690 (v).
Vessels Transferred between Can. and Newfoundland, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3464 (ii).
Veterans of 1866, Compensation to: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9999 (v).
Veterans, Grants to: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 5211 (iii).
——— *See* 'Militia.'
Victoria Electoral Div., Convictions, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 7602 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
Victoria Museum, Ottawa, Cor. *re* Foundation: Inquiry for (Mr. Hughes) 7666 (iv).

Victoria Meseum, Ottawa, Cracking of Tower, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 5937 (iv).
——— Cracking of Walls: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 9252 (v).
——— Expenditures *re*, Space allotted &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1975 (ii).
——— Inspection *re* Defects: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 7349 (iv).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of, on Stmnt. of Sec. of State: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10455 (v).
——— Inquiry for Stmnt. ((Mr. R. L. Borden) 10096 (v).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Proclamation *re* Earlier Date: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 9900, 10142 (v).
Waddington Power Development, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Broder) 7210 (iv).
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Walkerville Postoffice Building and Mail Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) *re* Staff, 2559 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).
——— *See* 'Post Office—Tilbury.'
Wallaceburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2633 (ii).
Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1101 (i).
'Wanda' Yacht, Appraising by Customs, &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4678 (iii).
——— Changed from American to Canadian Register, Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4300 (iii).
——— Date of Entry at Canadian Port, Notice to Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5933 (iv).
——— Length, Motive Power, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5834 (iii).
——— Valuation of: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Paterson) 5623 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods, Complaints *re*, Investigation by Com. on Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) 6905 (iv).
Water Carriage of Goods: *See* 'B. No. 210.'
Water-Carried Freight, Value, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6671 (iv).
Water Investigations *re* Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Waterloo Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 2634 (ii).
Water Powers: *See* 'B. No. 49.'
Water Powers, Conservation of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7261 (iv).
Water Powers owned by the Dom., Legislation *re* Regulation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7803 (iv).
Water Powers on St. Lawrence, Concessions granted: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 9780 (v).
Water Powers on St. Lawrence: See 'Long Sault.'
Water in Ry. Belt, Peace River, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Water and Sewage Pollution: See 'B. No. 131.'
Water Supply to Parliament Buildings, Rep. of Agriculture Dept.: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 5401 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2553 (ii).
——— See 'Ottawa.'
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Members, Reps. O. Cs.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 1339 (i).
Waterways Commission, International: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Waterways Treaty: Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695; in Com. on Res., 867 (i).
Waterways Treaty Bill, Govtl. Intention: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 8895 (v).
——— Inquiry for Plans (Mr. J. A. Currie) 3681 (ii).
——— *See* 'International Waterways', &c.
Ways and Means: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 695 (i).
Weapons, Carrying of: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Welland Canal, Enlargement, Change of Route, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).
——— Enlargement, Memorial, Pets, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Hodgins) 1500 (i).
——— Jane St. Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).
——— Stone Protection to Banks: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).
Wentworth, Number of Govt. Appointments since 1904: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 2162 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 2557 (ii).
Westbrook Mail Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1103 (i).
West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 811 (i).
West Dublin Bay, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
Western Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Western Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 94.'
Western Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board, Settlement, &c.: Remarks on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9696 (v).
——— Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9070 (v).
——— See 'Coal.'
Western Farmers as Immigration Agents to Europe: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 799, 1284 (i).
Western Farmers Interests *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 5513 (iii).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

West Indies and Halifax SS Service, Arr ngements *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4674 (iii).
——— Specifications *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4925 (iii).
West Indies Trade with Canada: on M. for Com. of Sup., 6371 (iv).
——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Foster) 6274 (iv).
West Indies Trade, Imports, &c., Total Value: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 2854 (ii).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
Westport Signal Stations, when erected, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1091 (i).
Westville Post Office, Number of Bricks used: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).
Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).
Weyburn Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).
Weymouth Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 1601 (i).
Wharfs for Lighthouse and Coast Service, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).
Wharfs. N.S., Contracts *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2160 (ii).
Wheat Prices in West and Canada and Liverpool Market: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 6267 (iv).
Whip, Chief Opposition, Retirement of Mr. Geo. Taylor: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).
Whitby Post Office Site, Purchase of: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1867 (i).
Whitemouth River Fishway: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
Wiarton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2636 (ii).
Wilhelm Telephone Factory, Seizure at, Compromise, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 7601 (iv).
Williamsburg Canal, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6396 (iv).
——— Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).
——— Lockmaster's House: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).
——— Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).
——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).
Windsor Branch, I.C.R. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).
Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 6272 (iv).
Windsor, N.S., Letter Carriers, Salary: Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).
Wingham Public Building Tower Clock, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6664 (iv).
Winnipeg Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 3052 (ii).
Winnipeg Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity with U.S.: Read (Mr. Lalor) 4121 (iii).
Winnipeg Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3018, 3029 (ii).
Winnipeg International Exposition, Govt. Assistance to: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 708 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).
——— *See* 'Selkirk.'
Winnipeg Rifle Range: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iv).
——— *See* 'Militia.'
Winnipeg River Water Rights, Grants, Leases &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 2162 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bradbury) 3955 (iii).
Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery, Apptmt. of Keeper &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4041 (iii).
Wireless Stations, Number, Location, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2678 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 1340 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6457 (iv).
Wireless Telegraphy on Ships: *See* 'B. Nos. 41 and 116.'
Wolfe Island Customs Official, Apptmt. of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8099 (v).
——— Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
——— Protection to Road: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1599 (i).
Woods Building: *See* 'Ottawa.'
Wood, Carriage by Water: *See* 'B. No. 210 & 212.'
Wood Island Life Boat Dimensions, Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3224 (ii).
Wool in the Fleece omitted from Free List *re* Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 6264 (iv).
Working Expenses, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
Workingmen's Wages, Increased Cost of Living, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 3065 (ii).
Wrecking Plant Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).
Yarmouth Board of Trade: Res. Reciprocity, Read (Mr. Law) 5550 (iii).
Yarmouth Dredging Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6031 (iv).
Yarmouth Farmers' Association, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Law) 4122 (iii).
Yarmouth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1600 (i).
Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
Yukon Buildings, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3214 (ii).
Yukon Territory Ordinances: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 8 (i).